Appendix

Roger Stevens: Man of Many Hats, Behind Our Expanding Arts Program, Described in the Washington Sunday Star

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an article written by Frank Getlein, and published in the January 23 Washington, D.C., Sunday Star gives an engrossing account of the extraordinary gentleman who is the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts, Mr. Roger Stevens. An up-down-and-up again career leading from prep school to Michigan University to work as a gas station attendant and a stint on the Ford assembly line brought him into the realty business and a $25,000 a year income by the age of 26. Not bad for a college dropout.

After gaining success in real estate he moved into theatrical production. In 15 years he produced 120 plays, including "West Side Story" and "A Man for All Seasons."

At the present time, in addition to being Chairman of the National Arts Council he is Chairman of the Board of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Whichever of his many hats he happens to be wearing, he exhibits a rare combination of imagination, originality, and organizational ability.

The National Council on the Arts is off to a good start with Roger Stevens at the helm. The first grants, announced several months ago, testify to his profound understanding of contemporary needs in the arts and his imaginative approach to attempts at their solution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the January 23 Washington Sunday Star entitled "The Man Behind Our Expanding Arts Program" be printed in the Appendix today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN BEHIND OUR EXPANDING ARTS PROGRAM

(By Frank Getlein)

The case can easily be made that the most important person in the American arts today is Roger L. Stevens, former bigtime realtor, former distinguished theatrical producer, and former college dropout, who is right at the center of the revolutionary Government involvement in the arts now going forward under the National Council on the Arts.

The case goes roughly as follows: From the Babylonians and the Egyptians right into the early 19th century not only have the arts tended to have direct and fruitful interrelations with government, but artistic periods of great productivity and high achievement have tended to coincide with special government interest.

Examples are endless of great artists producing on government commission or under government subsidy a great deal of the finest artistic heritage of man: Mozart and Moliere, Tchaikovsky and Raphael, Sophocles and Goya, all worked for government in one way or another. Government sponsorship of art is directly responsible for the circumstances, at least, in which flourished such varied artistic manifestations as classical Greek tragedy, Renaissance paintings, and Bauhaus architecture and design.

A LAGGING UNITED STATES

But the United States, ignoring the universal example of civilized nations, has generally let the arts shift for themselves, except when congressional committees have investigated them for alleged obscenity.

The most notable exception, that of the WPA and related projects of the New Deal, is deceptive, since the prime motive of Government there was not the production of art but the feeding of artists who, in the depression for once only, were considered equally entitled to eat, along with everyone else.

But this traditional attitude has been changing profoundly over the last generation. States have instituted arts councils. Cities have erected art centers, often sustained out of taxes. Within the last 5 years the Federal Government has followed both of these leads from States and cities. Granted the nature of government in our time in most fields it enters, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Federal role will expand and eventually become one determining factor in the nature of the American arts.

THE KENNEDY CENTER

One manifestation of the Federal Government in art is the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The plan for the Kennedy Center is for it to be the national equivalent of the community centers that have been growing everywhere recently. The Chairman of the Board of the Kennedy Center is Roger L. Stevens.

The other principal such manifestation, in many ways of more far-reaching significance, is the establishment by Congress, just at the end of the last session, of the National Council on the Arts, with an annual budget of $10 million to spend on the arts in America. In its first, historic disbursement, the Council late last year voted out almost $3 million, most of it directed with remarkable intelligence and understanding toward fundamental changes in the art apparatus of the country. The chairman of the National Council is Roger L. Stevens.

Set up as a financial reservoir for the Council and potentially of immense importance as a focus of private funding for public arts, is the National Endowment for the Arts. The endowment is there to receive money anyone wants to hand in for the Council's use in furthering the arts. It is unfortunately somewhat clouded at the moment by a legal opinion that the intent of Congress is that it can accept only money for no specified purposes on a matching basis.

Since almost all givers, in the arts, individual, corporate and foundation, have something or other they are especially interested in, this leaves the endowment with little to do in the way of accepting funds. People who worked on the original legislation establishing the new apparatus, however, take the view that the intent of Congress was no such thing. They believe the present paralysis can be eliminated by a simple legislative, administrative or judicial clarification. When that is accomplished, in the near future, the endowment will be on the road to the big money.

Chairman of the endowment is Roger L. Stevens.

And so it goes. Turn where you will, whenever government as government reaches out toward the arts, there you find Roger Stevens.

A TRAVELING MAN

You also find him, these days, all over the country. The American Government made its basic shift to upward mobility during World War II, and the Johnson administration is the most yet. Roger Stevens fits right in with the motif of government on the go. He travels incessantly. He goes to New York the way many Government workers go to McLean or Wheaton, as the normal end of a normal day. In addition he shuttles around the country like Defense Department people going to Vietnam. And for similar reasons: to see for himself.

Stevens nowadays accepts speaking engagements in the most unlikely places merely in order to get a look at some community or university theater he has never seen, to take in the work of a new playwright, to hear some little known or only locally known musical group. He makes six to eight trips a month, usually speaking, always looking and listening, and, on the wing, keeping up a substantial correspondence on the affairs of the Council, and the Center and with people who would like to get involved with one or both.

Recently, in Washington, briefly, between Detroit and Arizona, Stevens noted that for himself the great advantage of all the flying about he's doing is that it enables him to keep up on his reading, of which, in the contemporary novel, he does much more than most officials, keeping well up to date with the English and the French and wishing he could find more to admire in the American.

Stevens comes by his reading habits honestly. Like many school dropouts who later take up learning on their own he escaped the formidable disadvantage of a diploma interpreted as the end of an education.

AS A READER

The reading, like many other things about his rather spectacular career, has played its part in making him perhaps uniquely suited for the jobs he holds.

A third generation Michigan real estate man, Stevens began his career as a first generation gasoline station attendant. Born in Detroit in 1910, he completed Choate School on schedule and was accepted for Harvard when his father suddenly lost everything in one of those late 1920's intimations of the great depression to come. Young Stevens transferred to the University of Michigan, where he could live at home. He last a year, quit and embarked upon life on his own in Detroit.

The gas station and a stint in the Ford assembly line came in here, while he tried, without much luck, to crack the family trade. In the mid-1930's—his own midtwenties—

something of the family talent in realty appeared in Stevens to coincide with the changing realty situation in the motor city. As the market began to stir out of its paralysis, Stevens developed a sure instinct for undervalued property and a talent for trading in it to profit. By the age of 26, with the depression still going, he was making $25,000 a year on realty.

AS A REALTOR

And he was doing it by a method the Council is using in mum exploitation of the very limited funds now at the disposal of the Council: namely, on other people's money. Stevens used his realtor's eye and feel to select promising property, then got an investor or a group to buy it with no commission but with a partnership in the profits. This is basically the method the Council is using in several of its projects: the classical theater companies to open in three cities next fall will be school connected and educational as well as theatrical; the artists' housing project is based on a revolving fund supported by Government-insured mortgages.

The talent is first of all an eye for unrealized value going to waste and then a jigsaw puzzle man's instinct for finding the right pieces to make the picture.

The same rare combination is called for in the vocation of theatrical producer in the strange and complicated state of the stage in our time. In that vocation, entered while the realty phase was in very high gear, Stevens ran up a memorable record, bringing in as many as eight plays at a time and adding measurably to the quality that makes the New York theater something more than the diversion for out-of-town garment buyers it sometimes seems chiefly to be.

LITERARY BENT

Stevens is quite proud of that record and with good reason. While he grants that no producer in his right mind can afford not to do an occasional musical, his basic theatrical bent is literary. During those early years in Detroit, when he was living in boarding houses and working for Ford, he was also carrying on the education he had ignored in favor of poker while briefly at the University of Michigan. One of his fellow lodgers introduced him to Mann's "The Magic Mountain." Stevens for the first time encountered a book that took effort but rewarded in proportion. Another lodger and friend was Alan Seager, the poet and short story writer, then a young teacher and, for Stevens, a reader's guide to literature. There have been moments when Stevens very nearly became a publisher or an art gallery keeper, but theater got the nod.

He spent the war in the Navy at Miami for the most part, in a commission he obtained by the expedient, in lieu of the required college degree, of telling the Navy how much money he was making. Off duty he scouted Miami hotels and after discharge dabbled profitably in that field.

The year 1949 saw the expansion of his activities in two ways. He moved his realty interests to New York and he graduated from occasional investing in the theater to full-fledged production. Both moves were from Ann Arbor. In that town that spring he staged "Twelfth Night" for a drama festival, importing Broadway actors for the production. Pleased with the show, he brought it with him to New York, where it got critical approval and a final deficit of $45,000.

THE THEATER CAREER

The approval was enough and Stevens embarked on a career in theater that has ended only with his Government service. He says of his 15 years in the theater that "75 percent of the plays of literary merit, in those years, I produced."

Such a statement probably shocks people who think of Stevens primarily as the producer of "Mary, Mary," a Jean Kerr bon-bon which Stevens will defend and which was one of the minority of his plays to bear his name.

His first association in the theater was with the Playwrights' Company. This group of distinguished writers was originally formed in 1938 by Maxwell Anderson, S. N. Behrman, Sidney Howard, Elmer Rice, and Robert E. Sherwood. By 1951 it was no longer attracting the plays it needed to function successfully. This was due to the fact that unanimous agreement was needed to decide on a play and some of the members were slow readers.

Stevens has always been a fast reader. On joining the Playwrights' Company, he changed things so that he and Sherwood, another fast man with a script, could decide when necessary, as increasingly it was. Since the other members were writers—plus one lawyer—Stevens became the producer for the group.

He also produced for some years for the Phoenix Theater, one of the first of the off-Broadway enterprises. And he had a rewarding association with Robert Whitehead of the Producers Theater. With all of these outlets and others, Stevens was able to be certain he could produce a play he wanted to produce.

COULD RAISE MONEY

He was also able—and this is essential quality—to raise money more readily than many producers. In New York and in the Midwest there are any number of people who have made money in realty through Roger Stevens, and the number continued to grow during his years in the theater. He could and did call upon them for theatrical backing. The two things go together well. Stevens never considered theater as primarily a source of income. That was realty. Theater was adventure, art, literature, achievement. Financially, for an investor, theater becomes worthwhile if a man is in a high tax bracket and can afford to lose money.

Back in that Detroit boardinghouse, Stevens made the fundamental discovery that art is great fun "once you get the habit." That probably led him into theater to start with; he found so much dullness in the realty profession aside from the actual deals themselves. Theatrical production as practiced by Stevens, combined the intricate assembling of diverse parts with substantial artistic interest. His playwrights have included Eliot, Giraudoux, Anouilh, O'Neill, Shaw, Gore Vidal, William Inge, Tennessee Williams, Peter Shaffer, Jan de Hartog and Harold Pinter. "West Side Story" and "A Man for All Seasons" were Stevens productions. In the decade and a half of his theatrical work, he estimates he did 120 plays, of which 30 were hits and 30 got favorable reviews and no customers. He produced 25 first works of new playwrights and numerous revivals of classics, from Shakespeare to Ibsen and Chekhov. His productions consistently showed up in the "Best Plays" of each year.

In 1951 Stevens brought off the biggest realty coup of his career, the purchase of the Empire State Building. The transaction itself was enormously complicated, involving legal simultaneity for a series of property transfers and agreements, and therefore requiring 2,000 signatures on 600 documents. The price, $51.5 million, was the largest ever paid for a building—this being well before the Rayburn House Office Building went into fiscal orbit. The closing took 7½ hours of signing and exchanging documents, the last of which brought spontaneous applause from the hundred people involved.

The following year, out of party conviction and intellectual curiosity, Stevens became finance chairman for the Volunteers for Stevenson. In 1955–56 he performed the same job for Stevenson in the primaries and for the Democratic Party in the campaign. He found the main trouble in that line of work to be the proclivity of donors to pile in astute political and diplomatic advice between the beginning and the end of their signatures on checks.

His most personally satisfying recent realty action was in New Haven, as part of its major renewal program. Stevens arranged the move of an old New Haven department store, Malley's, a few blocks away from its location and persuaded Macy's to come across the street. Both stores are making more money than expected and the Macy move especially represents a reversal of the present trend of department stores to get out of town. Stevens is fairly disillusioned with urban renewal from a realtor's point of view, but he does regard Macy's in downtown New Haven as a vindication of an intellectual conviction.

REWARD OF ART

This is also the approach he brings to his work on the Council. He believes passionately that the arts holds rich rewards for many more people than are now getting them. He concerns himself deeply with problems of distribution. On taking on the job of fund-raising for what was then called the National Cultural Center, Stevens noted that the Center would help decentralize the arts. The first program of grants by the Council again and again takes up that same challenge. Plays are planned, exhibitions scheduled, for the smaller cities without adequate cultural facilities of their own. The problem of the meritorious unproduced play on Broadway is juxtaposed with the existence of the university and community theater.

Everywhere the extraordinary realtor's instinct for assembling pieces works across the arts in America.

Stevens shrugs off the possibility of his becoming a cultural dictator; there isn't that kind of money available. Moreover, he hasn't that kind of taste. He wants to increase cultural availability. He sees education in the arts as the root problem. He studies the pieces.

He likes opera and symphonic music, knows little of what came after the 12-tone scale. He likes modern painting from the Impressionists to about O'Keeffe, Marin and Hartley, has not kept up with pop and op, can't quite take them seriously. Yet as an assistant in art he chose Henry Geldzahler, the pop curator of the Metropolitan.

PRIVATE LIFE

Stevens probably comes as close as is possible for an American to Picasso's ambition to "live like a poor man who has a lot of money." He rents a house in Georgetown, larger than needed for himself and his wife, Christine, but with decent space for their large, ancient, dog. He owns half a dozen paintings or so, including a Monet cathedral, a Utrillo and a Chagall. But the paintings clearly are there because the Stevenses like looking at them. Quite consciously, Stevens prefers the intangible pleasures of the theater—which ceases to exist when the lights go out—to the material, the physical property of painting and sculpture.

He admires the English novel and the English theater because of their strong discipline, as opposed to what he regard as the absence of that quality in American life and art. Whether from discipline of from other sources, the English novelists, as contrasted to their American contemporaries, do show modesty, sublety and understatement, all of which characterize Stevens himself.

One of his favorite English writers, Anthony Powell, has a character say at one point, "In the end most things in life—perhaps all things—turn out to be appropriate."

That at least is how it has been with Roger Stevens.

Is Government Breeding Own Weakness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the January 27 editorial in the Peoria Journal Star be reprinted at this point in the Record.

Is Government Breeding Own Weakness?

It is easy to shrug off a Bobby Baker when his master is promising you peace, prosperity, and free medical attention—all without effort on your part except to put an "X" after his name on the ballot.

It is easy to shrug off phony budget figures, careless accounting, irresponsible spending, the accumulation of personal wealth while in Government service and under the beneficent rulings of Government, the manipulation of legal powers for extralegal performance, frankly discriminatory taxes, and frankly discriminatory laws as between unions and employers, and flatout political misrepresentation—when you figure you are in some manner or to some extent one of the beneficiaries of the skullduggery.

But the development of cynicism in the American voter, and of laughter and shrewdness and cleverness and showmanship as substitutes for such old-fashioned concepts as personal honor or unbending integrity, only stands up under benefits.

It is very poor preparation from times of trouble.

It is a very weak basis for sacrifice, for rallying to a "cause" that demands something from us instead of promises to give something to us.

This attitude is the real problem this Nation faces in the testing to which the Communist movement puts us.

This is what is really behind the peace movements and the draft dodging and the senatorial wriggles for ways that provide some temporary escape from saying we have to fight, at least.

The American leftwing, that cheered every doubledeal and every misrepresentation, and every power juggle and financial juggle that went their way, now simply refuses to believe anything the same Government says or does in regard to South Vietnam.

They created this all-powerful Presidency, and they corrupted it considerably, and now they refuse to believe or support an all-powerful and corrupt and dishonest leadership when it comes to demanding a sacrifice.

Meanwhile, a disillusioned rightwing long since refused to believe in the honesty and integrity of Presidential statements and actions, and has long feared such centralized power and secrecy.

There is among some of our youth and among some minority groups a growing distrust of any leaders or any leadership.

Thus, one of the reactions of centralized power has been a rebirth of a sentiment that leads only toward anarchy.

We tried that, in a way, back in Revolutionary days, and found that even in a basically agrarian society we couldn't function as a confederacy of independent States.

So, we tried to create a Federal Union that would balance the functional necessity for coordinated action with protection against tyranny. We tried to find a middle way between the total freedom of near anarchy and the total control of a tyrant.

The answer was a series of organizations dealing with different areas, State and local; a restricted central Federal organization with three separate and independent leadership branches; and a host of diverse, independent private organizations to be formed voluntarily to perform specific functions and to prosper or disappear on the basis of how well they performed them—rather than through any single power decision.

Under this system, some people did very well, many did well, and some fared badly.

However, it did accomplish three basic things: (1) It preserved more individual freedom of choice than any other system man had ever known; (2) it permitted men of ability and energy to move from poverty to prosperity on a scale never before known under any other system; and (3) it released more goods and services to improve the way of life of the mass of people on a scale never before known under any other system.

It makes us wonder now, if in a drive (which was sometimes idealistic and sometimes cynically political) to solve everybody's problems of every kind, even for those who make no contribution whatever to the solution of their own problems, we are not unbalancing the system. Are we creating new problems worse than those we now claim to be solving?

Are we creating a governmental power that breeds its own weakness?

How far do we go before we do create a population geared to "gimme," but hopelessly helpless to muster the confidence, loyalty, and spiritual strength to meet a real severe challenge?

It is a very serious question because the challengers are waiting in the wings, studying us, honing their weapons, and sending their pawns out to test us "safely" from time to time, here and there—Berlin yesterday, Korea before that, and South Vietnam, today.

If we fail thus, all this pursuit of the drifting smoke of theory and dreams and promises will disappear in the face of the harshest reality Americans have ever known.

Oregon Council for Constructive Republicanism Conference on Urban Dynamics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the 20th century's population explosion has transformed the United States into an urban nation. The Republican Party must recognize this fact if it wants to merit the support of a majority of Americans.

Fortunately, more and more Republicans are turning their attention to the problems of our metropolitan areas and are proposing constructive solutions to them. One such group of Republicans is the Oregon Council for Constructive Republicans, which sponsored a conference on urban dynamics last December at Lewis & Clark College in Portland, Oreg. I ask unanimous consent that some newspaper accounts of the conference and editorial comment thereon be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Dec. 11, 1965]

Facing Reality

A group of Republicans met the first of the month at Lewis and Clark College, in Portland. There is nothing unusual about that. What is newsworthy is that they skipped the chatter about rugged individualism and all that. Instead, they talked in terms of the hard realities of an urbanized America.

Mostly, they talked about cities. Local taxes, race relations, poverty, the automobile, and the structure of municipal government were their concern. These are topics that Republicans have too often left to discussion by Democrats.

Oregon Republicans have been far ahead of those in many States in their willingness to come to grips with problems, in other words to use government as a tool for creating a better world. Their emphasis has been positive and activist rather than negative.

The party nationally can learn much from the Lewis and Clark meeting and from a meeting of moderate Republicans at the Dorchester House, in Lincoln City, last spring. Despite the huge majority that Democrats command in this State, Republicans in county and State office have done very well. This is attributable largely to the progressive stance of Oregon Republicans as opposed to the negative stance of those in the national leadership.

You can't tell a Negro living in Portland's Albina district that he has no problems. You can't tell a chap who is stuck in a freeway traffic jam that we shouldn't try to find a better way to move traffic. You can't tell a woman who is afraid to venture out at night that this is just the way things are.

The party that falls back on the shibboleths of other years and refuses to face the realities of daily living will not win elections and should not. But the party that is willing to put the force of concerted public concern to work at making a better America will command the confidence of the people. The Democratic Party should not be permitted to win by default, although that's what Republicans in many States, and nationally most of the time, have permitted. The Lewis and Clark and Dorchester examples should be of national interest.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Dec. 4, 1965]

Reed Official Tells Republicans Cities Stand in Urgent Need of Attention to Problems

(By Harold E. Hughes)

Republicans tackled the problems of the big cities—taxes, race relations, poverty, automobiles and the structure of city government—as they opened a 2-day conference at Lewis and Clark College Friday night.

The conference on urban dynamics is sponsored by the Oregon Council for Constructive Republicanism, a group made up largely of moderate Republicans seeking to seek through research and discussion answers to the major problems facing the expanding urban population.

Secretary of State Tom McCall told the gathering recent elections proved that the "metropolitan areas are not anathema to the word 'Republican,'" showing, he said, that Republicans who can do well statewide can also run well in the big cities.

"In every election," McCall said, "was recognition that metropolitan problems are crucial to the Republican Party."

Dr. Richard T. Frost, vice president of Reed College, said if metropolitan problems "receive no more attention than they are now getting, they are going to get a lot worse before they are noticeably relieved."

He said, "In trying to get at the sickness of metropolis, we are like the proverbial visitors to the harem—our instincts generally tell us what to do, but we just don't know where to start."

But Dr. Frost suggested six starting places, saying none can be separated out as a "discreet matter by itself, for the key to urban progress lies in our ability to coordinate a number of thrusts rather than take temporary pride in progress along any one of them." Frost's six points:

1. The future city will have to generate its own fresh money, its citizens cannot survive by taking in each other's laundry.

2. Successful future cities will be the ones that make the most rapid and significant progress in the education of their citizens. He called it a "riddle and a shame" that Portland does not have a first-class graduate program.

3. Cities must renew their physical plants, just as industry does. Urban renewal must keep up great momentum. He suggested Portland enact an income tax to relieve property tax burdens.

4. Cities must assimilate their ethnic and racial minorities. The present national turmoil over the American Negro will not abate and it will take unusual leadership from the talents of both groups to handle it properly.

5. The auto presents to modern cities the toughest questions they have ever faced. Cities that are planning transport patterns based almost wholly on the private automobile will one day live to regret it.

6. Future cities must make progress in tooling up their governments. Portland needs to abolish the commission form and adopt a strong mayor, legislative council form of government.

It was this last point that caused Richard A. Braman, deputy city attorney, to boycott the meeting, charging that the Republican committees were stacked with advocates of Dr. Frost's proposal to revise the city charter, a measure on the May ballot.

Braman said that after noting the speakers, "expert witnesses" and reports to be released, "it seems the position of the conference on local government structure has been predetermined."

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Dec. 5, 1965]

GOP URBAN DYNAMICS CONFERENCE ASKS CITY EXPANSION INTO COUNTY AREAS

(By Harold E. Hughes)

The Republican Conference on Urban Dynamics Saturday adopted proposals calling for the expansion of Portland into county urban areas, voted for tax reforms, expanded education and job training, and supported war on poverty and race relations programs.

The 2-day session at Lewis and Clark College, sponsored by the Oregon Council for Constructive Republicanism, tackled the problems of expanding populations in the cities and sought answers through committee research efforts and discussion.

Republican Mayor-elect John V. Lindsay, of New York told the conference in an amplified telephone address from New York "that the problems of the city rise above any political party" and that "partisan politics may not be the answer to solving city problems."

He encouraged the Republicans by saying that his own election victory against a 3½ to 1 Democratic majority "proves that the voters don't want to feel that anyone has their vote" and will not automatically cast them for the entrenched party.

BROADER BASE URGED

Representative WENDELL WYATT, speaking to the noon luncheon, said that if the problems of the cities are to be solved areawide government must be established or greater cooperation among the numerous government agencies achieved.

"There are, so far as I know, no other alternatives available," WYATT told the college commons luncheon.

Later, the conference, attended Saturday by some 60 persons, including a scattering of Democrats, but mostly made up of moderate Republicans, adopted unanimously a resolution urging the expansion of Portland's city boundaries into the urbanized areas of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties.

This resolution called for differential tax rates in the new city areas related to services received, and for a part-time city council expanded to include representatives of the various city sections and directed by full-time elected mayor as is proposed in the May charter amendment election.

CONSOLIDATION PUSHED

Further goals included the consolidation of services and taxing districts and a voluntary council to work with government in Clark County, Wash.

Further recommended was a transit authority, joint jail facilities, and support for a November constitutional amendment permitting continuation of pensions of transit workers if a public system is adopted.

In the field of taxation, the conference came out unnaimously against a proposed 1½ percent property tax limitation, but urged that property tax relief be considered by the legislature in the fields of highway construction, direct service billings, local option taxes, stringent control of exemptions, and constitutional changes to provide for greater citizen participation.

The conference supported the 4-cent cigarette tax before the May voters as an aid to property taxpayers, voted for a broader based and simpler income tax and a sharing of Federal revenues with the States on a credit percentage of taxes paid by the citizens.

VETO CRITICIZED

In the field of race and education, the conference backed the principles embodied in apprenticeship training bill passed by the 1965 legislature and vetoed by Gov. Mark Hatfield.

The conference amended a proposal, but only after a close vote, that would have urged that if the present apprenticeship council fails to expand and reform as proposed in H.B. 1167, that the legislature override the Governor's veto when it meets in 1967.

The conference also passed an amended resolution supporting education for the disadvantaged child and reduction of racial imbalance by commending the Portland School District for its efforts in these fields, but "encouraging the board to expand these and other programs of similar intent," including model school, Head Start, open enrollment, and transfer of students.

The conference said its studies showed that "integration in previously all-white neighborhoods tends to improve social attitudes without hurting property values" and urged all citizens to support efforts to permit nonwhites to live anywhere they choose.

The conference took note of the Federal antipoverty program and said full utilization should be made of these funds, "recognizing that any such experimental programs inherently involved difficult administrative problems."

KINDERGARTENS ASKED

Expansion of preschool education, along with the establishment of public kindergartens throughout the State, won unanimous support.

Presiding was House Speaker F. F. "Monte" Montgomery, Republican, of Eugene.

Republican WYATT, predicting that the efforts of the Federal Government to solve urban problems will continue to expand and said that he was not opposed to all Federal activity in this field. But he warned that if cities and States rely too heavily on national programs to bail them out that State, county, and city lines will disappear, threatening the entire Federal system.

"Where possible," he said, "I favor a program of Federal-urban aid to be administered on the State level."

He urged Republicans to take notice of the enormous changes taking place in local-Federal relations and said there should be recognition that such changes are necessary if urban chaos is to be avoided.

WASTE SEEN

WYATT spoke of the great waste in the overlapping functions of local government and said such units exercise little or no control, while "some rural-dominated State legislatures are more interested in killing daylight saving time and providing farm-to-market roads than in helping the suburbs develop in a sensible manner. Some improvements in this area are on the way. It is long overdue."

WYATT found that it is difficult to deal with urban problems because the government machinery must be modified as the problems do not "fit into the old and established forms of government organization."

As to further Government expansion into local areas, "the simple truth is that it is happening because, like it or not, no other satisfactory alternative was available. Many of the rural-dominated legislatures knew little bout the problems of their cities."

He noted that there are now some 50 distinct urban programs, so numerous that some are overlapping, providing "financial assistance to the cities on a buffet-style arrangement.

"And the indications are that it (the role of the Government) will expand rather than decline in the years ahead, whether we approve the trend or not," he predicted.

James G. Patton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce that James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, whose headquarters are maintained in my congressional district, has announced that he will not be a candidate for the presidency when his term expires this spring. It has been my pleasure to be personally acquainted with Mr. Patton for more than 30 years. When I was a member of the Colorado House of Representatives, more than 30 years ago, Mr. Patton appeared before us regularly in the support of the farmers of the State of Colorado.

James G. Patton has devoted more than 33 years of his life on behalf of the farmers of America. His announcement caused much publicity, and I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article that appeared in the National Union Farmer, an editorial that appeared in the Denver Post on December 2, 1965, and a statement concerning the activities of Mr. Patton:

[From the National Union Farmer]

James G. Patton, for 33 years the champion of the family farmer, announced here November 29 that he would not be a candidate for the presidency when his term expires in March.

Patton, in his 25 years as president, is credited with transforming the National Farmers Union into one of the most potent forces in American agriculture and on the national scene.

His surprise announcement came matter-of-factly at the end of a speech before the Minnesota Farmers Union Convention.

The gathering of more than 500 delegates, held down by an upstate ice storm, sat silent through the totally unexpected pronouncement, then rose to give Patton a standing ovation as he left the speaker's stand.

The 63-year-old farm leader said he would remain active in various interests "to help build a quality America and a better world in which to live" and will continue as an "elder statesman" to advise and counsel the farm organization.

President Patton's remarks, taken down by the press, follow:

"I am not a candidate for reelection to the presidency of the National Farmers Union when my present term concludes in March 1966.

"I have served the Farmers Union for 33 years, the last 25 as its president. The years have been very happy and rewarding ones.

"The Farmers Union potash development is now a reality. Farmers Union insurances are now oeprating at a profit. We now have a great farm bill which will run until 1969.

"I, therefore, feel it is the best time to turn over the presidency during this period when a reestablishment of position and direction can easily evolve.

"Naturally, I am available as one of the elder statesmen of the Farmers Union for counsel, advice, and assistance any time I am asked, and I am looking forward to the years ahead when I will be able to devote more time and effort on special concerns I have to help build a quality America and a better world to live in."

Patton, the dean of American argicultural leaders and a world figure in agricultural, economic, and political policy, was first elected to the FU presidency in 1940 and has been reelected by acclamation at the conclusion of each term.

Following his announcement, Patton flew to Washington to participate in the White House Conference on International Cooperation.

The man that has been given credit for Public Law 480, the U.N. world food program, the International Federation of Agriculture Producers, the Full Employment Act, the war on poverty and other visionary programs, then flew to Portugal to conduct a preliminary study for the United Nations special fund of the potential for capital investment in agriculture there.

[From the Denver Post, Dec. 2, 1965]

JIM PATTON'S 25 YEARS

The retirement of James G. Patton, 63, as president of the National Farmers Union next March will remove from the American scene one of the most colorful and effective farm leaders the Nation has ever had.

In 25 years of NFU presidency, Patton has scored high on almost every criterion of leadership. He is a man with ideas, he isn't afraid to tell the whole world about them and he is persuasive.

These qualities have brought him into close contact with national world leaders. He has helped put Denver on the map as a center of influence.

Under his guidance, the Denver-based Farmers Union has had an effect on farm legislation far beyond its 750,000 farm-family membership. The organization has contributed to the Nation a strong secretary of agriculture, Charles Brannan, and has exerted steady, powerful pressure toward one main objective: a fair return for farmers.

That is a record any organization can be proud of. One of the reasons for NFU success is Jim Patton's 25 years as president. He will be hard to replace.

JAMES G. PATTON

James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, was born on a farm near Bazar, Kans., in 1902, shortly before his family moved to western Colorado. He graduated from Western State College, Gunnison, Colo., in 1929. From an early age he worked to help his family and obtain an education. Following college, he taught school and coached in school athletics, selling insurance at the same time to supplement his income.

In 1932, he helped organize a cooperative insurance company for the Colorado Farmers Union (now Rocky Mountain Farmers Union). Two years later he was named executive secretary of the Colorado Farmers Union and served in that capacity until he was elected president of the Colorado Farmers Union in 1938. Two years later he was elected president of the National Farmers Union.

As National Farmers Union president, Patton has served in a wide range of private and governmental activities.

Some of the Government committees on which Patton has served are: The President's Committee for Children (1940); National Economic Stabilization Board (1942–45); National Committee for Civil Defense (1942); National Labor Management Policy Committee during World War II; National Advisory Board, War Manpower Commission (1943–45); National Advisory Board, Research and Marketing Administration, USDA (1946–52); Public Advisory Board, Foreign Operations Administration (1948–55). Mr. Patton was one of the initiators and active proponents of full employment policies in the United States which led to the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946.

Patton was a founder of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, the free world organization of farmers. He esrved as vice president of the IFAP for 2 years before being elected president in 1958; he was reelected in 1959.

Patton has participated in other international bodies: Agricultural Committee for International Peace (1941); Agricultural Representative to Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (1941); U.S. delegate to Inter-American Conference on Agriculture (1942); U.S. consultant to United Nations Conference on International Organization (1945); U.S. adviser since 1945 to Annual International Conference on Food and Agriculture (U.N.).

Mr. Patton is also president of the National Farmers Union Life Insurance Corp. and the National Farmers Union & Property Casualty Co., service subsidiaries of National Farmers Union, and chairman of the Farmers Educational Foundation.

Mr. Patton is the author of "The Case for Farmers" (1960), in which he presents the reasons for his long advocacy of a strong farm program to assist family farmers both at home and abroad.

Mr. Patton is also chairman of the National Policy Committee on Pockets of Poverty, which, since 1961, has spearheaded the effort to develop a national program for eliminating poverty in America.

PATTON APPOINTMENTS SINCE 1961

Sponsor, Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.

Member, Citizens Committee for International Development.

Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education.

Member, Public Advisory Committee on Rural Areas Development of the Department of Agriculture.

Member, Board of Directors of National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor.

Member, National Public Advisory Committee for Area Redevelopment.

In January 1962, he received the French Croix d' Officier du Merite Agricole, highest French agricultural award, for his "contribution to international understanding of farm problems."

Member, National Committee for Support of Public Schools.

Panel of Public Advisers on Aging.

Member, National Planning Association's Committee on Overseas Development.

President, American Freedom from Hunger Foundation.

Sponsor, Atlantic Council of the U.S., Inc.

Chairman, Family Farm Study Subcommittee of the Public Advisory Committee on Rural Areas Development.

In June of 1959, Mr. Patton was a delegate to the Atlantic Congress in London, England.

Chairman, National Council for Industrial Peace (October 4, 1963).

Board of Advisers, Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation (1964).

Member, Public Advisory Committee for Trade Negotiations (1964).

Vice Chairman, Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, 1965.

Chairman, organizing group, Committee on the World Food Crisis, 1965.

Pursuer of Vietcong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article which appeared in the New York Times on January 31, 1966, entitled "Pursuer of Vietcong," written about Col. Harold Gregory Moore of Bardstown, Ky.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAROLD GREGORY MOORE: PURSUER OF VIETCONG

BONGSON, SOUTH VIETNAM, January 30.—They call Col. Hal Moore the man who can find the Vietcong.

Colonel Moore, who has an aversion to his given name, Harold Gregory, commands the 3d Brigade of the U.S. 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile). He is directing a vast search, Operation Masher, from a hilltop field headquarters north of Bongson. In a war where many commanders have spent days in the rice paddies without ever seeing an enemy soldier, Colonel Moore has succeeded time after time in finding and defeating the Vietcong.

He did so in the Iadrang River valley in November and in Operation Clean House at Christmastime, and he has done so again during the last week.

Yesterday, when a relief force was lifted into an area north of here to help two companies that had been pinned down, Colonel Moore leaped out of the second helicopter. He had fired his rifle through the open door of the craft as it swept into the landing zone.

MOORE'S FIRE TEAM

Shouting like a platoon leader, the lean, blond, 6-foot colonel moved his men into the trees and began setting up an assault. Several times he and the members of "Moore's fire team"—his sergeant major and a staff officer—dashed across open fields from unit to unit.

After the relief force pushed into the enclave, Colonel Moore was at its head. When the first medical-evacuation helicopter landed under enemy fire, he wigwagged it in, then grabbed the first litter and helped to lift it aboard.

Colonel Moore said today that he considered it impossible to command antiguerrilla operations from a rear area or from a helicopter.

"I like to get on the ground," he said, "to get the feel of the terrain, the feel of the enemy, the tension in the air. Many times, everything is fine, nothing is wrong—except that nothing is wrong. And then you move."

"I believe implicitly in my instincts," he added.

He is aggressive, a gambler by nature who sent his men into the Iadrang valley, 25 miles from their base, because he guessed that the enemy could be there. They were, and although he had to call for help, the battalion that he then commanded fought brilliantly.

FORMULA IS FLUIDITY

At Fort Benning, Ga., where the Airmobile Division was assembled, Colonel Moore instilled aggressiveness by refusing to let his unit accept awards for finishing second in divisional athletics.

Part of Colonel Moore's formula is fluid, unconventional tactics. As the fighting developed yesterday, he changed the plan for the deployment of his battalion five times, trying each time to focus his resources on the spot where he found an enemy troop concentration.

Although the 43-year-old colonel is popular in the division, some officers resent his flamboyance and envy his ability to attract the attention of his superiors. They are occasionally heard to call him lucky.

Colonel Moore considers his greatest weakness "a tendency to do everything myself." He has insisted, for example, on personally drafting a reply to every letter he receives, and his desk at Ankhe is full of unanswered mail.

He is a controlled man, capable of fierce concentration 1 minute and extroverted affability the next. As a result, he is impatient with the human frailties of others and is sometimes harsh.

Colonel Moore was born in Bardstown, Ky., on February 13, 1922, the son of an insurance salesman. At 17 he went to Washington to work as a clerk under the patronage of former Senator Albert B. (Happy) Chandler. For 3 years he attended night school at George Washington University.

In 1945, after his graduation from West Point, he filled a series of lieutenant's posts, and in 1952 and 1953 he fought in the Korean war as an infantry company commander.

Later, Colonel Moore served with North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces in Norway, living in Oslo for 3 years. With characteristic thoroughness, he taught himself to speak Norwegian and learned cross-country skiing so well that he won a medal for skiing more than 325 miles in one season.

Preparing for his assignment to Vietnam, the colonel completed a master's degree in international affairs at George Washington. He wrote his thesis on Laos and immersed himself in the writings of Mao Tse-tung and histories of guerrilla warfare.

After arriving in Vietnam, he took a copy of Bernard Fall's book "Street Without Joy," an account of the French defeat in Indochina, to the site of the ambush of Groupe Mobile 100 near Ankhe. He read Mr. Fall's description of the French tank units fate while sitting by the roadside, picking out terrain features as he read.

One result of Colonel Moore's political schooling is his insistence, emphasized in every briefing he gives, that civilian casualties be minimized. He has also gone to great lengths to win the understanding of Buddhist monks and Roman Catholic priests in villages where his units have campaigned.

The colonel's wife, Julia, and their five children live in Columbus, Ga., near Fort Benning.

Colonel Moore's most recent promotion, last November 27, made him one of only 15 colonels among the 1,352 members of his graduating class at West Point. It was the third successive time he had been promoted "ahead of his class."

"The Beautiful City of the Four Seasons"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the phrase "natural beauty" now resounds across our country from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, and America is taking on a "new look." The national effort to beautify America, however, is far behind one small community in my congressional district.

St. James, Mo., began a program almost 10 years ago to "dress up itself," a program which now stands in better prospective and significance in view of our national efforts.

St. James, Mo., is the beautiful "City of the Four Seasons." In summer, it is alive with perennials of every hue and design; in the fall, thousands of gum trees provide an almost celestial-appearing phenomenon; in winter, American holly trees turn the town into a winter wonderland; and in the springtime, flowering crab apple trees create an attraction comparable to the Cherry Blossom Festival of Washington, D.C.

This activity and creativity was prompted by a woman whose memory will live on and on and on in the unusual beauty of the city. The James Foundation sponsors a continuous betterment program in St. James with trust funds established from the estate of one of the city's oldest and proudest families, Lucy Wortham James. When America started upon the beauty crusade, I asked officials of the James Foundation to advise me of the details of the St. James program, and I believe the reply in toto is worthy of calling to the attention of the Members of the U.S. House and Senate. A letter from Mr. Ralph Hayes, of the James Foundation, follows:

DECEMBER 28, 1965.

Hon. RICHARD H. ICHORD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ICHORD: This will, I hope, supply the information you were kind enough to request. It will be a long letter to read—and a longer one to write. I warmly appreciate your interest.

When the President sent to Congress, and later signed into law, the 1965 Highway Beautification bills, he commented that they could put the wonders of nature into our daily lives and place beauty in reach of all Americans. In Mrs. Johnson's later, and eloquent, television appeal for the natural embellishment of the Capital City, she stated the nub of the matter in terms so simple and forceful as to recall President Kennedy's inaugural injunction: "Ask not what your country can do for you." If all who heard her voice, she said, would do no more than plant a tree and raise a flower, the land would stand transformed.

David Thoreau had offered the same advice a century earlier: "It be worth the while if in each town there were a committee appointed to see that the beauty of the town received no detriment."

Good counsel isn't always transmuted into good results. But one small community (among, doubtless, many others) took the exhortation literally—indeed, went to meet it, a decade before the President's wife pronounced it. As you imply, its experience may interest others and I therefore appreciate the opportunity to furnish the particulars your letter mentions.

To keep first things first, it should be said at once that the story goes back to the benign, unselfish instincts of a woman, long dead but nevertheless more vital now than when she lived and planned for a later day. When Lucy Wortham James, lacking immediate family or close relatives, was revising her will in the midthirties, her interests focused on her ancestral homestead in the storied Ozark foothills. Her great-grandfather, migrating from Ohio to that western wilderness in the 1820's, helped found the historic Meramec Iron Works, near the future village of St. James in Phelps County, Mo., a hundred miles southwest of St. Louis. For half a century, until antiquated by the vast Mesabi ore deposits, Meramec iron was among the elements contributing to the earlier stages of the industrial development beyond the Mississippi.

After the turn of the century, Lucy James reacquired much of the rolling acreage her forebears had held a hundred years before and formed in her mind the image of a legacy and heritage from her ancestors to her descendants. She opened her land to her neighbors and wrote to her executors:

"As this is considered to be the most beautiful spot in Missouri, it is my great hope that you will arrange that it may ever be in private, considerate control, and ever open to the enjoyment of the people."

To serve that purpose, she tendered her residuary estate to the New York Community Trust whose publicly controlled managerial board administers 200 such gifts, large and small, for the common benefit. The trust named the gift the James Memorial and organized in St. James the James Foundation so that the fund might have the promptings of a local medium. Mrs. James died in 1938. After the settlement of her estate, the close of the war and the ending of wartime restrictions, the James Foundation, organized by the Community Trust in 1941, was fully functioning by 1945.

War-deferred construction was given first priority. A small library, supported by the municipality, was taken off the tax rolls and placed in a handsome new structure of Georgian design. Now it houses 17,000 books—6.8 for each person in the town—has attained the exceptional circulation of 20 books per person per year and has spread its services to 27 smaller communities. Its annually awarded "Reading Circle Certificates" are prized accolades in the area's schools. Its "Ozark Collection" is outstanding. It's "story hours" bring throngs of children to "Lucy's Playhouse"—the rebuilt structure that was, in another century, a magic place for Lucy James in her own childhood. From outdoor high-fidelity equipment, summer musicales are broadcast through the institution's spacious, wooded grounds.

A Boy Scouts' lodge was built, far enough from the nearest neighbor to dwarf the sound effects it generates. Construction of the Lucy Wortham James Elementary School was aided. The obstetrical section of a new county hospital was furnished. Refresher courses for doctors, nurses, and teachers were financed. At the annual autumn festival, the wide spectrum of the James Civic Awards covers 150 classifications of baked and canned goods, needlework and handicrafts, crops and animal husbandry. A juvenile band was equipped, trained uniformed and set upon a prize-winning career. A municipal flag was devised and on holidays the national and local colors fly together from every lighting standard in the business district.

Six miles out, the picturesque ruins of the old iron works, centering about the Great Meramec Spring with a daily flow of 96 million gallons, were made into a recreational tract of 1,600 acres. Through them, storm shelters, fireplaces for cooking and rustic tables for picnics are scattered, but the primeval character of the surroundings is disturbed as little as may be. They are as free of commercial concessions as when the Shawnees camped there.

A conservation area, bird sanctuary and wildlife refuge were created. With the collaboration of the State of Missouri, the "branch" rushing out from the Great Spring became an angler's paradise—replenished nightly with creel-sized rainbows raised in nearby rearing tanks. Along that trout stream, the yearly beginning of "the season," signalized by a blast sounding in a frosty dawn, is a regional festival. Thousands of ancestral photographs, culled from attics for miles around, meticulously processed, captioned and bound in leather covers, became "The Old Album"—five dozen volumes recreate the story of the town's people and places through a century and a quarter.

As for future history, the foundation has set itself the possibly unique task of constructing a cinematic "biography" of the community. Significant happenings are annually filmed in color and motion, sometimes with sound. In 10 years this will be a nostalgic chronicle; in 50 a vintage archive. If something of the sort were coexistent with great moments in our past, at Plymouth Rock or Williamsburg, Independence Hall or Fort McHenry, Fraunces Tavern or Gettysburg, history might possess a new dimension.

As in many towns, the rights-of-way of westward-moving railroads passed through the center of the settlements served—or hamlets grew up along the rail lines—and, in time, the stretches of property immediately adjacent to "the tracks" often became depressed areas, neglected and unkempt. That was so in St. James, but the St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad transferred to the James Foundation the land paralleling the railroad but available for landscaping. It was made into a model park, extending through the middle of the city. A gift to the town enabled it to further brighten the scene by repainting all the bordering structures. A parish house has been built beside the beautiful village church that Mrs. James attended and a newly completed olympic-sized swimming pool adjoining the library is centered in 23 acres of forested terrain.

Despite all this, there was, nevertheless, a troublesome fly in the municipal ointment: the town lived under the grim threat of a major tree blight. At the foundation's request, Robert Moses, New York Park Commissioner, sent his deputy, Stuart Constanble, to survey the situation in 1956. Mr. Constable's report was a draconian document:

"Of the town's goodly supply of street trees, two-thirds are soft maples. Many are diseased or otherwise damaged. The rest are standing targets of heavy damage from wind and hail storms. Unless steps are taken in the near future, the town will have few trees in 15 to 20 years. A massive planting of flowering species as street trees could provide a unique and handsome spring effect. The James Foundation would do a great service if it embarked on an extensive program of street tree planting at the earliest possible moment."

That, in 1956, was the principle and philosophy of the Federal beautification legislation of 1965. The undertaking prescribed in Mr. Constable's report was promptly begun. Professional advisers, headed by Hugh Steavenson of the Forrest Keeling Nursery in Elsberry, Mo., were brought in to determine the species to be planted and to devise a crash program. The winning entry was American holly, buttressed by sweet gum and flowering crab. Holly was deliberately chosen, not only because its picturesque and colorful appearance have made it one of our best loved trees, but because it was not then grown within many miles of St. James and so would be distinctive there. Soil analyses and weather records warranted the conclusion that it could be safely cultivated and that judgment proved correct.

Bulldozers were brought in to remove in a single operation all dead or diseased trees whose owners consented. A massive design of renewal was pressed from door to door. Church yards, school grounds and other public places were provided with all the trees they could absorb. Grade students were given small plants, with prizes awarded for the best results from competitive cultivation. But in general, and except for exhortation, the foundation's work stopped at the private lot lines: within them, planting was left to the enterprise of the townsfolk.

The official population of St. James is slightly under 2,500. Up to now, the foundation has planted more than 25,000 trees. Residents planted thousands more. Thus, for each inhabitant, St. James now has 10 trees. New York has one-fourth tree per capita; Montreal, one-seventh.

Comparative unit costs are significant. Only God can make a tree, but He does it with singular economy in the Ozarks. The Society for a More Beautiful National Capital finds that "$40 will cover the cost and planting of one flowering cherry tree. * * *" in Washington. In New York, the "Salute to the Season's Fund" estimates a London plane tree of 3 inch diameter can be installed there for $136.

Originally the cost of the 1½- to 2-inch plants used in St. James was around $15. In 1964 it fell below $10. In 1966 there will be a further drop. The figures aren't strictly comparable because the foundation has begun to grow its own. Three years ago it started a "tree bank" on the Meramec Spring grounds. The bank's first "stock dividend" will be distributed in 1966. New planting overcompensates for every tree withdrawn.

Thus, St. James has long been pushing toward the intensive execution of natural beautification new fortunately being stimulated by the National Government. An imperfectly realized byproduct of that countrywide crusade is an explosively expanded demand for trees that is fortunately in the offing. One way of sensing this is by canvassing retail outlets. Such a poll, lately conducted by the trade magazine, American Nurseryman, found these straws in the wind:

Curtis Nurseries, Inc., Callicoon, N.Y., reports a "strong demand for shade trees."

Tankard Nurseries, Exmore, Va., foresees: "There will surely be a shortage of * * * trees."

Wight Nurseries, Inc., Cairo, Ga., are "booked out on a number of items."

Boyd Nursery Co., McMinnville, Tenn., finds a "shortage of large sizes of shade and flowering trees."

Morning Star Nursery, Rives, Tenn., says "by spring most nursery stock is going to be in short supply."

Sneed Nursery Co., Oklahoma City, Okla., is "sold out of a number of sizes of regular varieties."

Carol Shamburger Nursery, Phoenix, Ariz., anticipates "a consistent increase in demand for shade trees. * * *"

Conard-Pyle Co., west Grove, Pa., finds "the supply on the tight side; many items are sold out."

Cole Nursery Co., Painesville, Ohio, has a "scarcity of nursery stock."

Scarff's Nursery, Inc., New Carlisle, Ohio, encounters "an increasingly strong demand for all evergreens, ornamental trees and shrubs."

Fairview Evergreen Nursery, Fairview, Pa., is experiencing "shortages * * * in many varieties of shade trees."

Cottage Gardens, Inc., Lansing, Mich., notes a scarcity of shade trees, with "no indication that, in the near future, there will be much of a change."

Plumfield Nurseries, Inc., Fremont, Nebr., declares that strong demand reflects a short supply of "shade trees, dwarf fruit trees, specimen evergreens and shrubs. * * *"

Willis Nursery Co., Ottawa, Kans., finds in prospect an "acute shortage of many items in landscape sizes."

Greenleaf Nursery Co., Muskogee, Okla., predicts a "great future demand for * * * shade trees" and adds: "We do not have a shade tree left to sell this season."

It is conceivable that this industry could be deceiving itself—conceivable but improbable. A simpler explanation beckons: a tide is rolling.

A syndicated article captioned "Beautification Boom" by Sylvia Porter of the New York Post begins: "'Beautification is about to become big business in the United States." The Vermont Legislature will convene in special session in January to consider establishing "scenic corridors" a mile wide along the Federal Interstate Highway System and 11 intermediate highways in that State. Within 2 weeks of the enactment of the Highway Beautification Act, $60 million was federally allotted for landscaping and scenic improvements. Next year, the Government will invest an estimated $3.9 billion for highway aid and the President has proposed that a sizable proportion of this, perhaps one-third, shall become applicable for recreation areas, scenic acquisitions, landscaping and other roadside developments within or outside the highway right-of-way. A notable development in the national environment is beginning to take shape.

If the city of St. James had many times the population and resources it does have, its portion of so broad an enterprise would still be minimal. Nevertheless, this town, within the limits of its means and size, has been laboring toward this salutary end. It has done much more: before it began its campaign to make itself the "Forest City of the Ozarks," the James Foundation made an exploratory investment in another Missouri community to obtain some experience and test some procedures in a parallel endeavor—a citywide cultivation of flower boxes. The test town was Neosho; the time, 11 years ago. A banner headline in the Neosho Daily News of February 10, 1955, read: "New York Community Trust Group Designates Neosho as 'Pilot City.'"

Neosho's response was dramatic. Little outside assistance was needed to induce it to get itself in bloom (or to gain for itself the guerdon of "All America City" from Look magazine in 1958). A reaction began whose results were described by an article on the "Neosho Plan" in the Tulsa, Okla., World:

"This is a city with flowers in her hair. Color is rampant. Flower boxes are everywhere, from the front of the streetsweeper's porch to beneath the banker's colonnades. Sweet potato vines dangle from a judge's second story window and petunias sprout from trash containers. * * * The standard greeting isn't 'How are you?' but 'How do your geraniums grow?'

"It all started when the New York Community Trust picked Neosho as a pilot city for a nationwide beautification project. * * * Now that the program is in full swing, there is no stopping the citizenry. Beautification is contagious. The county courthouse looks like a hanging garden * * * and that's exactly what the New York Trust has in mind."

"Neosho," said Ford Times, "is going all out to see just how pretty it can get" and Reader's Digest titled an article on the subject: "The Whole Town's Blooming."

The chain reaction had a built-in continuity. Following the small initial booster shot, the town took off on its own. It's still going. After a decade, Daniel Longwell, resident of Neosho and former managing editor of Life, wrote to the New York Community Trust:

"This is the 10th year of the flower boxes. Last year they were wonderful. Our finances are in good shape. The movie we made is busy all over the country. Three sets of color films, with canned talks and our flower box circulars have been sent to hundreds of communities throughout the United States. There is generally a waiting list stacked up for the material. Should you drive from here to Jefferson City or to Wichita, you'd see outcroppings of this effort all along the line. I consider it a hell of a compliment to the New York Community Trust that this has gone on unabated."

The flower box know-how reflected by Neosho was transplanted to its smaller neighbor in 1963 when St. James instituted a double-barreled program: trees and flowers all over town. Sparked by the Associated Garden Clubs, the James Foundation again employed a professional adviser, George Sonewald, of Rolla, Mo.; constructed hundreds of brass-bound redwood boxes in standard sizes; made available a carefully formulated soil mix; presented the boxes, complete with soil and flowers, to "public" outlets such as schools, churches, municipal buildings, etc.; and sponsored, again, a door-to-door canvass of business houses and residences.

The flower boxes are now a hardy perenniel. In 1965 the garden club reported 1,700 of them in bloom—more than one box to every two residents as the community homes in on the dual target: Forest City and Flower Town. Says Flower and Garden magazine:

"This fall [in St. James] thousands of sweet gum trees sparkled with autumnal color, this winter thousands of American hollies decorate front lawns all over town; and in the spring thousands of flowering crab apples will bloom in yards, parkings, and along roads. * * * Although the James' Foundation has provided the financial impetus, the city leaders have pitched in to do the job of organizing and administering the town projects. One thing has lead to another until now the city finds itself in the middle of a widespread facelifting program, and is beginning to speak of itself as 'the new St. James.'"

The editor of Flower and Garden, Rachel Snyder, inspected the town, conferred on it the magazine's national award for "achievement in fostering the spirit of gardening," and wrote: "After a year of surveying beautification throughout the country, we found nothing to compare with what has been done in St. James." The National Association of Nurseymen gave St. James its Plant America Award.

The first fruit of all these efforts is decorative and ornamental. Important as that is, it may be a sort of fringe benefit compared with the solid assets accruing to the general economy. Last year, 308,000 visitors were clocked into the Merimac Spring Recreational Area. All came by motor car, many from distant States. Each brought along a quota of needs: fuel, food, lodging, fishing supplies, garage services, picture postcards, and whatnot. The Missouri Division of Commerce estimates that traveling transients are "worth" $12.56 a day to the host locality. If seen as no more than a material investment, it wouldn't be easy to find a more fruitful one. It provides a bountiful "cash crop," willingly provided by eager contributors. With pain to no one, it enriches the spirit and simultaneously nourishes the till.

St. James is merely one small town and the James' Foundation is only a single fund. Its parent, the New York Community Trust, is, as foundations go, of no more than moderate size, but each and all of them can conform to the prayer of the President's wife to plant a tree and raise a flower. The effort of St. James to do just that was put in this perspective by Flower and Garden: "If reckoned on a per capita basis, this is probably the most ambitious tree restoration project in the United States this year." If that were done everywhere and en masse, the land would be bright.

Lucy Wortham James has been dead for over a quarter century, but when recurring awards are made or anniversaries observed in St. James, invitations or announcements are issued in her name as if she were not absent—and who will say she is? Her impress is etched on the neighborhood she cherished. Her influence is as genuine as when she walked its streets. Death did not still her hopes. It will not stay her plans.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph Hayes.

America's Toughest Dog Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, each year the wonderful people of my hometown, Laconia, N.H., sponsor the world's championship sled dog races. Teams from all over the United States and Canada compete in this canine world series. The February issue of Ford Times has an excellent article on this unusual competition and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

America's Toughest Dog Race

(By Ron Butler)

In the wind-lashed, snow-locked lake country of middle New Hampshire, one of the roughest, most grueling competitions known to man or animal is conducted each February—the World's Championship Sled Dog Races. It's the world series of dogdom.

Champion dog sled teams from the United States and Canada gather in the little town of Laconia to match cunning, speed, power, and endurance for 3 days over an icy, 60-mile wilderness course.

With a top purse of only $1,000, drivers race mostly out of passion and pride, and the dogs themselves seem to exist solely for this very race, as does the town of Laconia.

The event—a Mardi Gras with mittens—draws thousands of visitors. Nobody sleeps. The B. & C. Diner on Main Street offers 24-hour service and beer and ale as cold as Lake Winnipesaukee. Across the street, the Laconia Tavern Hotel is even busier, serving as unofficial headquarters for the race.

By the time the race begins, several days of eliminations have already passed by, cutting the field to 30 teams. Finalist teams consist of 6 to 13 dogs each, the number determined by the driver for racing effectiveness.

The course covers 20 miles a day, and the drivers must use the same dogs each day during the event. A driver must return each day with the same number of dogs with which he began, to remain qualified.

Although entries come from as far away as Fairbanks, Alaska, the local teams are understandably the favorites. Perhaps the most popular and unusual group is a team of Irish setters owned by Bill Lyman, president and one of the founders of the Lakes Region Sled Dog Club, sponsors of the race. It's unusual to find Irish setters in front of a dog sled. But with their red coats and "feathers" flying against the snow, they are undoubtedly the most colorful dogs ever to hit the trail.

Mostly, the teams consist of Siberian huskies or Alaskan malemutes or mixtures of both. Other teams are made up of samoyeds, mongrels, and run-of-the-mill Eskimo dogs, or entirely of mongrels.

A good lead dog is a driver's right arm. Along with setting the pace, it can lead a team through blinding snow, past obstacles and dangers where other dogs might plow right in. He takes all commands verbally—no whips are used.

While the race is exhausting for the dogs, it's no picnic for drivers, either. At the start and finish, a driver seems to glide along on a joyride, but actually he must run and push a good deal of the way to make up valuable minutes that might mean winning or losing the race.

Women sometimes enter the Laconia races, and to encourage them, the judges award a $50 prize to the woman clocking the best time in the 3 days of racing.

Sleds are extremely lightweight, varying from 7 to 10 feet in length with a long runner heels going to 4 feet or more. The first 3 dogs have light harness, usually attached to a central cord by one line. Farther back, the harnesses become strong until the rearmost dogs have traces and crosstrees, similar to those for horses.

FINISH LINE IN TOWN

The race begins and ends on Main Street in front of Woolworth's Five and Ten. The teams proceed down Main, out to the edge of town, and then follow a hilly, treacherous circular route back to where they began. Average time for the 20 miles is an hour and 40 minutes.

Only once, the night before the final day of racing, does the town's interest stray from the sled teams and settle on another marvel of nature. That's when Laconia holds its annual "Musher's Ball" to crown a beauty queen.

The colorful and exciting Laconia races remain foremost a tribute to man's ability to face obstacles and turn them into sport. And, each year, the New Hampshire village, whose population could fit into Macy's department store, puts on an elaborate sporting spectacle that shows all New England how it's done.

The Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, February 8 will mark the 56th anniversary of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America and to this fine organization we owe an enormous debt. It is a debt that cannot be measured in dollars and cents; nor should it be merely acknowledged and summarily dismissed. For it is a debt of gratitude. It is a debt of appreciation for the solid and stable role that the Boy Scouts of America have played in the development of the strength and character in American youth which these days of our civilization so desperately demand. Perhaps it is a debt that can never be completely repaid, but it is a debt that must be gratefully recognized.

From this great voluntary movement has come a tangible and meaningful contribution to our American way of life. In times of peace and in times of war, in the hours of our national disaster and in the days of our calm, the record of the Boy Scouts deserves our recognition and our fullest support. Clearly theirs is an example that organized youth can be, and often is, a vital force in strengthening the principles and ideals that are so much a part of our great American heritage.

Youthhood is a time of restlessness and change, and this is good. These young energies are among our Nation's greatest resources, and properly channeled and directed, they are one of our most effective means of insuring our dignity among nations, our progress both at home and abroad, and the liberty which we hold so dear. The Boy Scouts of America offer to all boys between the ages of 8 and 21 a constructive and well-planned program that serves as a stimulus to this splendid potential. It has been said that the story of the Boy Scouts is the story of 1 boy and the record of 33 millions of boys, for since its inception more than one-half century ago, scouting has presented a challenging appeal to men and boys alike. Men see scouting as a carefully structured means of encouraging character and citizenship in our youth. But the Boy Scouts of America is essentially a boy's organization and boys see scouting as a marvelous adventure. Indeed, the scout movement, combines both these aspects with a well defined program of service—service to God and service to our country. Both in planned good turns and in emergency services, American scouts have proved true to this concept and who among us can enumerate the daily good deeds of individual scouts.

It was in 1910 that this fine organization was established in this country. It was in 1910 that the first charter to a boy's club was granted to Scout Troop No. 1 in Frankfort, Ky. As a Kentuckian, I am understandably proud and I take additional pride in the steady and significant growth of the Scouting movement in my home district, the Second District of Kentucky. Scout participation is at an alltime high and packs, troops and Explorer units operate in virtually every community, town, and city. Nor are their activities confined to local and national boundaries, for Scouting is an international movement and Scouting units can be found in every free nation of the world.

This year, the Scouting program—"Breakthrough for Youth"—will be brought within reach of the boys who until now have not had the opportunity to become Scouts. Today's youth need such influences, for we must never forget that these same young boys will be the men who are to safeguard the future of our country and in a large measure, guarantee the hopes of millions the world around.

For 56 years the Boy Scouts of America have served their God and their country and I wish for them a future of honor, of growth, and ever-increasing stature.

Firm but Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the President of this Nation has repeatedly indicated that although our guard is up, the hand of friendship is out.

His state of the Union message dealt at length with the war in Vietnam, and he dealt with it properly. He told the world that we will continue to oppose aggression, but he left open the door to all who will work with us for peace.

The Des Moines Register subsequently noted that:

> It was no war message, though it expressed determination to fight on if need be and expressed confidence that Americans would continue to support the effort.

The world is complex, and while most people everywhere long for peace, there is still the urgency to be firm and resolute and ready to stand up for justice.

This the President has done—eloquently and effectively.

I believe the editorial which I have quoted is an effective summation of President Johnson's message, and I ask permission to include it in the RECORD in order that my colleagues may study it.

[From the Des Moines Register, Jan. 14, 1966]

JOHNSON'S VIEW ON VIETNAM

Fully half of President Johnson's state of the Union message to Congress was devoted to foreign affairs, and nearly all that half to the war in Vietnam. Yet it was no war message, though it expressed determination to fight on if need be and expressed confidence that Americans would continue to support the effort.

It was an anguished message, calling it a "crime against mankind that so much courage and so much will and so many dreams must be flung on the fires of war and death." There was anguish in the President's heart for the valiant foe and the harassed Vietnamese civilians as well as for the young Americans he feels he must send to "struggle and die in a distant land."

President Johnson does not regard his extraordinary peace offensive as over yet, nor the harsh words about it on the Hanoi radio as rejection yet. The day after he spoke, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY met for 1 hour and 50 minutes with Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin in New Delhi, and Rusk flew on to Thailand instead of coming home.

In the state of the Union message, President Johnson summarized his peace efforts to date, and repeated United States willingness to negotiate now, or simply taper off use of force now if the other side will only respond. He repeated that U.S. goals for South Vietnam are not permanent U.S. bases, alliance, or economic interest, but free choice by the people of South Vietnam—even if they choose to rejoin North Vietnam. What the United States fights is reunion forced by terrorism and invasion. "We will stay until aggression has stopped," he concluded.

His "we will stay" got through. It is not clear that the rest of the peace message did get through to the leaders of the Communist nations. Not yet.

The rest of the Johnson foreign policy would be much more workable if peace can be restored in Vietnam, but the President intends to keep plugging away at it any case. The policy includes: preparedness for war; efforts at agreed arms control, arms reduction, and ultimately arms elimination; strengthening the United Nations, the Alliance for Progress, the Atlantic Community and other constructive regional associations of nations; and attempts "to improve the life of man" on a world scale through "major new directions" in foreign aid.

The new directions will include proposed new efforts in agriculture, health, education, and population control, at a proposed cost of $1 billion in the next year. The President hopes that other countries with means will join this work.

President Johnson grouped several enduring strands of post 1945 U.S. foreign policy under the principle of support of national independence, namely: encouraging the end of colonial rule; "hostility" to "rule of the many by the few" and to race discrimination; building bridges to Eastern Europe; sympathy with nationalism in all of the underdeveloped nations; and defending independence against armed violence or threat as in Berlin, Korea, Cuba, and now Vietnam.

This is a new way to group these established policies. The thinking ties in with President Johnson's statement at the beginning of the foreign policy section in the state of the Union message that "the touchstone" of foreign policy "is the interest of the United States"—but that U.S. interest must not be seen "through a narrow glass."

A better world, a peaceful world, a more prosperous world, a world better organized in the interest of all—all this is very much in the national interest of the United States taken alone.

How to achieve it is fraught with anguish and doubt, creative thought and strenuous exertions.

Time To Move Ahead on Resource Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a time we needed to protect and develop this Nation's natural resource base it is now. The protracted drought in the Northeast area of our country has concerned many about future water supplies.

Tremendous urban expansion has concerned others about the unnecessary waste of rich productive farmland for nonagricultural purposes.

Each year more than 1 million acres of agricultural land goes out of production to meet our growing population's needs for housing developments, highways, shopping centers, parking lots, and the like. Unfortunately much of this land is our best agricultural land. When it is sealed under concrete and asphalt, it is lost to agriculture forever.

The day is here when we must carefully plan our use of natural resources. For help in this field we need to look no further than the soil and water conservation districts that have almost 3 decades of this work to their credit.

In my congressional district 52 percent of the farmers, operating 53 percent of the land, are cooperators in local soil conservation districts.

Of the 10,500 district cooperators, more than 8,000 have developed basic conservation plans on their land.

Fifteen local groups, operating three-quarters of a million acres of land, have applied for help under the small watershed program so that they might properly develop their land and water resources for benefit of all the people in the area.

I salute these people for the work they are doing and I urge others concerned about resource conservation to look to their local soil conservation districts for help and guidance.

FAA Employees Real Public Servants—Columbus, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Members of Congress receive many complaints about the nature of service rendered by Federal employees. In fact, rarely do we receive complimentary communications about so-called public servants.

Among the exceptions, I recently received a wonderful letter from a constituent, William T. Clark, outlining his experiences with the personnel of the Federal Aviation Agency at the Columbus International Airport, Columbus, Ohio.

General William McKee, and his staff are certainly to be commended for the outstanding service rendered by these dedicated people, and other agencies of our Government would do well to emulate the practices of the FAA personnel in Columbus.

The letter follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
December 27, 1965.

HON. SAMUEL DEVINE,
Congress of the United States,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DEVINE: From time to time I have the urge to write to you concerning Federal agencies. I have been jerked around by the IRS, put up with mail service I was convinced couldn't get any worse (but did) and suffered abuse or worse still, utter disdain, every time it has been my misfortune to tangle with a Government employee. Finally I write * * * concerning the FAA.

As many men in, if you'll pardon the familiarity, "our" age group I wanted to fly from the time I took my first ride in a 1928 Byrd. I joined the AAF my 18th birthday as an aviation cadet. I was going to fly. I did, but not as a pilot. I was a navigator on a B-17. After I left the service came the problem of education, then family and all the usual things and it was not until July 1965 I was in a position to "take another crack at it". When I realized I was going to fall into the tender mercies of yet another Government agency I nearly tossed over the whole thing but I still had the urge and it was now or never. I made my first trip to the FAA at Port Columbus for my student permit. I was warmly greeted by the receptionist, given more assistance than anyone could reasonably expect, met the gentleman in charge, who actually made time to answer my questions and left convinced that the FAA could not possibly be a Government agency.

I was actually invited to visit the tower where three men with the memory of elephants and the patience of Job directed, guided, cajoled and led, the little 150's and the big 707's in neat order without once falling back on abuse or disdain. These people are all nameless for the most part to me and I, certainly, to them. I don't know any possible way they could be thanked for their dedication, concern and plain devotion to their jobs and the lives of those who are under their control. So I shall thank them to you and you can relay this to whoever should have it.

Specifically among the dozens of people and voices is the tower controller who when told "this is my sole flight" said "We understand. We'll watch out for you" and did by calling me before I called him to make my three "first" landings simpler. At least a half dozen voices in the FSS ready with anything you needed and with concern that you understood the weather situation. One of these is a lady who if asked will tell you it's not fair weather for students to try their wings. The smooth, even, unexcited voice of the radar operators who take the time to match for traffic for a Cessna 150 flying marginal VFR. Last and certainly not least is the man who has a face and a name. Who offered to give up his Christmas Eve to give a flight test to a total stranger, Mr. William Hubbard. Only the weather prevented it, and when I took the test flight I found not a hidebound check rider but still another instructor more interested in safety than a 1, 2, 3, pass-or-fail check ride. In the entire 50 hours from student permit to flight test I did not encounter a single instance of rudeness, not one sneer, not one tone of irritation or impatience. Every person I asked for assistance, information, or just wanted a question answered went out of their way to help and did it with interest. It has been an unbelievable experience.

So, I finally got around to writing about a Government agency. Would that we could have more like the FAA.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM T. CLARK,

The Poor Leading the Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the woman referred to in the Wednesday, January 28 editorial of the Peoria Journal Star is the mother of 11 children, the youngest of whom are ages 5, 4, and 2, although the mother has been estranged from her husband since 1957. I would simply ask, What kind of an example does this set for our younger generation when we for all practical purposes reward such promiscuity with national recognition on the President's Advisory Council? I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the editorial be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

THE POOR LEADING THE POOR

Chicago's representative to the National Advisory Council for the war on poverty is a woman whose only income is aid to dependent children.

She is part of an organization that claims that the "experts on poverty" are the poor, and that Mayor Daley was wrong and "political," etc., by putting the program (previously) in the hands of people who are not poor.

The fact is that this lady sounds pretty shrewd, and her selection suggests real politics rather than a real war on poverty.

The trouble is that this country doesn't need experts on how to be poor. It doesn't need guidance on how to be poor. It doesn't need a program on how to be poor.

It needs experts, it needs guidance, and it needs a program on how not to be poor.

We are hardly going to find it among those who are still poor, and they seem to resent the people who could reasonably help them most—those who used to be poor and found a way to economic salvation.

Those examples aren't so hard to find in this land of ours, and the way they accomplished it in most cases is far from secret.

It is just difficult to make political hay by that kind of direction and instruction, apparently.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY L. GREIGG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, in December I participated in a program at Paullina, Iowa, at which the Des Moines Register and Tribune presented conservation awards to outstanding conservation farmers in my part of Iowa. Similar awards were made in all parts of the State to candidates selected by local soil conservation districts.

It was a rewarding experience to meet and talk with local conservationists and to observe their enthusiasm and their dedication to protect and improve the State's land and water resources. It is worthy of note that their concern is to develop these resources. It is worthy of note that their concern is to develop these resources as an integral part of the economy and welfare of the rural community, both agricultural and nonagricultural.

My observations at the awards ceremony prompt me to express tribute to all of Iowa's soil conservationist district leaders and district cooperators who are doing such a magnificent job of caring for our vital natural resources.

Their programs reflect the thinking, experience, and needs of the entire community because all concerned were involved in the making of the programs.

Our growing population accompanied by expanded use of natural resources will demand more complex planning and broader resource conservation and development activities in the future than ever before. Soil conservation districts have accepted this challenge and are armed with the experience of over a quarter of a century. They are equipped to deal with the broader resource problems of the future by recognizing them today, and I am sure they will handle them well.

Help for Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson recognizes that life in the cities must be improved. His message on the Nation's cities is an eloquent statement of the problem.

Social renewal, as he recognizes, must go hand in hand with physical rebuilding.

The selection of a number of communities of different size and in different parts of the country to serve as "demonstration cities" is an excellent idea.

The important thing, the New York Herald Tribune declared, is that the President recognizes the problem "and is determined on solving the crisis."

The article, typical of many concerning this plan, is offered for the RECORD:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Jan. 27, 1966]

BETTER CITIES WITH FEDERAL AID

President Johnson's message to Congress on the plight of the cities is vigorous and imaginative. Urban woes are fully recognized. The President says life in the growing metropolitan centers must be improved. What the struggling cities have been unable to do for themselves is to be accomplished by massive Federal aid.

Just how massive can be seen by the Johnson specifics. The President wants selected but unspecified cities rebuilt "on an unprecedented scale." In asking for great additions to low- and moderate-cost housing, he speaks of tackling up to 20 percent of existing substandard structures. The impact in New York, for instance, where the city has to run hard to hold its own against slums, would be revolutionary.

But Mr. Johnson deals not only with housing. He seeks "the rebirth of urban America." Federal aid will concern itself as well with every form of renewal from transportation and education and economic opportunity to basic environmental change. The emphasis is to be on meeting needs by new approaches, reforming administrative procedures, and directing every technique and talent to solution of the urban crisis. And this will be the challenge to the just-born Department of Housing and Urban Development.

To start the program, the President proposes $12 million in planning grants. That's for the cities to show cooperation with demonstration projects. After this beginning it is recommended that $2.3 billion in Federal appropriations be provided over a 6-year period. The far-ranging message also calls for legislation to bar racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing.

It is self-evident that the Johnson program will require a vast amount of reorganization and coordination in government. But this should be taken as detail. The important thing is that President Johnson understands the cities' desperate problems, accepts the Federal responsibility to help, and is determined on solving the crisis. The money will be provided as justified by every present indication, and surely planning genius for urban rescue will rise to the necessity. The people of the cities can face the future with greater confidence, and this must be counted as substantive advance of the first order.

National Association of Secretaries of State 48th Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution that was adopted at the 48th Annual Convention of the National Association of Secretaries of State.

This resolution, which expresses complete approval of the policies of President Johnson and the United States in Vietnam, was forwarded to me by the distinguished Secretary of State of Illinois, the Honorable Paul Powell.

Prior to taking office as the secretary of state in January 1965, Paul Powell served in the Illinois General Assembly for 15 consecutive terms beginning in 1934. While a member of the assembly, he served as minority whip, minority leader, and then as speaker of the house in the 66th, 71st, and 72d general assemblies.

Born and educated in Vienna, Johnson County, Ill., he began his political career by serving as director of the Vienna Township High School and then as mayor of his hometown.

Paul Powell is one of the most prominent Democrats in our State, and has been honored twice by the press, which elected him "Outstanding Legislator of Illinois" in 1951 and again in 1955.

The resolution he sent to me follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECRETARIES OF STATE 48TH CONFERENCE, WAIKIKI, HONOLULU, HAWAII

RESOLUTION

Whereas there has been much controversy in the newspapers, magazines and other news media over Vietnam—some contending that the U.S. participation was too great, and others that the U.S. commitment was too little; and

Whereas numerous demonstrations opposing the policy of the Government of the United States in Vietnam do not reflect the views or wishes of the overwhelming majority of American citizens; and

Whereas it is necessary that all economic and military efforts should be made to prevent the spread of the cancer of communism; and

Whereas traditionally the United States has aided small nations in the preservation of their sovereignty and has decried exploitation of them by large or small powers, and infiltration of them by tyrannical "isms," and so long as the United States constitutes a nation it shall continue to do so; and

Whereas members of the National Association of Secretaries of State sincerely believe that all loyal citizens and recipients of our country's bounty should not hesitate to express their feelings on the situation and should make known that a solid majority of the citizens of the United States support the U.S. policies in Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association of Secretaries of State in meeting assembled, That it hereby express its complete approval of the policies of the United States in carrying on its operations in Vietnam;

That it condones no interference in them; and that if necessary it hopes additional aid is offering to bring an early and victorious end to the conflicts; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States by the president of the National Association of Secretaries of State and upon returning to their respective States, each member of the National Association of Secretaries of State send a copy of this resolution which expresses unanimous feelings to their respective Senators and Representatives in Congress.

NOVEMBER 12, 1965.

What Is the Antipoverty Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a reporter, Margaret Josten, of the Cincinnati Enquirer, has written a seven-part series on the antipoverty program in Cincinnati. I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues as the kind of reporting that helps inform the public about the various antipoverty programs at work in our communities under the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

Miss Josten, in outlining the OEO programs in Cincinnati and Hamilton County, quotes R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, as saying "extraordinary progress has been made in the last year" in Cincinnati.

It is a source of pride to me that the Cincinnati antipoverty program has had such a fine start.

Miss Josten's series also notes the fine contribution made to the national antipoverty program by a former Cincinnatian, Theodore M. Berry, who heads the OEO Community Action Division.

He is credited with maintaining tight control over the allocations to the community action agency in Cincinnati.

I was particularly pleased to note Miss Josten's comment that Mr. Shriver and John E. Hansan, executive director of the Community Action Commission in Cincinnati, have been very open and direct in revealing OEO records to the press to enable her to write her stories.

Some points Miss Josten makes in her series which I think are important:

Lack of education is at the root of the poverty problem. In Hamilton County, the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation records show close to 70 percent of jobless persons have less than a high school education.

"Unlike the custom in some cities, the poor of Cincinnati are given a voice in policymaking."

Agencies receiving OEO money include the YMCA, Board of Education, Federation of Settlements—"all agencies never so much as tinged by graft."

The city finance department handles all cash independently—paying bills, dispensing cash, helping to devise the proper accounting procedures for the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity which, to date, has been a hard taskmaster.

We should not be blind to the fact that the war on poverty has its full share of enemies, those who opposed the program from its very inception, and those who are now beginning to appear as the program has begun to gather direction and momentum.

These enemies, whether voting against the program in Congress, or attempting to sabotage its operation at the local level by captious and irresponsible criticism of details, have the same goal: they are determined that the program shall fail.

Miss Josten's articles present a balanced picture, not gilding the lily, but also not nit-picking. This is a thoughtful, penetrating, discerning and singularly readable review.

Following is the first article of the series:

WHAT IS THE ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM?

(By Margaret Josten)

While Vice President HUMPHREY is hardly the embodiment of the poetic man, he has extracted from the writings of Thomas Wolfe what might be the very essence of the war on poverty.

"To every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man, the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his wisdom can combine to make him—this * * * is the promise of America."

Assuming that few would argue the good behind these words, why have the American people been so slow to embrace what some feel is the No. 1 issue on the homefront?

Why does a frontline commander in the war on poverty speak wryly of "this cacophony, this dissonance, this generalized condemnation of something called a poverty program?"

The answers might lie in the well-publicized riots, dropout rates, even extortion and sex rackets, which have plagued some of the newly born Job Corps campus.

Perhaps the equally spotlighted charges of political string-pulling and too-high salaries in such cities as New York, Chicago, Cleveland, have done their bit to keep the general public from rallying around society's first attempt to wipe out deprivation.

Or maybe it's just that nobody in Washington—or in Cincinnati, for that matter—can pinpoint big battles won in a dollar-and-cents way.

R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity and, as such, czar of all that is afoot in the antipoverty war, believes the answer is much simpler.

The American people, he says, are just plain confused about what the poverty program is all about.

"It's just like giving an American sports page to an Englishman," Mr. Shriver explains.

In other words, the "pass" that is a base-on-balls in baseball and the "pass" that occurs when one player throws the ball to another in football, are no less confusing to the Englishman than are OEO, VISTA, Head Start, CAP, NYC, and other trappings of the poverty war to the average American.

(OEO is the Office of Economic Opportunity; VISTA stands for Volunteers In Service to America, the Domestic Peace Corps; Head Start is a preschool program to help youngsters overcome environment; CAP is the Community Action Program; NYC is the Neighborhood Youth Corps.)

The cacophony and the dissonance are not so audible in Cincinnati as in some other parts of the Nation.

This may be due to the very organization of the Community Action Commission, the Cincinnati area arm of the war on poverty.

"It was designed so it could not be controlled by anybody," says John E. Hansan, CAC executive director.

"We couldn't care less about politics," he adds, noting, "In cities where they're having the most difficulties today, I think the poverty program is under the mayor."

Organization of the CAC here a little more than a year ago was essentially a tripartisan effort.

Theodore M. Berry, then a charterite councilman, now director of the OEO's community action division in Washington, was a spearhead in its formation. So were councilmen Willis D. Gradison Jr., Republican, and Congressman JOHN J. GILLIGAN, Democrat, then a councilman.

Business, labor, education, religion, the Community Chest and a score of other agencies were part of deliberations leading to the birth of CAC. Today, all these, plus the poor themselves, have representation on its board.

The confusion about the poverty program in Cincinnati continues despite all this.

Some consider the antipoverty war a mere extension of the dole. Others complain that so-and-so was hired in a particular program because he or she was a friend of so-and-so.

And how often does one hear that most of the poor are drunken bums and/or prostitutes unwilling to be shaken out of their degraded ways?

Since millions are being poured into the war—in the Cincinnati area alone, close to $8 million in the last year—Mr. Shriver and others of the OEO hierarchy feel it is time the hodge podge is straightened out in the public mind.

To this end they recently invited to Washington reporters assigned to cover their cities' poverty programs.

There, and at Camp Kilmer, N.J., a site of the Nation's biggest Job Corps camp, reporters were given a firsthand look at battle plans, plus the reasoning behind them. Nobody—insofar as reporters could determine—dodged questions.

Officials freely admitted goofs have occurred. Mr. Shriver said, "We all understand that in the conduct of wars mistakes are made * * * I notice we bombed several villages in North Vietnam by mistake."

Mr. Hansan opened his books to scrutiny in Cincinnati. Salaries, expenses, budgets were explained. He, too, answered all questions put to him.

Now, armed with the answers from Washington, and Mr. Hansan, the Enquirer will attempt to present in succeeding articles, the picture as it exists.

In a democracy, as Mr. Shriver points out, understanding is a necessary predecessor to accomplishment.

Oren Harris

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of our most esteemed Members. OREN HARRIS has served our Nation with honor and distinction during his 25 years as a Member of this body, and is one of the nicest people I have ever had the pleasure to know. For the past 9 years I have been privileged to serve under his able leadership on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. As chairman of that committee, no one could have devoted himself more earnestly and more untiringly than OREN, and the committee has made many substantial and important contributions to the citizens of this great country under his direction. He has commanded the respect of all his associates as an outstanding leader, a dedicated colleague, and a valued friend.

OREN's appointment as a Federal judge is eminently deserved, and I know he will continue to serve his country with equal credit and distinction in his new post. The Federal courts are gaining an able and astute member with a rich background of knowledge and experience. The House of Representatives is losing one of its greatest Members and one of the most dynamic chairmen to ever serve in the Congress. As he assumes his judicial duties, I join OREN's many friends in wishing for him and Mrs. Harris every happiness and success in the future.

Buildup for New FBI Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee would give the House an opportunity to vote soon on the bill requiring Senate confirmation of the Director of the FBI, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

This measure passed the Senate last May 24, and was referred the next day to the Judiciary Committee. I am confident there will be no pocket veto of a measure of such importance which the American people certainly approve.

In this connection, with unanimous consent, I introduce in the RECORD an article from a recent edition of Freedom Press.

BUILDUP FOR NEW FBI CHIEF

WASHINGTON.—Backstage movements push Adam Yarmolinsky as a replacement for J. Edgar Hoover when he retires as Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Yarmolinsky's title of Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs in the Defense Department was reportedly given him in a buildup as expert on security.

Yarmolinsky has had access to most Pentagon secrets for more than 3 years. He authored the Gesell report which included regulations about the social life of military men while off duty. Authorship of the Fulbright memorandum which curbed anti-Communist activity by military men is attributed to Yarmolinsky.

There is a strong movement in Congress for legislation to require that appointments for FBI Chief must be confirmed by the Senate.

Attorney General Katzenbach is fighting this restriction on his powers. Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee has tried to keep the bills requiring such confirmation from coming before the House for a vote.

New Minimum Wage Demands Strengthen Federal Controls Over States and Private Industry

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include a very thoughtful report on H.R. 10518, the minimum wage bill. This report was made to the annual Washington meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama by Mr. George Cruit, Cruit Personnel Consultants, of Birmingham, Ala. Mr. Cruit points out how the measure would hurt Alabama and what is true in Alabama would be true in other States as well. He also reminds us of the increased Federal power over private industry which is a hidden aspect of the bill.

Mr. Cruit's report follows:

MINIMUM WAGE: H.R. 10518

(Statement in the industrial relations field, presented before the Alabama congressional delegation, January 24, 1966, by George Cruit, Cruit Personnel Consultants, Birmingham, Ala.)

Gentlemen, no doubt, you are aware that the House Education and Labor Committee has reported a clean bill which would increase the minimum wage for nonfarm workers to $1.75 per hour, establish a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour for agriculture workers and cover almost 8 million additional workers.

Here again, as so often in the last session of Congress, H.R. 10518 goes far beyond the President's recommendations in this field. In fact, it almost doubles his recommendation for the coverage of additional workers.

Of significance is that fact that a span of 12 years elapsed before the 1949 minimum of $.75 was increased to $1.15; yet less than 4 years after the effective date of the $1.15 rate—September 1961—and less than 2 years from the effective date of the $1.25 minimum—September 1963—a rate of $1.75 is proposed.

The debate on increasing the minimum wage has brought forth the same arguments but one repeatedly offered by proponents is that only wages in the lower brackets are affected when, as a matter of fact, the entire wage structure is influenced.

Employees in the higher wage brackets expect wage differentials to be maintained and this tends to push total labor costs up by considerably more than the increase in the legal minimum wage multiplied by the number of workers in the minimum brackets.

Unless such increased labor costs are accompanied by greatly increased productivity or greater efficiency, they must be reflected in lower profit margins to the employer or be passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices, or be absorbed by a combination of these factors.

If employers are unable to raise product prices, they must avoid higher wage costs by the use of more machinery or by somehow getting along with fewer workers. Particularly vulnerable in this respect are small business operators.

We in AIA believe each of you will agree that many provisions of H.R. 10518 will have a disastrous effect on the economy of Alabama. To mention a few:

1. Extension of coverage to small logging enterprises.

2. Minimum wage of $1.25 for agricultural workers—although not engaged in interstate commerce. A completely new concept.

3. Requiring employers of tipped employees to pay at least 50 percent of the minimum wage regardless of how much the employee receives in tips.

4. Requires employers to pay 85 percent of the minimum wage to students.

5. Should hospital personnel be covered for $1.25 per hour, hospitals in Alabama would be forced to raise their rates $5 per day to cover this increase. If the minimum wage should go to $1.75, the increase in hospital cost would be beyond the reach of many patients.

This measure is aimed at the heart of the small business community. Instead of helping labor, especially the unskilled and uneducated, it would close the doors of opportunity rather than opening them.

This measure is inconsistent with present Government policies because it will increase costs, raise prices and no doubt increase unemployment.

We, in AIA, are deeply concerned over the far-reaching control this measure gives the Federal Government over all business, private as well as public, local as well as interstate. It is apparent to us that the sponsors of this bill want the Federal Government to become a national regulator of all business.

We ask each of you to study and weigh carefully the impact H.R. 10518 will have upon the industrial growth and the economy of the State of Alabama.

We call upon you to use your vote and influence to stop this ever-increasing encroachment of the Federal Government into fields which should and must be left to the States if our private enterprise system is to survive.

President Johnson, With the Rare Courage of Former Presidents Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, Ordered the Resumption of the Bombing of Military Targets in Vietnam, and at the Same Time Pursued Further the Peace Offensive by Appealing to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the American people and the peace-loving people of the entire world should feel proud of our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, who displayed the rare and great courage of our former Presidents, Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. Perhaps no other President in all of our history has ever faced a greater decision, nor showed greater determination for peace than did President Lyndon B. Johnson, when he announced his decision on Vietnam.

Perhaps no President has ever tried harder, as was exhibited by perhaps the greatest peace offensive that the world has ever seen, in trying to get every leader, every nation, and every group of people to bring about a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam.

Our commitment to the freedom-seeking people of South Vietnam was made by President Dwight Eisenhower, and the late John Foster Dulles, the then Secretary of State. This commitment was carried out throughout the Kennedy administration, and likewise throughout the Johnson administration. It has certainly been proven in the court of world opinion that Lyndon B. Johnson, as President of the United States, wanted an honorable peace, and he showed that he would go to any length to achieve this goal. On the other hand, the two Communist countries, Russia, and particularly Red China, have shown that they not only do not want peace in Vietnam, but rather desired our surrender and failure to keep our commitments to the free world. The people learned the horrible lesson of what appeasement and backing down could do when Hitler was not stopped at the Rhineland. Many historians say World War II could have been averted if this had been done. All acts of appeasement after that only went further to make Hitler's appetite more insatiable for world conquest. Certainly if China could bluff us, or force us to surrender and leave Vietnam, it could probably be the beginning of the loss of so many free countries that world war III would be inevitable.

As one fellow in my district so pointedly explained: "It is certainly easier to stop Red China in Vietnam than it would be at a later date on the Alaskan border, or even on the Canadian border. When it comes to picking a good place to fight, the aggressor, and the aggressor alone, not the defender, has the choice of location. In this case Red China and North Vietnam are the aggressors. But no place in the entire world is a good place to fight a war. No place is a good place for people to bleed and suffer to die." The spread of communism must be stopped, and I think only our firm determination will bring it to a halt. The place where we must take our stand of course at this time is Vietnam.

Even though the North Vietnamese and Red Chinese have thoroughly misjudged the United States, I think that they will realize in the future that the vast majority of our people back our President and our American forces to the limit, and that we will not get tired as they wishfully hope, and foolishly believe. An editorial in the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate of December 28, 1965, clearly illustrates the fanaticism of North Vietnam and the Chinese Communists, which I insert as follows:

THEY HOPE WE'LL GET TIRED

Each new frustration in Vietnam brings additional references to the French withdrawal from that country and to the reported confidence of the North Vietnamese that they and the Vietcong can "defeat" the United States as they "defeated" the French. But the fact remains, of course, that the French were not actually defeated in Vietnam, at least not in the classic sense that the Germans and the Japanese were defeated in World War II.

There never was any total commitment of French power in Vietnam, any more than there has been, as yet, a total commitment of U.S. power. There never was any all-out, final confrontation on the battlefield between French and Vietnamese military power. The French simply decided that the game was not worth the candle. In a very literal sense, they got tired and went home and that is exactly what the Communists are hoping that the Americans, who stepped into the breach left open by the French, eventually will do.

The leaders of North Vietnam and of China are Communists and fanatics. But they are not idiots. They realize that to talk of military victory in an all-out test between the United States and North Vietnam is silly. They realize that at the present level of atomic weapon development the outcome of an all-out war between the United States and China would be be equally predictable. But regardless of their braggadoccio and what they may say for the benefit of their own people, that is not really what they are hoping for. They are hoping that if they keep on making things as miserable for us as they can, we will get tired and go home, having decided that South Vietnam isn't worth it. The statement which Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnamese dictator, is said to have made to a French Army officer many years ago is still significant:

"You will kill 10 of our men and we will kill 1 of yours and in the end it will be you who will tire of it."

Our job now is to convince Ho Chi Minh and a few others that we will not tire of it, that we are going to continue building up our strength and increasing the pressure to whatever degree may be necessary, and that we are not going to get tired and go home. When we have convinced them of that, their attitude may undergo an important change.

In an editorial report entitled "The Year of the Horse," by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., there is a letter written by John Harris, which I think gives some light on the present position of the Red Chinese and North Vietnam Communists in Asia. This report and letter, I quote as follows:

Editor's Reports Year of the Horse

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

The ancient Chinese calendar proclaims that this is the "Year of the Horse," and maybe, in some inscrutable way, it is. Some racetrack habitues will certainly agree, although wondering which horse.

The calendar, unfortunately, does not also proclaim it as the "Year of Horse Sense." If it did, the 4-day truce in Vietnam—held to celebrate "Tet," the Chinese Lunar New Year—might have developed into peace for that tragic land .

But the war, like that peculiar calendar, is made in Peiping—and its suburb of Hanoi—where any kind of sense appears to be sadly lacking.

Other factors concerning the presence of Communist China in and around southeast Asia are the subject of a report submitted to me by John Harris, a member of my staff who recently concluded a stint as a war correspondent in Vietnam, and who has also traveled extensively through other Far East areas.

I am happy, therefore, to in turn submit this report to you:

"Dear Bill: From Saigon to Tokyo there isn't a bartender who can make a really good martini. I do not know whether this is the result of Red Chinese influence in these regions, but there is no doubt that the proximity of Red China is being distinctly felt in other ways.

"It is certainly felt—in unmistakable fashion—by American combat troops in Vietnam. For example, I remember going through the effects of a dead North Vietnamese soldier, slain in the Ia Drang Valley, and found he had carried a Chinese submachinegun, a Chinese army pack, a Chinese weapons-cleaning kit, and a sackful of Chinese hand grenades. His razor blades, however, were from East Germany and Hungary, and were a little rough on the chin.

"In glittering Hong Kong the department stores bulge with the products of Red China, all at dirt-cheap prices made possible by dirt-cheap labor. The goods are being sold to shoppers from throughout the world and Peiping is raking in billions in foreign currency as a result. Thus the informed word around Hong Kong is that Red China wants the British to stay for a long time to come.

"This is not to say that the glowering mass of Red China north of British territory does not keep people in a mild state of jitters. Some local businessmen were recently queried, by a newspaper, as to whether a historic but dubious corner of Kowloon—the mainland portion of Hong Kong—should be closed up and even demolished by the local vice squad. They all replied with a virtuous 'yes,' but nervously added: 'But we'd better ask the Red Chinese first * * *'

"In other words, along the South China coast no one wants to rock the boat. This is especially true in the tiny and ancient Portuguese enclave of Macao, just across the Canton River estuary from Hong Kong. There you can stroll down a city block almost into Red China. But local regulations forbid the taking of snapshots near the frontier. Not because the Portuguese don't want pictures taken—they couldn't care less—but because the Chinese don't. And in Macao that's all it takes.

"On the other hand, in the old city of Taipei, capital of Taiwan, or free China, the presence of Red China has other effects. For one thing, it means that the streets are sprinkled with American servicemen—a reminder of the American commitment to defend Taiwan from Communist attack. But, oddly, it is also seen in the magnificent national museum now in process of development.

"In exchange for hard, Western, capitalist cash, Peiping is apparently unloading the priceless art treasures of ancient China on the Hong Kong markets. Some of the best of these are being snapped up by free China and placed on permanent public exhibit. A striking testament to the cultural heritage of the Chinese people, the exhibits certainly belong where visitors from throughout the free world can see them. On this score at least, then, the word to Red China is: Keep it coming.

"Moreover, while the topic of Red China is never far from anyone's lips in southeast Asia today, the panic-button attitude that once prevailed around the area seems to be wilting, like a second-hand lotus blossom. In short, the big, bad dragon is not as feared as he once was—and there is no doubt that the extent and determination of the American commitment in South Vietnam has much to do with this.

"An additional contributing factor to this change in the Far East weather is the incredible fiasco that has overtaken Communist fortunes in one of the most heavily populated countries in the world—Indonesia. There, where Communists were once high on the political hog, the comrades are reportedly being slaughtered like cattle. And all because the Indonesian Army caught wind of an apparently premature and crudely organized Red plot to take over the country—and hand it on a platter to Mao Tse-tung.

"These and other developments—such as China's admitted internal economic troubles—have given a weak and virtually defenseless country like Thailand the courage to totally throw in its lot with the United States. Even though Thailand sits virtually on China's doorsteep, it is becoming the scene of a growing American Military Establishment, from where aircraft have already been contributing heavily to the war in Vietnam.

"In characteristically impassive fashion, all Asia waited to see what China would do during the intensive American bombings of North Veitnam, its ally and immediate southern neighbor. China did nothing, and the significance of this was not lost on the observers. Moreover, it has never been forgotten in Asia that American soldiers brought Chinese land hordes to a grinding halt in Korea, the 'Asian mainland' where Western power was supposed to dig its own grave.

"Almost anyone in Asia, whether Westerner or Easterner, agrees that nowhere in the world is strength more respected and recognized than in the Far East. They say it is the one region of the world where no quarter is asked or given. This is why so potentially historic an event as China's detonation of an atomic bomb impressed so few in the swarming area. It was fully understood that China was nowhere—and would be nowhere for an unforeseeable time—in the nuclear power face-off among the military giants of the world.

"In hard-headed Asiatic calculation, the myth of the American 'paper tiger' had become replaced by the reality of the Chinese 'paper dragon.' That's why, it seems, that in the 'Year of the Horse,' the heavy Far East money is shifting to Uncle Sam.

"Sincerely,

"John Harris.

"P.S. I still can't eat with chopsticks."

It seems to me that the element of "face" is probably proving the strongest factor in keeping Hanoi from the Vietnam conference table. The Communists must know, from the bottom of their materialistic hearts, that they cannot win in South Vietnam and that the whole brazen effort to take over that country by force has come up against a made-in-U.S.A. stone wall.

Thus the big Chinese puzzle now could be whether the Far East comrades will decide that a "loss of face" is preferable to a loss of pants. The choice is squarely up to them.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps as never before, in order to help the members of our Armed Forces in Vietnam, we Americans are called upon to show unity and unrelenting backing of our President and our fighting men in Vietnam. For only that backing, and that show of unity can so unmistakably show the follow of the present thinking of the warloads of China and North Vietnam, who have clearly shown that they do not want peace, and actually expect our surrender. What will happen in the future remains for history to record, but the battle for peace goes on with the full heart and spirit of President Lyndon B. Johnson and our administration in hoping and praying that the United Nations may be able to bring about that peace that is so desired by the vast majority of the people in all the world.

And so it is left up to the American people since the decision has been made both to resume the bombing, and to continue the search and drive for peace to hope and to pray that the United Nations will be able to bring about the end of the conflict, with a peaceful and honorable solution.

Proof To the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the people of America want victory in Vietnam. After a fruitless peace overture to the North Vietnamese, President Johnson has again directed our aircraft to resume bombing raids against the forces of aggression.

The President had no choice. It should be abundantly clear to even the most naive by now that the Communist forces understand only one language—the language of military force.

Their misguided leaders must be made to understand in clear, forceful language that America is not soft; that we fully intend to stand behind our commitments in the Far East.

Let no one have any doubt about the commitment of the United States to the cause of freedom in Asia. Hanoi and Peiping continue to express the line that our determination will weaken, that our efforts will falter. I say to them now—they are engaging in a dangerous delusion if they believe their own propaganda. They are making the fatal mistake of tryants when they misinterpret our love of peace. We have shown the world our only desire is for peace, but not peace at any price.

My people at home strongly support our stand in Vietnam, and I believe their thinking is representative of patriotic Americans everywhere. In an editorial entitled "Proof to the World," the Honorable Thomas R. Waring, editor of the News and Courier, emphasizes that resumption of bombing should leave us with a clear conscience. Otherwise, further delay will be paid for in more American blood. Mr. Waring's logic is commendable, and under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the Record, I submit his editorial for the information of the Congress:

Proof to the World

Having refrained from bombing North Vietnam for more than a month, the United States has given proof to the world of its willingness to seek peace. In this period, the Communists clearly indicated their refusal to grasp the olive branch. If the United States resumes the aerial assault, it will do so with the clearest conscience. Only those who urge peace at any price, including surrender, can reproach President Johnson.

Representative L. Mendel Rivers said Tuesday that, in his judgment, the United States ought to resume attacks on North Vietnam. He also said: "I have the impression that a resumption of bombing attacks may be imminent."

American willingness to suspend aerial attacks may prove costly. The Communists have had more than a month to install new missiles and antiaircraft guns in North Vietnam. Navy and Air Force fliers may pay with their lives for the peace offensive which the peace groups forced on Mr. Johnson. Invariably, those who propose concessions to the enemy are the ones responsible for higher casualties.

Editorial Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues editorial opinions of one of our radio stations in Buffalo, N.Y., WGR:

Be a Better Driver

Why don't you start off 1966 by doing all you can to become a better driver? Helpful, indeed, are tips from pro drivers published in booklet form by a major oil company in cooperation with the National Safety Council. We pass them on to you.

"Don't show off or clown behind the wheel. It's the mark of an amateur. The pros know better.

"Have guts enough behind the wheel to chicken out when commonsense tells you it's time to give in. Never mind who's right. Be smart, stay alive.

"The public highway is for sharing, not competing. If you want to race, enter the 500 at Indianapolis, where they pay you for it.

"The squeal of tires and roar of the exhaust may sound like hot stuff to a driver who needs to build up his ego. But it tags him as strictly an amateur to the real pro. The smooth driver just doesn't do it, any more than the pro player misjudges a fly ball to make the catch look harder.

"The pro gives in to bad weather, bad roads and traffic jams, and slows down. He knows from experience that there are some things bigger than he is. He lives longer that way * * * and gets there almost as soon.

"Would your coach send in a player who had been drinking? Well, it does double for driving. Remember, a half-loaded driver is more dangerous than a loaded gun."

And, if you're a girl: Write off the character who tried to impress you by driving like a cowboy, risking your neck and your pretty face to indulge his egotism and desire to show off. Suppose he ends up by throwing you through the windshield. So you end up crippled or disfigured the rest of your life just because junior space cadet had to put on a show. Get yourself a replacement. You'll be surprised how easy it is, you doll.

Measles Prevention

Common measles can take the edge off the IQ of children who escape its more serious aftereffects such as brain fever, pneumonia, and middle ear infections. This is the warning of Dr. James L. Goddard, Assistant Surgeon General, to parents and physicians in a recent interview.

"I've personally felt for a long term that we underestimate the seriousness of measles in terms of the dulling it may cause," Dr. Goddard says. "In other words, a child who might have been a very gifted child with a very high IQ may get measles and * * * not be quite as bright because of the encaphalitis or inflamation of the brain that often accompanies measles."

In a discussion with Joseph R. Hixson, science writer of the New York Herald Tribune, Dr. Goddard, who is also Chief of the Communicable Disease Center, U.S. Public Health Service, in Atlanta, Ga., emphasized the following:

1. Between 400 to 500 children are dying annually of common measles, in addition to the thousands who suffer complications.
2. Vaccines have existed for several years for the prevention of measles and only public apathy stands in the way of eradicating it.
3. Reactions to the new vaccines are minimal.

Science is making tremendous strides toward the eradication of once dreaded diseases; scientific progress is worth little, however, if we do not take full advantage of it.

Teen Patrol

On a busy expressway it takes only one car with a flat tire or engine trouble to cause a traffic jam several miles long.

There is no pat solution. But one of the answers is to get the disabled car off the road as soon as possible. We'd like to see the safety councils at the public and parochial schools organize a teenage expressway patrol. Many of today's teens know more about cars than you and I. We believe most of these young people would be more than willing to volunteer a few hours each week, to help the motorist, provide gas, change a tire or get an engine started. The police department might welcome the chance to train these young adults, and we're sure the teens would jump at the chance to help our overworked police department.

If Buffalo teenagers formed an expressway patrol they'd provide a worthwhile community service and earn the gratitude of every motorist.

Is it legal? Can it be done?

Amendments to Fair Labor Standards Act Unfair to Canning Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the following report on the effect of the proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act on the canning industry was presented to the annual Washington meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama. The report was presented by Mr. Charles R. Wiggins, Jr., Moss & McCormack Mining Co., Jasper, Ala.:

Statement in the Industrial Relations Field Presented Before the Alabama Congressional Delegation, January 24, 1966

(By Charles R. Wiggins, Jr., Moss & McCormack Mining Co., Jasper, Ala.)

AMENDMENT TO THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT—H.R. 8259 AND S. 1986

The proposal would repeal section 7(c) of Fair Labor Standards Act which permits canners processing seasonal commodities to employ workers for 14 weeks without payment of penalty overtime; amend section 7(b)(3) which now allows canners during seasonal operations to employ workers for 14 weeks for a maximum of 12 hours per day and 56 hours per week to require time and a half for overtime after 10 hours a day and 48 hours a week; and require payment of double time after 48 hours a week this year, 47 hours next year, 46 the following year, and 45 hours thereafter, unless exemptions otherwise apply.

Within the membership of AIA are many companies engaged in the canning business. Since this legislation would adversely affect them directly and the general public indirectly, our association favors the retention of these exemptions now permitted under the Fair Labor Standards Act. We are opposed to the repeal of of section 7(c) and the imposition of statutory double time. This position is taken for the following reasons:

First. Congress recognized the necessity for the seasonal canning exemptions when the law was passed in 1938 and Congress has resisted every effort since that time to repeal or modify these provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The processing of perishable agricultural crops requires prompt handling from the field and through the cannery. Ripening is controlled by nature and crops must be canned without delay when ready. Quality can only be achieved by this action and the consumers' interest must be protected.

Second. The canning industry in Alabama includes many relatively small businesses located in rural agricultural environments and should not be subjected to the labor standards of urban industrialization.

Third. The imposition of penalty overtime at any time during the canning of fresh, perishable agricultural products would not be effective in spreading employment as the industry presently offers seasonal jobs to available qualified workers to the maximum extent practical.

Fourth. The seasonal exemptions apply only to perisable crops that must be processed when harvested. Highly perishable crops such as peas, corn, green beans, tomatoes, peaches, apricots, cherries, and plums cannot be stored for later canning.

Fifth. The full 28 weeks authorized by the present law are needed in handling the seasonal crops that periodically mature from spring through the fall.

Sixth. The proposed legislation will add significantly to canners' cost of operation without achieving the stated purpose "to reduce unemployment and to strengthen the economy by a better distribution of work presently performed." Higher prices to the consumer will necessarily result.

Address of Representative Basil L. Whitener, of North Carolina, at Young Democrat Banquet in Gastonia, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Hon. Basil L. Whitener, addressed the North Carolina Young Democrats on Saturday, January 29, 1966, at Gastonia, N.C.

In his speech to the Young Democrats he pointed out the necessity for supporting the President in his efforts to halt the spread of communism in southeast Asia. He also reviewed the record Congress has made in behalf of a better America.

I feel that my colleagues in the House will find his speech to be most interesting and informative, and I request that it be inserted in the Appendix of the Record:

Address of Basil L. Whitener, Member of Congress, Before North Carolina Young Democrat Club Installation Banquet, Holiday Inn, Gastonia, N.C., Saturday, January 29, 1966

I am honored to be with you this evening. As a resident of Gaston County and as Congressman of the 10th Congressional District I welcome our visitors to our county and district.

We can be proud that we are Democrats. We belong to the only political organization in the country that since its beginning under the great Jefferson and Jackson has represented every section of the Nation and all classes of our people. Ours is the political party that has room to accommodate all shades of opinion concerning matters of local and national interest. We can rejoice in the fact that ours is the party which does not demand conformity of opinion or action.

We can be proud that we are not a sectional party. We can take pride in the fact that the Democratic Party is the one political organization in our Nation that has a unity of purpose and a zeal for a better way of life for our people to which no other political party can lay claim.

The interest the Democratic Party has in the common welfare has been manifest since its founding. It was Jefferson who said that: "I consider the people who constitute a society or nation as the source of all authority. I am not among those who fear the people." The Democratic Party has never feared the people. The party has always found its strength in the American people.

On another occasion the great Jefferson said: "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if he ever had a chosen people."

Another great Democrat and the other founder of our party, North Carolina's own Andrew Jackson, summarized his Democratic philosophy by saying: "In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue every man is equally entitled to protection by law."

My friends, our party is based upon the political philosophy of those two great Americans. The political ideals and philosophies which they bequeathed to us form the foundation upon which rests our great party.

The American people have always turned to the Democratic Party in times of economic stress and whenever our national security has been threatened. In 1917, it was the scholarly Wilson who led the American people on their first great venture to preserve the principles of democracy for themselves and for our friends across the sea.

After the disastrous economic decade of the 1920's, the American people turned to the great Franklin Roosevelt. He led us out of our Nation's most devasting depression.

Under the dynamic Roosevelt the American people not only conquered economic adversity but went on for the second time to crush tyranny abroad. And when Roosevelt passed away it was another great Democratic President, Harry S. Truman, who successfully piloted the American Ship of State through the treacherous waters created by communism and saved Europe from economic collapse through the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine.

The booming economies in Europe and the free governments in the Middle East stand today as spectacular tributes to the Democratic leadership of President Harry S. Truman. History will surely record him as one of our greatest Presidents.

Our late President John F. Kennedy halted the spread of communism in the Caribbean through bold military and diplomatic decisions. And today, my friends, another Democratic President is leading our Nation at a time when American liberties are threatened by Communist tyranny on many fronts throughout the world.

Let us consider together some of the efforts that President Johnson and our Democratic administration are making to halt the spread of communism. The American effort to halt the Communist subjugation of southeast Asia is the most challenging opportunity, either domestic or foreign, confronting our Nation today.

There are those who question why we are in Vietnam. The answer is very simple. Our troops are in Vietnam to preserve the political integrity of that small country and, by so doing, to halt the cancerous spread of subversive communism throughout southeast Asia, and, ultimately, into Formosa, the Philippines, and other areas.

Nearly 200,000 young Americans are in Vietnam today. Many others may yet take their places in the battlelines before the Communists can be brought to the conference table. Our commitment will be expensive. Our struggle will be hard and dangerous. Whatever the cost, America must be prepared to pay it if we value freedom for ourselves and for liberty-loving people everywhere.

Our President deserves the support and prayers of our people in his efforts to lead us along the difficult diplomatic and military paths of southeast Asia. As members of a great political party wherein all shades of American public opinion can be accommodated, we, of course, do not expect every American to agree with the diplomatic and military decisions of our President.

One of the glories of our system is the fact that we are a nation which tolerates nonconformists. When the right to differ with the policies of our Government and the decisions of our leaders is abrogated at home, we will have lost our liberty as surely as if it had perished on the battlefield.

But in the exercise of our right to disagree we should not overlook the fact that if American efforts to contain communism fail, the privilege of free speech and our other treasured freedoms will disappear from the fact of the earth.

The majority of the American people support our President. The majority of the Members of Congress support the President and will give him whatever he requests to bring about a just and lasting victory in the Far East.

My fellow Democrats, we are living in a period of economic opportunity and material growth without parallel in the history of the world. Our present progress in every field has been phenomenal. Under the dynamic leadership of our party we have in the past 5 years made unprecedented progress in every phase of our national economic life.

We have better housing, better schools, improved health conditions, more highways, and countless other blessings than was predicted as recently as 10 years ago.

For example, during 1965 American business spent for plants and equipment over $51 billion. In a 2-year period expenditures for this purpose increased over 30 percent. It is predicted that we will have a gross national product this year of over $722 billion.

We have a lower rate of unemployment than at any other time in our history. Employment has risen by over 6 million people since 1961. Unemployment has dropped from 7.1 to 4.4 percent during this period.

New businesses are currently being incorporated at the rate of 197,000 every year. We had only 13,000 business failures last year, and of these 11,000 involved companies of less than $100,000 capital investment.

Common stock prices, earnings, and yields are at a high level. Corporate profits, after taxes, have grown more than 80 percent.

Since 1961 personal income has increased more than $120 billion to an annual rate exceeding $530 billion. The factory worker's wage has increased 20 percent since 1961, and farm income has increased nearly 20 percent.

We often hear the allegation that the Federal Government is getting the greater share of revenue and that State revenue collections are suffering as a result. It is interesting to note, however, that in fiscal year 1964 our booming national economy helped to increase over-all State revenues by 31 percent to an all-time record of $45.2 billion.

Democrats have not lost sight, however, of other important facets of our national life. For instance, 1965 was the greatest year in the American space effort. A Democratic Congress appropriated $5,175,000,000 for our space program.

Our Ranger, Mariner, Gemini, Saturn, Tiros, and Early Bird achievements have been the result of our Democratic administration's drive to make America first in space. President Johnson said recently: "The capacity of this country for leadership in this realm is no longer in valid question or dispute any place in the world."

Our present Democratic administration has been aware of the great need to conserve our God-given natural resources. As a result, your Democratic 89th Congress last year passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Wilderness Act, the Public Land Law Review Commission Act, and, in addition, added nine new areas to our great national park system.

Your Democratic administration is about to conquer the age-old problem of fresh water from the sea. Twenty-three million Americans face a perennial water shortage in the Northeast. The success of our desalinization program alone can add untold billions to our national wealth through the development of arid agricultural lands and increased commercial opportunities.

My friends, I could enumerate many other areas wherein we have pushed on to new heights of achievement for a better life for the American people. A Democratic Congress authorized 3 billion additional dollars last year for Federal aid to the States for the construction of new highways, appropriated billions of dollars for many new programs to combat poverty, to improve the health of our people, and to further education.

It has been demonstrated in the legislative programs enacted in the past 5 years that the Democratic Party is still the party of promise and of accomplishment for the American people. Our party keeps its face turned to the future, full of hope and new ideas.

As an example of the concern that our party has for our people, our national administration has for the first time in our history made a concerted drive to control narcotics and to halt the abuse of drugs.

Ever mindful of the debt our Nation owes to our veterans, the 89th Congress has enacted far-reaching legislation for the benefit of those who have worn the uniform.

The first session of the 89th Congress provided more than $4.1 billion for veterans, more funds for medical care, medical research, compensation and pension than has been provided in any one of the previous 35 years of the history of the Veterans' Administration. Medical care funds alone totaled $1.29 billion.

Our party is making an impressive record in behalf of the American people. As we move along on the high road to a better life we must not overlook, however, the great responsibilities and obligations which have been placed upon this generation of Americans.

In our desire for greater opportunity for our people we must not permit our financial house to fall into disorder. We must bear in mind that a sound and healthy economy and a fiscally sound government are prerequisites to the future well-being of our people. We should not, therefore, demand more of the government than we ourselves are willing to give.

The Democratic Party holds in its hands the future of our Nation and the future of the free world. We have not shirked the responsibilities history has placed upon us in the past. We shall not falter in accomplishing the great missions of progress and peace that lie ahead.

Young Democrats have a very vital role to play in the building of the great America of the future. I know that you will measure up to the high ideals of our party. In the Democratic Party all people have the best hope of our time and the future.

Address of Congressman John V. Tunney to the Annual Football Banquet at the University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1965, I had the great pleasure of welcoming to my congressional district in Indiana one of the ablest new Members of the House of Representatives, our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN V. TUNNEY of the 38th District of California.

Congressman TUNNEY was the principal speaker at the annual Notre Dame alumni football banquet, an occasion of great importance in my district. At this banquet, held at the University of Notre Dame, students and faculty of the university joined Notre Dame alumni in honoring the coaches and members of the Notre Dame football squad.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete text of Congressman TUNNEY's splendid address on this occasion.

The text follows:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE JOHN V. TUNNEY TO THE ANNUAL FOOTBALL BANQUET AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, SOUTH BEND, IND.

It is a great honor to be here at the annual Notre Dame football banquet.

Tonight I would like to direct my remarks to the football team. You are the ones being honored and deservedly so. The tribute is not being paid just because you had a winning football season; but in addition, because you and the teams before you have always played hard and clean. The tradition of your team is cloaked in honor.

The University of Notre Dame's reputation with the average sports lover throughout the Nation is based primarily on what happens on your football field on Saturday afternoons in the fall. With educators, graduate schools, and future employers, Notre Dame's reputation is based upon high academic standards; but the average sports lover look, only at your football team. Your president and your professors may shudder at the thought of this; it is a fact nonetheless.

Notre Dame's football reputation has through the years been superb. It has been synonymous with skill, sportsmanship and the will to succeed. It has denoted courage, persistence, and resourcefulness. It has imparted the faith that must exist within your student body that in victory, be magnanimous; in defeat, be honorable.

It is my belief that the qualities which make superior athletes and which enable these athletes to band together into a coordinated and effective team, are the same qualities which enable men to excel in their lifetime careers.

Nothing brings out the qualities of leadership, alertness, courage and aggressiveness more than athletic competition. Gen. Douglas MacArthur knew this when he had the following words carved on the stone portals of the gymnasium at West Point:

"Upon the fields of friendly strife are sown
the seeds
That, upon other fields, on other days, will
bear the fruits of victory."

COURAGE

Courage is a commodity which cannot be purchased in the marketplace. A person either learns to overcome his fear of unknown and future dangers or he does not. Physical courage does not always portend mental and spiritual courage, and it is of course, mental and spiritual courage which are so badly needed in every job and profession throughout one's life. It is clear, however, that the self-confidence that a person acquires by being able to withstand physical pain is an important component in standing up to life's pressures and remaining true to principle.

My father has told me on numerous occasions that the self-confidence and discipline that he learned in the prize ring have helped him in many instances of his subsequent business career. I know that it is it befitting true modesty to talk about one's father in flattering terms, but I hope as athletes, you will forgive this son of an athlete.

My father has felt always that he had his reputation to uphold in everything he did. He had been honored during his boxing days as a clean-living champion. He has never wanted people to say, "You know, Gene Tunney. Once upon a time he was quite a guy." I do not think that anyone will ever say this. Being conscious of having been a champion, my father has always tried to live like one and in more than one instance, he has given up a business deal which he felt would be profitable, but not entirely fair to all parties concerned.

Sportsmanship, like courage, is an essentional ingredient to genuine success on the playing field or in a man's profession. I am reminded of the statement of Grantland Rice:

"When the one great Scorer comes to write
against your name;
He marks, not that you won or lost, but
how you played the game."

The other day in California, a former professional football player who now hold a rather low-paying job as a shoe salesman was telling a group of high school students who had made Riverside County's all-league football team that they ought to forget all the stuff they had heard about sportsmanship—the only thing that counted was winning. He added, "Everybody loves a winner. If you walk into a clothing store after a National Football League game, the owner gives you, as a winner, a suit. He tells a loser to show his money before he even shows him what there is in stock."

Aside from the natural revulsion that anyone feels in having a man proclaiming such a debasing philosophy to youngsters, I wondered for a while if there were any pragmatic merit in what he was saying. I am convinced there is not.

HONOR

Whatever we do in life, however much money we make or glory we bring to our name, our satisfaction is dependent upon the value we assign to the accomplishment. Its value to us is influenced by what others think. Fortunately, honor is still glorified by most Americans. To reach a goal without honor, is to invalidate the whole purpose of the effort.

Success is sweet not only because of the personal gratification derived from the accomplishment, but also because of the esteem that others have for the victor. The saddest spectacle in the world is the man who rides roughshod over his peers in accomplishing his ends, only to find that at the moment the taste of triumph should be the most succulent, it has turned to ashes in his mouth because people hate the means by which it was achieved.

Perhaps the reason the speechmaker in Palm Springs has not been more successful since he retired from football is that too many people have heard his speech and do not trust him with anything more important than their footwear.

An analysis of the careers of great men in different walks of life shows several factors in common. These factors are found in the careers of great athletes. First, all have the desire to fight their way to the top and have developed their individual talents to the best of their abilities. Second, most have developed quite early in their careers a clear vision of their ultimate goals and have pursued these goals with dedication. Third, almost all have worked harder and longer than their contemporaries, and have persisted when others said that it could not be done. Fourth, all have had an inner faith that they would succeed. Fifth, most have had a unique ability to be honest with themselves while in the ascendancy and are capable of objectively evaluating their talents and deficiencies. Sixth, many great men, even though fiercely proud, have humility in their knowledge that for all their talent, they are beholden to their Lord for all they have.

It is clear to me that you members of the football team have a great headstart over most of your fellow students as you go out from under the shelter of university life.

LEADERSHIP

You have learned to fight and persist in the toughest type of competition. You have developed your leadership capabilities and have seen the value of sportsmanship. Your physical courage has been demonstrated week after week and your faith sorely tested. It is going to be your challenge and your duty to transfer all you have learned to your future vocations.

It can be fairly said that never before in history has our country needed men with your backgrounds more. In the era of technological advancement, urban sprawl, population explosion, social revolution, and confrontation between the West and the East, your particular leadership talents are in short supply. We need intelligent, fair-minded men in business, in government, in positions of community leadership.

There has been much talk in recent years of how America's youth is in revolution. More articles and books are being written now than ever before on the changing face of youth. Many authors deplore what is happening to movies, morals, and manners; and blame it on young adults and teenagers.

SERVICE

I believe that youth today are more committed to a sense of justice, altruism, and service than ever before in history. The record demonstrates this. More than 10,000 young volunteers are now serving in the Peace Corps and another 3,000 have already returned home. More than 100,000 youths have applied for service in this same Peace Corps to promote international cooperation, understanding, and aid.

When the Domestic Peace Corps (VISTA) was launched, more than 3,000 inquiries were received on the first day.

The fierce sense of justice that pervades many segments of youthful America is manifested by involvement in the civil rights movement in our country, dedicated work in political campaigns, and an increasing desire of many students to work with and help the poverty stricken during vacations. I sense an activist commitment to the promotion of social values today that did not exist as recently as 10 years ago when I was going through college.

I have a vague sense that university students today look upon the students of the 1950's as disengaged with the moral and social issues of the day. Whereas I recall that a person was really "in" if he was blase and slid along taking nothing too seriously, it is my understanding that the student of the 1960's is "out" if he is not aware of and interested in the great moral and political challenges of our time.

VISIT TO VIETNAM

I have just returned from Vietnam. While there, I had the opportunity to speak to at least 400 Californians serving in our Armed Forces. I met them as they were going into battle and as they were returning from patrols. I met they in supply depots and in hospitals. In every case, I would ask one question: "Do you feel that we are doing the right thing?" I can report to you that not one man said that he did not feel that we should be in Vietnam. All seemed to know that it was important that the United States turn back Communist aggression in this far-flung corner of the world.

One Marine lieutenant, 23 years of age, had only 2 days before had his right leg blown off in combat, said to me in response to my question as to whether or not our country was doing the right thing in Vietnam, "Congressman, if I had to do it all over again, I would do the same damn thing." It is quite clear that our soldiers understand that although the Communists are not invading our borders today that their assault against the freedom of the South Vietnamese people is a direct assault upon the future freedom of America.

The Communists believe that they will be able to take over the rich, technological nations such as the United States and the Western European countries by first taking over the underdeveloped nations of the world. They believe that by exporting revolution to these underdeveloped countries that automatically, one by one, they shall fall victim to Communist domination. The Chinese Communists believe that it is possible to equate the world to their own experience within China. They believe that once a guerrilla force captures the countryside, the cities will fall like ripe plums into their lap. They envision the underdeveloped areas to be the countryside and the rich, technological nations to be the cities.

According to the Communist theory of inevitability, there is no question but that one southeast nation after another must pass from independence to Communist allegiance. A necessary component of the Communist theory of guerrilla warfare is that in the in-between equilibrium stage of the struggle between guerrilla forces and governmental forces that the will of the government to resist is slowly sapped and eventually is broken. It is for this reason that the Communists look upon the demonstrations in the United States against the Vietnam war as a sure sign that America's will to resist is weakening. The leaders delude themselves into believing that a majority of Americans support these demonstrations. It fits into the formula that America's will should break and the Communists use every mental gymnastic to prove the validity of the formula.

My trip to Vietnam convinces me more than ever before that it is essential that we turn back Communist aggression and prove to them once and for all that national wars of liberation are not the wave of the future. I am also convinced that the young men from America, who have gone so far and who have left so many loved ones, are deeply, personally, and permanently committed to the defense of this little and embattled land. Their strong reaction against the demonstrations and the irritation with which they read reports that peace marches are being held back home is proof of their dedication and fighting spirit.

I know that we will win the war in Vietnam and my on-the-spot investigation has proved to me that we are winning the war now. The Communists are starved for a victory. They have not had a substantial victory over American troops for the past 4 months and nothing would give them greater pleasure than to be able to broadcast throughout Asia and the rest of the world that they were capable of defeating Americans. Our troops have superior firepower and training. They work in close coordination with our airpower. They have demonstrated that the helicopter can be a most important and effective method of increasing the mobility of troops. They have been killing 10 Vietcong to every 1 of our own lives lost in battle. In short, they have proved that they are superior soldiers.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN COMMUNISM AND DEMOCRACY

Assuming the war in Vietnam is won, what happens next in the long and titanic struggle between the forces of communism and democracy? Our will and our strength will surely be tested again at other times and in other places. We must be willing, we must be able to respond to the challenge. In the long and in the gray twilight period before our confrontation with communism is resolved, there will be many opportunities for the weak, for the uncommitted, for the selfish to say "Let's give up the fight in the international arena and return to fortress America." As is always the case in any long and strenuous engagement, there are some who are called but who fail to meet the test.

We can, I believe, be confident that our Nation's future is a happy one. In this generation as in all others in the past, we find talent, exuberance, and faith bubbling to the surface of our people, wanting, yes, demanding to be tested. A nation such as ours, endowed by laws such as ours, populated by people such as ours, with a spiritual commitment to democracy such as ours, cannot help in the long run to overcome all obstacles.

America, however, looks to men such as you here at Notre Dame for her future leadership. It is your obligation to serve her well.

Report From Marine Commandant Wallace Greene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, has just returned from a 2-week trip to Vietnam and other countries in southeast Asia. On January 25 he reported his findings in remarks delivered before the Union League Club of New York.

The U.S. forces in South Vietnam now total nearly 200,000. Marines represent 42,000 of that number. The Commandant stated that the two-pronged mission of the Marine Corps, military and civic action, is being vigorously prosecuted. Of particular military interest is the general's comment that—

> We own the night now, we have taken it away from the Vietcong.

The Commandant also found that the Vietcong are exhibiting more cruelty than before, murdering more innocent civilians, more village chiefs and their families.

Of great personal encouragement to me was the continuance of the high morale of our troops. Time after time, wounded servicemen spontaneously expressed to General Greene their desire to return to their units.

Under unanimous consent, I should like to place into the Record the full transcript of the Commandant's remarks:

Remarks by Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, Commandant of the Marine Corps, at the Union League Club, New York, N.Y., January 25, 1966

Mr. Hovgard, members of the Union League Club, and distinguished guests, as some of you may know, I returned to Washington, just a week ago Saturday from a 2-week trip to Vietnam and other countries in southeast Asia. During these next few minutes I want to give you a report on what I saw of the situation out there, the progress that has been made during the past year, and, of course, something about the activities of the marines who are engaged in combat. Anything I don't touch on during these opening remarks, I'll be happy to cover during the question period which I understand will follow.

The primary purpose of my trip was to have a firsthand look at the marines in Vietnam. I did that, of course. I also was interested in updating my information on the activities of the other services and the troops of other countries who are engaged in the struggle along with us. In the course of my trip, I also visited in Thailand, Taiwan, Korea, and Guam, in an effort to gain some insight into the feelings that are current in these other places.

As a starting point, let me remind you that the overall strength of U.S. forces has grown from the 30,000 that were there a year ago to nearly 200,000. Of that number, about 42,000 are marines. The 3d Marine Amphibious Force, which includes ground and air combat elements, as well as combat supporting forces, is located in the northern section of South Vietnam in what is known as the 1st Corps—the I Corps—area.

From the very beginning, since last March, marines have projected seapower ashore and have been physically located within three perimeters, sometimes called enclaves. During these 10 months we have been gradually expanding those perimeters, with the idea of forming a single beachhead extending along the entire coastal plain of the 1st Corps area. There are over 2 million people living in that strip, which is about 165 miles long. Our target is to provide security to these people, to provide them with the safety and the rehabilitation that they need so badly and desire so strongly.

All our forces out there—not just the marines—have a twofold program underway. There is the military action, which makes most of the headlines, of course. This is a slow laborious process, for it usually means one of two things. We either set an ambush and wait for the enemy, and destroy him, or we have to hunt him down, once we learn he is generally in the area. Tactics are different from World War II days and from Korea. But I am convinced they are sound and effective. I want you to know that at least three-quarters of our troops are on the move during the night. We are setting over 100 ambushes every day. We own the night now, we have taken it away from the Vietcong. We make many large and small patrols. We have what I believe is the most effective tactic for the defense and the expansion of our perimeters, yet one which still removes the initiative from the marauding Vietcong.

Conversely, there has been an interesting change in the tactics of the enemy. When our forces first entered the struggle out there, the Vietcong were using primarily guerrilla-type tactics. Now we find them ranging in size up to battalions and regiments. They are fighting for the more heavily populated areas, and the areas where they previously had their bases. The constant patrolling and the incessant bombing has forced this change.

There is a vast difference, also, in their attitude toward the people. They are violating that oft-quoted principle of Mao's for guerrilla action, which required that the guerrilla swim in the sea of the people. For success, the guerrilla must rely upon the friendly populace to hide him and sustain him. They aren't doing that now. Instead, their reign of terror has increased. The Vietcong are exhibiting more cruelty than before. They are murdering more innocent civilians, more village chiefs and their families than ever before. They are taking the food out of the mouths of the people, almost literally, by stepping up the so-called taxes they collect from the villagers who are not in the secured areas.

This has helped to bring on an alienation of the average Vietnamese citizen. To foster and encourage this alienation is the purpose of our civic action program, the necessary second prong of our two-way attack on the entire problem.

My feeling is that you could kill every Vietcong and North Vietnamese in South Vietnam, and still lose the war. Unless we make a success of the civic action program, we are not going to obtain the objectives we have set—to bring a lasting peace to this country, free from the terror and aggression of the Communists.

Unlike Korea, during the conflict there, a sense of family in many cases does not exist. This is to say nothing of the community or the government. There must be a political rehabilitation, as well as a physical one.

By now, the people in the villages where we have been want to be our friends. They know we have no ideas of exploitation, and that we are not colonialists. They realize that the Americans are there to help them, and they are cooperating with us, in an honest effort to help themselves. This is the real target in South Vietnam—the winning of the people.

We have made a good start, but it is a tremendous job that remains to be done. The program has not been expanded as much as it should be, because we don't have the people—sufficient people—to do all that should be accomplished.

There must be Vietnamese forces—the local police or the popular forces—placed in the villages that have been cleared—pacified—to provide the needed security, once the military action has been completed. Then there must be technicians to instruct the people in sanitation, in better farming methods, to help them rebuild their houses, their schools and their churches, and to start them down the long road to political stability. I am convinced, however, that if we just push on with determination and resolution, we can accomplish all this.

We have some problems facing us, however. None of them is serious enough to hamper our operations at all, but some of them are covered by the various news media from time to time, not always as thoroughly as they might be—and I want you to have all of the facts.

The ports are very crowded. We are improving the one up at Danang, as well as the large one at Cam Ranh Bay. When these are completed, unloading of ships will be expedited and distribution of materials, which is probably the largest problem, will show much improvement.

Communications in the area are overloaded, but it is only a matter of time before this will be eased.

Covered storage is a must. It is raining somewhere in Vietnam practically the year round. Similarly, shelters built of the ground are a basic requirement. These projects are constantly underway.

There are some shortages of heavy equipment and generators. Heat, humidity and rainfall take their toll, but once the matter of unloading and distribution is solved, most of the related problems of logistics will be solved.

Personnel problems are not great, although there are some shortages in certain hard skills. As our buildup in strength continues, and we have more time to have people properly trained, this discrepancy will be minimized.

A number of men have contracted a very stubborn strain of malaria, seemingly quite different from that we encountered in the South Pacific. Our medical people are right on top of the problem, however, and the more serious cases are evacuated promplty. As a matter of fact, nearly all the patients with whom I talked in the hospital in Guam were malaria evacuees.

Here I found a most interesting fact which I must tell you about. Every single man I talked to was anxious to get out of the hospital—not to come back to the States—but to rejoin his outfit in Vietnam. I didn't ask them this question. They volunteered the information. The attitude of the men, in Vietnam, as well, is outstanding—is something of which you and I can be justifiably proud.

For example, there are right now over 2,000 marines who have asked for an extension of duty in Vietnam. I asked a few of them, "What do you want to stay out here for?" I received the same answer from each one: "We feel we are making a real contribution to our country. We like these Vietnamese with whom we work. We see the benefits that come from our operations here, not only in civic action, but in the patrols we go on. We want to stay here."

These were American teenagers, for the most part, giving me answers like those. They know why they are in Vietnam. They see the results of their efforts, and they want to stay there until the job is done. It is a reassuring feeling you can get from talking with these young Americans—entirely different from some of the feelings one can have watching some of the anti-American policy demonstrations back here.

I also learned something else out there that was very reassuring. A few months ago I believed that to many people here in the States didn't either know or care about the fact that Americans were fighting in a war in southeast Asia. Recently there has been tangible proof that a great many Americans do care. I'm sure the same thing happened to the men in all the services, but I can speak certainly about the marines. In our area alone, there were over 320,000 pounds of special mail delivered from all over the country. This was not just from relatives and friends. There were gifts, letters and cards from people who in many cases didn't even sign their names. This was proof to these marines that the people at home are behind them and are supporting them. It is difficult to describe the tremendous boost this sort of a demonstration makes on the morale of a youngster who is thousands of miles from home at Christmas.

It also signals to me a refreshing change—that the majority of Americans do understand why we are fighting in southeast Asia, and that they realize it is an important struggle to retain our own freedom and that of the family of nations in the free world.

I can't tell you what the final formula for success will be out there. A lot will depend on what the other side does. If our adversary continues to pour in more men and materials, it is reasonable to assume that we will necessarily increase our commitments. It may be necessary to resume striking at the lines of communication and the supply centers in the north. From a purely military point of view, and I realize there are other considerations, but militarily speaking this would be an obvious benefit. Once the Vietcong's support from the north is halted, I believe the route to the negotiation table will be shortened.

It may take a massive effort to bring this struggle to a close. It may take a long time. It will certainly require a lot of patience, a lot of courage and sacrifice, as far as money and luxuries are concerned. There may be extensive casualty lists also. However, I am certain that if we execute a properly balanced program of military and civic action, with a united front here at home, we will eventually prevail. With an understanding of why we are there, why we cannot withdraw, and with the concerted efforts of the fine men who are now fighting in Vietnam, we can attain national objectievs in southeast Asia, preserve the stakes of the free world, and bring the campaign in South Vietnam to a successful close.

Those are my observations from the scene and my considered thoughts on the future. If you have some specific questions, I will be glad to answer them if I can.

Over 75 Representatives Ask for Arms Balance in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD copy of a letter which was sent to Secretary of State Dean Rusk on January 26, 1966, requesting that effective measures be taken to strengthen Israel's defenses and thus maintain arms balance in the Middle East. Over 75 Members joined in signing the letter. Many of the Members, however, have not had an opportunity to see the text of the letter because it was not sent to every Member of the House for signature. Thus, I insert it in the RECORD so that any Member who wishes, may associate himself with this appeal, by writing in similar vein to the Secretary of State. The text of the letter follows:

Within recent weeks we have become gravely concerned over the new military preparations which the Arab states are making to implement their anti-Israel summit conference decisions.

As a result of these decisions the Arab states are spending millions of dollars to train new brigades and to equip them with new weapons, to be acquired from the Soviet Union and the West.

The arms buildup is a direct result of the policies of President Nasser, who has promised that a war with Israel is inevitable. Arab states acquire arms because they are encouraged by Egyptian promises or because they fear Egyptian expansionism. Consequently, Israel is compelled to increase her defense preparations at great cost to her economy.

All of us look forward to the day when the Arabs will decide to end their war against Israel and agree to enter into negotiations for a limitation in their arms and the attainment of a peace settlement. We wish that day could be today.

But, deplorably, the Arabs remain committed to destroy Israel. The United Nations has been unable to challenge this illegal posture, the Soviet Union pours new weapons into Egypt, Syria, and Iraq, and our own Government and the United Kingdom have recently undertaken to increase the supply of planes, tanks and missiles to Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

We are not complacent about any of these developments.

We are aware of our commitment to oppose aggression in the area. But we are mindful that the concentration of hostile and well-equipped armies on all Israel's frontiers presents a constant threat of an attack too swift to be prevented by external intervention.

In view of this continuing danger, we believe it is imperative that the United States take effective measures to strengthen Israel's defenses in order to deter those who menace her security. In our judgment the tactics of indirection pursued in the past are no longer adequate or appropriate.

Israel is a progressive and vibrant democracy, a friend and defender of freedom, with a message of inspiration for all the new nations of Asia and Africa. Peoples everywhere who share her commitment to democracy and freedom also share her anxieties for the future. They look to us to help her to defend herself and, at the same time, to do all in our power to bring about a lasting peace settlement.

We appeal to you, Mr. Secretary, to advance policies which reaffirm in every way our traditional determination to help all the peoples in the Near East to peace and a better life.

Brock Adams, John B. Anderson, Frank Annunzio.

William H. Bates, Alphonzo Bell, Jonathan B. Bingham, William S. Broomfield, George E. Brown, Jr., Phillip Burton, James A. Byrne.

Elford A. Cederberg, Emanuel Celler, Frank M. Clark, Don H. Clausen, Jeffrey Cohelan, Robert J. Corbett, James C. Corman, Glenn Cunningham.

Emilio Q. Daddario, Dominick V. Daniels, Harold D. Donohue, Ken W. Dyal.

Leonard Farbstein, Daniel J. Flood, John E. Fogarty, Donald M. Fraser, Samuel N. Friedel, James G. Fulton.

Edward A. Garmatz, Jacob H. Gilbert, John J. Gilligan.

Seymour Halpern, Wayne L. Hays, Henry Helstoski, Chet Holifield, Elmer J. Holland, Frank Horton, W. R. Hull, Jr.

Harold T. Johnson, Edna F. Kelly, Eugene J. Keogh, Carleton J. King, Paul J. Krebs, John C. Kunkel, Clarence D. Long.

Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Thomas C. McGrath, Jr., Ray J. Madden, William S. Moorhead, Abraham J. Multer, Leo W. O'Brien, Barratt O'Hara, Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Richard L. Ottinger.

Edward J. Patten, Thomas M. Pelly, Claude Pepper, Melvin Price, Roman C. Pucinski, Thomas M. Rees.

Ben Reifel, Joseph Y. Resnick, George M. Rhodes, Howard W. Robison, John J. Rooney, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Edward R. Roybal, William F. Ryan.

Fernand J. St Germain, William L. St. Onge, James H. Scheuer, Richard S. Schweiker, Garner E. Shriver, Robert E. Sweeney, Herbert Tenzer, Sidney R. Yates.

Largo Sentinel Analyzes the State of L.B.J.'s Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, two of the most astute and well reasoned analyses that I have seen of the President's recent state of the Union message appeared in the January 20, 1966, edition of the Largo Sentinel, a highly respected weekly newspaper located in my district of Florida.

Following are the editorials to which I refer, and which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

LYNDON: WHAT HE SAID

No doubt Lyndon Baines Johnson carried an impressive rating last Wednesday night in his annual state of the Union message to the American people. All television channels were preempted and the program appeared in color for those lucky enough to have the proper receiving equipment. It would have been better, perhaps, if we had been able to see the event in color. As it was we felt a little like we were watching P. T. Barnum selling the Cardiff Giant to a gullible public.

Traditionally the state of the Union message is regarded as an appraisal of the situation that the United States is in from a standpoint of foreign and domestic relations. Mr. Johnson touched on a great many points of domestic policy as he leaped from spending program to welfare commitment to tax magic. The listening audience was asked to believe that a deficit of less than $2 billion would be possible during a full-scale guns-and-butter spending program. Our leader suggested the way to this amazing fiscal triumph would be through increasing personal income tax withholding and speeding up corporation taxes. Thus the Government would borrow the money from the people who are expected to make it, before they make it, and at no interest. He neglected to say that something like $3.8 billion would be realized through this slight of hand which would not be there next year.

Among the other feats of legerdemain performed was the now-you-see-it, now-you-don't telephone and automobile excise tax cut of January 1. Reenactment of this tax will add enough to the Federal income to bring about the relatively small budget deficit according to the figures recited during the speech. It will indeed be a feat of magnificent proportions if all of the programs, all of the war effort and spending in general can be accomplished without a deficit extending into $6 or $8 billion.

The war in Vietnam is not popular among those who are labeled as hawks since their position is one in which they demand swift and decisive action based on winning the war. Johnson did not mention winning as as a goal in Vietnam. The cautious ones, the so-called doves, hailed the lapse in bombing Vietnam despite the fact that any response appears to be nearly nonexistent. Johnson appears to be caught in a dilemma in which the only way out is through. That is he must either back out or move through toward victory. This is a situation where he cannot control the actions of all the principals nor can he predict with any degree of accuracy what their reaction may be to moves made by the United States. This is not a comfortable position for the heavy-handed Texan who is used to having his own way in most everything except perhaps, his daughter's marriage.

The state of the Union message was disturbing in that it carried the message of a man who labors for a consensus on the one hand with a program of massive welfare now being extended into a worldwide application in apparent hopes that the impoverished across the land will join the legions of L.B.J. boosters among the welfare recipients here at home. On the other hand the tone came through of a man who realizes that two centuries of progress, bringing us to the point of being the greatest and most generous civilization the world has ever known, still find leaders of rival world forces bent on our destruction. The obligations of protecting that civilization at the expense of losing points in the "world opinion poll" are not as easy to face as are suggestions for spending money among the poor.

Lyndon; What He Didn't Say

Midst all of the suggestions for advancing the spending for welfare, the new Department of Transportation, and the 4-year terms for Congressmen (well calculated to gain congressional favor) there were a number of pertinent points that were totally ignored. We hope that responsible Members of the Congress will raise these points on the floor for debate and demand that they be included in any program of action that we may embark upon.

We heard nothing of the demands of labor for wage increases of 30 percent and more in the railroad operating unions and in the transit unions of New York. He did admit in a press conference, the following day, that the settlement of the transit strike in New York had far exceeded the guidelines of noninflationary price and wage adjustments. He didn't do anything about it though, to no one's surprise.

Floridians noted a lack of emphasis on the space program. With all other aspects of Government spending given a good leg up on the Great Society train it seemed significant that this vital program was totally ignored in the picture Lyndon painted. A sharp cutback in spending for space could have a quick reaction on the economy of Florida.

The rights of people in Vietnam to determine their own destiny was made clear. The rights of the millions of people who have been gathered unwillingly into the community of captive nations to those same rights of determining their destiny was ignored. In fact it was strongly suggested that we step up our trade with those who had done the captivating of these people.

Mounting evidence of Communist terrorism in South and Central America was ignored. Numerous countries are feeling the increase in this reprehensible tactic of the Vietcong in this hemisphere from the Dominican Republic to Brazil. Plans for assistance to these nations were not mentioned.

There was no mention of the plan recently announced to settle the problem with Panama by a treaty amounting to almost total surrender to forces of the radical left. When sovereign U.S. territory is given away by treaty, or at least is in the position where it is about to be offered to the Senate for ratification, it would seem to be worth mentioning in the state of the Union message.

Rising threats of inflation were skimmed over without a backward glance. Cost-of-living figures are rising at a rate that should create some interest among people other than those getting hurt. No one thing can defeat the aims of the war on poverty faster than inflation. If there is to be any victory in that war there must be curbs on inflation. An example on your own table is the reduction of the weight of a standard loaf of bread from 1½ to 1¼ pounds while retaining the same size. Perhaps you haven't read the wrapper; it might be interesting.

There was no mention of accepting the help of the well-trained and equipped army of Nationalist China to aid our cause in South Vietnam. There was also no mention of extreme vulnerability of our forces to a sudden and massive air attack from China with nuclear weapons or conventional bombs. There was no mention of the tremendous stock of supplies being shipped regularly to our enemies by our so-called friends.

There was no mention of the weapons of war being supplied by Russia and her Eastern European stooges to the Hanoi war effort. The idea of increasing trade with these countries must seem strange to a man looking down the barrel of a Polish-made rifle, built with steel from a plant supplied by the United States and delivered with trucks along a road we cannot bomb; trucks built with the capacity of plants assisted by U.S. dollars.

The state of the Union is not quite as suggested by last Wednesday's message.

Salute to Louie Vinocur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, this coming Friday evening, February 21, 1966, there is scheduled in my hometown of Painesville, Ohio, a surprise dinner in honor of one of Lake County, Ohio's outstanding citizens. The dinner is in honor of Mr. Louis Vinocur, county administrator, Lake County, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who will be present, and for the countless thousands of taxpayers of Lake County who have benefited by Mr. Vinocur's services, I would like to outline a few facts about this very likeable gentleman.

Louis Vinocur started to work for the Lake County Commissioners on December 1, 1960. At that time it was my pleasure to be serving on the board of county commissioners. He was recommended to me by my fellow commissioner, John D. Hadden. Mr. Vinocur brought with him over 15 years of experience in the State auditor's office and a thorough knowledge of county finances and procedure. As the years went by, Lake County became the fastest growing county in the State and Mr. Vinocur's experience proved to be of tremendous value. His insistence on the investment of idle county funds has saved the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars. A great personal tribute to Mr. Vinocur is the fact that, while he himself is a stanch and loyal member of the Grand Old Party, he has served in the capacity of administrator under the administration of both political parties. In his job he has always put the good of the public before personal political consideration.

Louis Vinocur is a strong family man. He now resides with his wife, Mercedes, at 7 North Park Place in Painesville. A daughter, Mrs. Roberta Friedkin of Massachusetts, and a son, Sander, have made him the proud grandfather of five lovely children.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to call Louis Vinocur a personal friend. He is a close confidant of mine whose advice I have often sought and will continue to do so. I hope to be in Lake County on Friday night to say along with his hundreds of friends, "Thanks Louie."

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Congressional Record I wish to insert a statement by County Commissioner John Hadden concerning Louis Vinocur. This excellent statement most adequately reflects the thoughts of thousands of Mr. Vinocur's friends:

As an example to the youth of today who may feel an inadequacy in the future of America or in the benefits of education, we of Lake County, Ohio, point with pride to our appointed county administrator as an ideal to strive toward.

This gentleman, Mr. Louis Vinocur, as a peasant lad in southern Russia—with his family at the turn of the century—walked across Russia to the North Sea to seek a better life in America. Going first to Montreal and then to Cleveland, he progressed through education and application, working his way through school and earning his degree from Ohio Northern University.

He has served the public of Lake County and the State of Ohio faithfully and well and has now reached the pinnacle of his years. A successful man—with a fine family—a faithful public servant with integrity, honesty, candor, and fearlessness, combined with friendliness and a warm human nature. His legacy will be a good life and a dedication to duty that the student of today would do well to emulate.

Congress and Vietnam—Peace and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I take the liberty of including herein two editorials which appeared in the New York Times—one in the January 31 edition entitled "Congress and Vietnam," and the other in this morning's edition entitled "Peace and War."

I believe these articles merit the consideration of all Members of the Congress, and I therefore commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1966]

Congress and Vietnam

With 200,000 American troops in Vietnam and growing concern that many more may have to join them there, pressure is increasing in Washington for a formal, full-dress congressional debate on U.S. policy in this area.

We believe that a comprehensive discussion of this issue in the Senate—or in both the House and the Senate—is extremely desirable. A matter of this great importance deserves more adequate and more organized attention than is provided by the occasional statements individual legislators have made in recent months. Moreover, the situation in Vietnam and the scale of American involvement there have changed drastically since the Tonkin Gulf incidents of the summer of 1964 that produced the blank check congressional joint resolution President Johnson has recently cited as legal authority for his present use of American forces in Vietnam.

There is certainly no lack of opportunity for the needed great debate on Vietnam policy. Both chambers of Congress have before them the President's request for an additional appropriation of $12.7-billion to finance military and economic activities in that area. Senator Gruening has introduced a resolution to deprive the President of authority to send draftees to southeast Asia, while Senator Morse has sponsored a bill to repeal the 1964 joint resolution on which the President relies. A major discussion of Vietnam would be appropriate to consideration of any or all of these matters.

The argument can be made that such an open clash of opinion would strengthen the conviction in Hanoi and Peiping that the United States is tiring of the Vietnam war and will abandon Saigon sooner or later. But this argument is not very persuasive since the North Vietnamese and Chinese Communists are already well aware that a significant number of Congressmen and other Americans have publicly indicated their lack of enthusiasm for escalating that conflict.

Congress must engage in a full and systematic debate on Vietnam policy if it is to meet its constitutional duties as well as its members' moral obligation to the voters they represent. Such a debate could help educate the people of this Nation—many of whom are undoubtedly hazy about why American boys are fighting and dying so far from home—on the issues involved, and the nature of the choices before the country. Life might be simpler for the administration if Congress merely continued to rubberstamp its Vietnam policy, but President Johnson's political position both at home and throughout the world would be much stronger if his actions won formal and explicit congressional endorsement after full airing of all points of view. Those who oppose a congressional debate encourage belief, in Hanoi and elsewhere, that the present White House policy in Vietnam has less domestic support than the President claims it has.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 1, 1966]

PEACE AND WAR

In a dramatic move timed immediately to follow resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam, President Johnson has asked the Security Council of the United Nations to intervene in the Vietnam conflict by calling for an international conference and a ceasefire. This is an important if long-delayed gesture by the United States that holds the possibility of opening the way to peace and only emphasizes the sincerity of President Johnson's desire to put an end to the war in Vietnam.

It is unfortunate that the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam was not deferred at least until there was some evidence of the success or failure of the American move in the United Nations. In fact the good effect of the appeal to the U.N. was in part vitiated by the prior order to resume the bombing. Continuation of the bombing pause would have been a far more effective complement to the U.N. resolution than the renewed bombing attacks on North Vietnamese targets, which will almost certainly lead to further escalation of the war. More men, more planes, more ships, more money, more materiel, more wounded, more dead—these are the unmentioned but probable sequals to the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam. The course the war took during the previous bombing raids proved that even if the attacks slowed down infiltration from North Vietnam, they did not prevent it. North Vietnamese soldiers and materiel had been going south in quantity long before the bombing pause.

There is no reason to believe that renewed bombing can bring a different result. The United States could bomb Hanoi and Haiphong and even destroy all of North Vietnam without wiping out the threat posed by China. In fact, the danger of a ground war with Communist China, and perhaps a nuclear world war, would thereby be brought considerably closer.

President Johnson argued that "if continued immunity" were given to North Vietnam, "the cost in lives—Vietnamese, American and allied—will be greatly increased." But if 100,000 or even 500,000 more American troops are sent to Vietnam, as is predicted, many more lives are surely going to be lost. What was a morass is becoming a bottomless pit.

President Johnson said that "the end of the pause does not mean the end of our pursuit for peace." In this he is, of course, completely sincere. The great conflict over Vietnam that has arisen in the United States is precisely over the meaning of "the pursuit for peace." A number of respected and informed Senators and Representatives; military men like General Gavin and Ridgway; academic specialists, teachers and clerics; and a great many friendly foreign statesmen and commentators, all believed and said that the bombing of North Vietnam ought not be resumed. They all felt that "peace" had not given a full and fair chance. They all fear the consequences of the United States getting more and more deeply involved in Vietnam.

So far as the bombing of North Vietnam is concerned, the decision has now been made. American troops in the field must be supported; but so must American efforts—inside the United Nations and ouside it—to reach an honorable settlement in order to restore peace and self-determination in Vietnam.

Oren Harris

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the people of the Fourth District of Arkansas sent to this body a bright, young and aggressive attorney from El Dorado, Ark. Ever since then the people of Arkansas and the United States have greatly benefited from the service here of the Honorable Oren Harris. Unfortunately, Oren is now leaving this body to assume a seat on the bench of the Federal District Court in Arkansas. The House of Representatives will sorely miss him.

For the past 8 years as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Oren Harris has originated, fought for, and succeeded in enactment of legislation which touches deeply upon the life of every person in this country. His investigative and legislative skills have led to progressive laws in fields ranging from the make believe world of radio and television to the very real worlds of public health, commerce, and transportation. Under his chairmanship the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—a very difficult one because of the sensitive and complex nature of its jurisdiction—has gained a stature seldom known in the history of this body.

I think I speak for all my colleagues here when I say that I am happy to see the Federal judiciary gain a member of Oren Harris' stature. And I think I also speak for them when I say I am sad to see Oren Harris leave the House of Representatives. We wish him godspeed and good fortune.

Associated Industries of Alabama State Position on Packaging and Labeling Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all the Members to an important report made to the members of the Alabama delegation at the annual Washington meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama. The report deals with the labeling and packaging bills and was presented to the conference by Mr. Whitfield King, Jr., assistant to the vice president of the Chemstrand Co. at Decatur, Ala.:

PACKAGING AND LABELING

(Statement in the public affairs field presented before the Alabama congressional delegation, January 24, 1966, by Whitfield King, Jr., assistant to vice president, Chemstrand Co., Decatur, Ala.)

S. 985, Hart; H.R. 643, Multer; H.R. 770, Gilbert; H.R. 993, Farbstein, H.R. 1576, Roosevelt, and H.R. 1664, Celler—AIA has been on record as opposing this type legislation since its introduction several sessions ago.

This legislation would empower the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration to adopt and enforce rigid regulations over the packaging and labeling of consumer nondurable goods, including:

Control of the weights and volumes in which goods may be packaged and sold, regardless of whether existing practices are deceptive.

Control of the sizes, shapes, and dimensions of packages.

Absolute prohibition of "cents-off" promotions and the use of such label terms as "economy size."

Control of pictorial illustrations on labels.

Specification of label terms that may be used to describe package sizes, such as "small," "medium," and "large."

Requirement that sufficient information as to ingredients be stated on labels.

Specification of type-size and location of net contents on labels.

In addition to foods, drugs, and cosmetics, the law would cover hundreds of consumer package goods, and affect many heavy industries engaged in producing or fabricating packaging materials.

Our association cannot support this legislation for the following reasons:

1. In many respects this legislation merely duplicates provisions in the existing law. The Chairmen of both the Federal Trade

Commission and the Food and Drug Administration publicly testified their agencies already possess power to prevent false or misleading labeling and packaging, where it occurs.

2. Other provisions of this legislation go far beyond existing law, by authorizing intensive Government control of package sizes and shapes without regard to deception, and prohibiting "cents-off" label promotions altogether.

3. For the consumer, the bill will tend to increase rather than decrease the prices of market-basket goods. Rigid regulation of package sizes, shapes and volumes will slow down packaging progress, require heavier capital outlays in machinery and equipment, and raise prices at the retail level. On canned foods a requirement of net weights in even pounds or half pounds would cause incredible confusion and expense because of the difference in density of products which are now packed in a single size. In reality, the bill is a package standardization bill which will limit the housewife's freedom and range of choices, and impair her ability to choose real values.

This is needless and dangerous legislation. It should not be passed.

Assistant Commerce Secretary Brimmer Describes Negroes' Progress Under the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Andrew F. Brimmer, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs, recently delivered an interesting and factfilled speech setting forth the meaning for American Negroes of the 5 years of economic growth and prosperity under the Kennedy-Johnson administrations.

The speech points out the progress that has been made by Negroes in the last 3 years in particular. It emphasizes also the need for continued economic growth, eradication of discrimination, and widened opportunity if Negroes are to share equally in the national wellbeing.

The text of Secretary Brimmer's remarks at the annual banquet of the Houston, Tex., Citizens Chamber of Commerce, on January 21 follows:

ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN BLACK AND WHITE

Next month, the United States will celebrate the fifth birthday of the longest peacetime economic expansion in the Nation's history. During these 5 years, gross national product, the broadest measure of the pace of business, rose by more than $171 billion, to a total of $675 billion in 1965. Last year alone, the gain was $46 billion, or well over 7 percent.

As the President observed in his state of the Union message last week, these have been good years for America. I would like to add that these have been the best years for the American Negro.

These simple observations are an inadequate summary of a truly remarkable achievement by the American economy. What is remarkable is not merely the strength of the steady climb from the recession of 1960–61. Rather, the remarkable feature is that the period of expansion has endured so long that prosperity has begun to seep even into the Nation's backyards and byways populated primarily by Negroes. While the faster pace of business has not brought a bonanza to the Negro community, it has brought the largest gains relative to the white community experienced since World War II. While prosperity has solved no basic problems of race and society, it has carried a record number of black people within reaching distance of the ladder to a middle-class life. And because so many of the disadvantaged—both black and white—are just on the verge of reaching for the first rungs on the ladder, it is vital that economic progress not only be maintained but also broadened further to include those still living beyond the mainstream of well-being.

Looked at from the general situation of the American Negro, the national objective of sustaining a high level of prosperity in a matter of the greatest urgency:

While the Nation has enjoyed 5 full years of prosperity, Negroes have participated in a substantial way in only the last 3.

Although generally good times have reduced the overall unemployment rate to 4.1 percent, for Negroes it was 7.3 percent last December.

The last few years of prosperity have enabled an increasing number of Negro families to escape from poverty, but two-fifths of such families are still poor.

Thus, the economic prospects for the Negro during the year ahead—far more than for any other large segment of the population—are intimately linked with a continued high rate of economic growth, coupled with lessened job discrimination, widening opportunities for training, and more rapid upgrading presently held jobs. Consequently, the President's determination to maintain a high level of national production, and his decision to continue laying the foundations for the Great Society while providing the men and means to support the military effort in Vietnam, are the best New Year's present the Negro community—and other disadvantaged groups—could receive.

In these remarks, I wish to look behind the contours of the general prosperity to examine the extent to which Negroes have shared—and have not shared—the fruits of economic growth during the last 5 years.

I look first at the general profile of economic expansion.

I trace the trends in labor force participation, employment and unemployment for white and nonwhite workers.

I sketch the pattern of changes in personal income of white and nonwhite families, with special emphasis on the escape from poverty.

I show the magnitude of the differential benefits of economic growth for the white and nonwhite population.

Finally, I indicate why the hopes of the Negro community rest so heavily on the expanded opportunities which will come as the Great Society unfolds.

LABOR FORCE, EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The lateness of the Negro's participation in the current prosperity is seen most clearly in the labor force statistics published by the U.S. Department of Labor. (The labor force consists of the number of persons 14 years of age and over who were employed or seeking work on the date of the monthly survey.) These figures show that, over the 5 years since 1960, the total labor force increased by 5 million, a gain of 7 percent. The nonwhite labor force rose by 600,000, or by almost 8 percent. This faster growth raised the nonwhite proportion from 11 percent of the Nation's active manpower in 1960 to 13 percent in 1965.

The profile of year-to-year changes within the period is particularly sharp. During each of the first 3 years of the expansion, the nonwhite labor force grew by 100,000 persons. But in 1964, the rise was 200,000, followed by an increase of 100,000 in 1965. The movement for the white labor force was quite different: during the recovery year of 1961, the white labor force expanded by 900,000, followed by a gain of only 200,000 in 1962. As the pace of economic activity quickened, the white labor force climbed by 1 million each year in 1963 and 1964 and by 1.3 million in 1965.

We know in general that prosperity not only brings more jobs, it also induces more people to seek work. As more and more of the unemployed find jobs, this encourages others (including many businesses and others with only a moderate attachment to the work force) to become more venturesome. The opposite behavior is also observable: if the search for jobs produces little success, there is a progressive withdrawal from the labor force of those disappointed. This pattern of behavior was especially evident among nonwhites during the current expansion. Between 1960 and 1961, reflecting the impact of the recession, the male nonwhite labor force was static. However, some 100,000 more nonwhite females moved into the labor market—probably a good many of whom were seeking to compensate for the loss of income as males became unemployed. On balance, there was no net increase in nonwhite female employment, and the full 100,000 moved into the jobless ranks. In the following year, 1962, the female component of the nonwhite labor force became static.

But 1962 also saw the revival of hope among nonwhite men, whose numbers in the labor force advanced by 100,000. This was little more than matched by employment gains, and unemployment of nonwhite males fell moderately. Beginning in 1963, the nonwhite female labor force rose by 100,000 each year through 1965. But it was only in 1964 that a substantial improvement occurred in their job situation, when a gain of 200,000 was registered. The nonwhite male labor force showed little change in 1963; but 1964 brought an increase of 100,000 followed by a leveling off in 1965.

At this point, it would be well to focus more closely on the trends in employment and unemployment during the last 2 years. As mentioned earlier, 1964 marked the real entry of nonwhites into the current prosperity. In that year, the number of jobs held by nonwhites jumped by 300,000; in 1965 a gain of 200,000 was recorded. Moreover, these gains went primarily to nonwhite men. In 1963—despite 2 years of vigorous economic growth—over 10 percent of these men were jobless. By the end of 1965, this figure had dropped to 6 percent.

The progress among key breadwinners is even more striking. At the end of last year, the unemployment rate for married Negro men whose homes have not been disrupted by divorce or separation was less than 2 percent—the same as for white men with the same marital status. Even the overall rates of unemployment fell sharply for nonwhites in the last year—from 8.9 percent in December 1964, to 7.3 percent in December 1965. for the entire labor force, the decline was from 5 to 4.1 percent.

Nevertheless, the general participation by nonwhites in the Nation's prosperity remains far from satisfactory:

In December 1965, 598,000 nonwhites were unemployed. This was 26 percent of the total unemployment, although nonwhites constitute about 13 percent of the labor force.

The unemployment rate for nonwhites was 7.3 percent, against 3.7 percent for whites and 4.1 percent for the labor force as a whole.

Among youth just beginning their careers, the opportunity to participate was even less promising. The unemployment rate for nonwhite youth was 26.4 percent in December 1965, compared with 11.3 percent for white youth and 13.1 percent for the total. And for nonwhite female youth, the rate was a discouraging 31.8 percent, or 2.7 times that for white girls.

INCOME OF THE NEGRO COMMUNITY

The delayed participation of the Negro in the current economic expansion is also thoroughly documented in the trend of personal income. The latest income figures available by color are for 1964. In that year, aggregate personal income (as defined by the Bureau of the Census) amounted to $395.7 billion. The income of nonwhites was $26.4 billion. Thus, nonwhites received 6.7 percent of the total. This was a record share. In fact, this ratio alone tells a great deal of my story: in 1960, it was 6.2 percent. With the rise of unemployment during the recession, it eased off to 6.1 percent in 1961. Because Negroes lagged behind as the recovery got underway, the ratio declined further to 6 percent. But as more and more nonwhites were drawn into the gainfully employed, the ratio rebounded sharply to 6.4 percent in 1963, and it made a further strong advance to 6.7 percent in 1964.

The share of personal income going to nonwhites since 1962 has risen faster than the nonwhite population, so there has been a genuine improvement in economic welfare. Between 1961 and 1962, nonwhite per capita income declined from $986 to $977. But during the next 3 years, there was a steady rise to $1,168 in 1964. Again the quickening participation of nonwhites is evident. The increase was 3.7 percent in 1963 and 4.7 percent in 1964. For whites, there was a fairly steady growth in per capita income from 1961 to 1964. It moved from $1,966 in 1961 to $2,188 in 1964. Over this period as a whole, per capita income for whites increased by 11.3 percent—while for nonwhites it was 18.5 percent. Nevertheless, by 1964 nonwhites still had only slightly more than half the income per head as whites.

When examined on the basis of median income, another striking change is evident as Negroes were pulled progressively into active participation. In 1964, the median family income of Negroes actually grew faster than the income of white families—in both percentage and dollar figures. This commonly used yardstick rose by $374 (or 10.8 percent) for Negroes, compared with $310 (or 4.7 percent) for white families. Of course, a large gap remained: the median was $6,858 for white families and $3,839 for Negroes. Thus, here also the Negro family's income was just over half that of white families.

THE ESCAPE FROM POVERTY

Some of the most meaningful evidence of progress is found at the low end of the income scale—the percentage of families who have managed to escape from the poverty bracket.

Here again, the evidence indicates that prosperity quickly changed the lives of the white population, but it took 2 or more years to produce an impact on Negroes, Mexicans, and other minority groups.

In 1961, the first year of the present economic recovery, the number of nonwhite families with incomes below $3,000 actually increased by 1.4 percent, or in actual numbers by 29,000. Meanwhile, some 297,000 white families were crossing the poverty line in the other direction, reducing the number of poor white families by 4.8 percent.

In 1962, there was another 4.4-percent reduction in the number of poor white families, but there was virtually no decline in the nonwhite poverty ranks.

In 1963, there was an 8.9-percent drop in the number of white familes living below the poverty line. And, for the first time, there was a sizable drop in the number of poor Negro families—105,000, or 4.9 percent.

There was a substantial change in the relative white and Negro gains in 1964. The number of white families living on the fringes of the economy was reduced by 3.2 percent. But there was a 7.5-percent decline in the number of Negro families in the poverty ranks.

Even though the total white families outnumbered Negro families by about 9 to 1, the number of Negro families who crossed that invisible line in 1964 was almost equal to the number of white families—153,000 Negro families and 164,000 white families.

We do not have the score for 1965, but it seems likely that poverty's domain was again substantially reduced.

From 1959 to 1964, the number of poor families of all races declined by 1.4 million—despite an increase of 2.8 million in the total number of families.

Thus, sizable numbers of both whites and Negroes climbed above the bare subsistence level in those 5 years; the proportion of poor white families decreased from 15 to 11.5 percent; for Negroes, the decline was from almost half (49.6) to less than two-fifths (39.1). The poverty level can no longer be regarded as the approximate median income for nonwhite families.

While the incidence of poverty was moving downward, the total number of Negro families increased by 12.3 percent and the number of white families by 6.2 percent.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS AMONG SOUTHERN NEGROES

The current long period of economic expansion has made a particularly strong contribution to the improvement of the Negro's position in the South. Two big years, 1962 and 1964, resulted in a substantial improvement for them. Unlike the pattern elsewhere the median family income of nonwhites in the South increased $340 in 1962; it rose by only $65 in 1963 and then moved strongly upward again by $378 in 1964. The median had declined by $5—from $2,117 to $2,112—in 1961. By 1964, the midpoint for southern Negro families had grown to $2,898.

This was still only about 44 percent as great as the median income of $6,569 for all U.S. families, but it represented considerable improvement over the 38-percent figure for 1960.

The position of Negro families outside the South in relation to all U.S. families has declined slightly, from about 81 percent in 1960 to 79 percent in 1964. The trend for this group has been upward the past 2 years, with the percentage figure rising from about 76 percent in 1962. The median family income of $4,540 for Negro families outside the South was considerably more than twice as great as that of southern Negro families, but the 1964 median of $5,160 for Negroes in the North and West was less than 1.8 times as great as the southern median.

The remarkable gains of 16.2 percent and 15 percent in the median income of southern Negroes for 1962 and 1964, respectively, were far above any gain made by Negroes outside the South in the 1960–1964 period. However, the advance was only 2.6 percent in 1963. These best years for Negroes in the North and West were 1963 and 1964, when median family income rose by 7.7 percent and 5.5 percent, respectively.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONTINUED ECONOMIC GROWTH

The evidence presented above clearly demonstrates that the current prosperity—while delayed in reaching the Negro community—has finally begun to make a difference in the degree of their access to economic opportunity. This evidience also demonstrates the need to maintain the bridge of high-level business activity over which Negroes can continue to move into the mainstream of the Nation's economic life.

Just how critical is this necessity can be seen from the results of some of the analytical work we have been doing in the Department of Commerce. We asked these questions:

What is the rate of increase in economic activity required to reduce the level of total unemployment by 1 percent?

How does a given percentage change in economic activity affect nonwhite unemployment compared with the effect on whites?

The answers to these questions are both striking and instructive. We have concentrated on finding an answer to the second question. The answer to the first was provided some years ago by Arthur Okun, who is now a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Okun estimated that overall economic activity (or gross national product—GNP—after allowing for price changes) must grow by about 4 percent each year to offset the long-run increases in productivity and the labor force.

In other words, a growth rate of 4 percent is needed simply to keep total unemployment from rising. Moreover, a 1-percent increase in GNP over and above that required to keep unemployment from rising will usually bring a decline of about 0.3 percent in the total unemployment rate.

Following the same statistical procedure used by Okun, the Census Bureau performed a set of calculations to estimate the effects of changes in GNP on the unemployment rates for a number of different groups of whites and nonwhites. The result can be summarized as follows: In general, a 1-percent rise in GNP will reduce the rate of unemployment by the indicated percentage.

Total	—0.30
White, total	—.26
Nonwhites, total	—.47
Males over 20 years of age:	
Whites	—.28
Nonwhites	—.56
Females over 20 years of age:	
Whites	—.21
Nonwhites	—.31
Youth (14–19 years of age):	
Whites	—.30
Nonwhites	—.61

These statistics tell us a considerable amount about the dependence of the Negro and other nonwhites on sustained prosperity.

The total nonwhite unemployment rate is far more sensitive to changes in gross national product than is the total white unemployment rate for all age-sex components. For a given increase in gross national product, the nonwhite unemployment rate decreases about twice as much as the white unemployment rate, and for a given decrease in gross national product the unemployment rate increases about twice as much.

The male unemployment rate is more sensitive than the female rate for both white and nonwhite adults. For nonwhites, the male unemployment rate fluctuates almost twice as much as the female.

The teenage unemployment rate is more sensitive than the rate for persons 20 and over and for both white and nonwhite.

An average growth of gross national product of 4 percent per year has maintained all these unemployment categories at a given level in the past, except nonwhite teenage unemployment which has risen when gross national product has increased less than 5 to 5½ percent per year.

From a review of this evidence, I conclude that prosperity pays high dividends for all of our citizens. I also conclude that without continued prosperity, our Negro citizens stand little chance of any dividends at all.

THE NEGRO'S FAITH IN THE GREAT SOCIETY

The administration of President Johnson, and that of President Kennedy before him, has followed a policy of actively promoting economic growth, balanced with price stability. A major element in this policy was the provision of incentives, such as tax reductions, to stimulate aggregate purchasing power.

At the same time we have actively tried to improve the economic status of those who are frequently bypassed, even during periods of general prosperity. This method of attack includes the antipoverty program, job training, and Federally assisted projects in the fields of education and health.

Last week, President Johnson decided that this Nation possesses the human and material resources to continue and expand these programs, even though we are engaged in a costly military effort, and maintain price stability at the same time.

This decision to continue laying the foundation for a Great Society has a special significance for nonwhites because a greater proportion of nonwhites need help to escape poverty, racial discrimination, ignorance and disease.

In citing the greater gains of the past year or so, I would like to caution against drawing the conclusion that nonwhites definitely are on the brink of a breakthrough. Many years of growth—even at the present accelerated pace—will be required to close the economic, educational and social gaps between Negro and white. No problems have been solved.

And, further improvements may be more difficult in the year ahead. It is much harder to achieve further reductions in total unemployment after the rate has dropped to around 4 percent and still avoid inflationary pressures. Yet, it is precisely the high level of general economic activity which makes possible the strides necessary to take Negroes and other minorities into the mainstream of progress. This is fully recognized in the Federal Government. The Great Society—with its rich promise of opportunity—will continue to be built while we provide for the military effort in Vietnam. And—with the proper mixture of public policies—we can do both and avoid inflation at the same time.

The Honorable Pat Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am grieved to hear of the death of the Honorable Pat Cannon, a former colleague in Congress from Florida, and a longtime distinguished jurist in our State.

It was my privilege to serve with Pat Cannon in the House of Representatives and to enjoy a warm friendship with him. He was elected from Miami in the late 1930's, and he served until 1946. As a matter of fact, I am the only member of the Florida house delegation who served with him in Washington. Subsequent to his service here, he became a judge of the circuit court in his home town of Miami and continued to serve in that capacity until his death.

Pat Cannon was one of the best known and best liked Members of the House. He was a big man with a personality to match. Liking him was instinctive. As a Congressman, he served well, and represented the city of Miami and the State of Florida with distinction. Although 20 years has elapsed since his service here, the memory of Pat Cannon is still strong in the Halls of Congress, among the Members, the staff, and the House employees who knew him and who still serve here.

I consider it a privilege to add my praise to his memory, and I extend my condolences as a longtime friend, to the members of his family.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Tydings, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Vacancy

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

MSX: Deadly New Enemy of the Oyster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the effects of the prolonged drought in the Northeast are most evident in their everyday, dramatic aspects. The hidden, side effects of the water famine are just beginning to appear.

Still one more effect is revealed in an excellent article by James F. Waesche in the Baltimore Sunday Sun. He tells of the appearance of a bacteria destroying oysters and possibly, other seafood. The bacteria thrives only in salt water, but the lowered fresh water levels is allowing the saline-living bacteria further progress in Chesapeake Bay.

The article points up the urgency and the necessity for the overall survey of the Chesapeake Bay area, including Baltimore Harbor, legislation introduced by me in last year's session and passed by the House and Senate. President Johnson allowed funds to begin this study in his budget message. We believed that the sea nettle was largely responsible for the decline in revenues from bay products and recreation, but this article reveals the menace of still another enemy. The survey of the Chesapeake region evidently should not be delayed.

In an effort to give wider readership to this article, I ask its inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MSX: DEADLY NEW ENEMY OF THE OYSTER

(By James F. Waesche)

A mysterious protozoan parasite, MSX, has been drifting up Chesapeake Bay the way an invisible, odorless cloud of lethal gas would roll over a city: silently, but with disastrous effects. Wherever it has appeared oysters have perished and the industry dependent upon them has collapsed.

Delaware Bay was hit first. MSX wiped out the oysters there in 1957. In 1958 it was discovered in the mouth of the Chesapeake. In 2 years it had reached the Maryland-Virginia line—after ravaging oyster grounds to the south. This year researchers have found evidence of it as far north as the mouth of the Choptank.

Already it has taken its toll in Maryland. Crisfield has been particularly hard hit. "The oyster business here is dead," lamented a Crisfielder close to the industry; and, although its comments are more cautiously phrased, the Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs tends to agree. "MSK has certainly hurt the economy of the Crisfield area," an official acknowledged.

(It is said, incidentally, that a few Crisfield packers, desperate for oysters, are buying them in Baltimore, trucking them to Crisfield, then repacking them and shipping them to out-of-State markets as bonnes bouches from the Seafood Capital of the World.)

The problem is not Crisfield's alone. MSX investigators are labeling the parasite "a distinct threat from Virginia north to the Honga." Also, they note, "more dead oysters have been reported this year than before."

What's drawing—or what's propelling—MSX up the bay? Changing salinities, scientists say. The oyster-killing parasite seems to thrive only in water containing more than 15 parts salt per 1,000 parts fresh water. Until recently, Maryland's portion of the bay was never that salty. It has become so lately though, because of the prolonged drought in New York and Pennsylvania. Lack of rain there has greatly decreased the volume and flow of the Susquehanna River, which, under normal conditions, supplies the bay with 90 percent of the fresh water it receives from sources north of the Potomac.

Because less fresh water is flowing into the head of the bay, salt water from the ocean has been able to push farther and farther up the mouth, causing the isohaline—the imaginary line that divides the relatively salty portion of the bay from the less salty portion—to move steadily northward, providing more and more "living space" for MSX. At present the isohaline stretches from the mouth of the Choptank on the Eastern Shore to Cove Point on the western. It is 40 miles closer to Baltimore than it was 5 years ago.

"And it's getting higher," remarks Frederick W. Sieling, chief of CBA's Natural Resources Management Division. "Unless theres a change in the rainfall pattern, it'll get higher still."

He points out that the isohaline, roughly 25 miles long, crosses the bay as a sharp diagonal. It is much higher on the Eastern Shore than on the western. Several factors cause this. One of the most surprising is the rotation of the earth, which tends to slosh waters from the western side of the bay upward and against the Eastern Shore. Then too, the deep channel is on the eastern side.

"Creeping salinity" is, so far, one of the few concrete things that MSX researchers have to go on. They know little about the parasite itself. The letters MSX, in fact, stand for multinucleate sphere unknown. Only one of the organism's life stages has been identified—the one which lives in and kills the oyster. It may spend part of its life in some other animal, or in the water, or in both. Biologists don't know. Neither do they know how it is transmitted from one oyster to another. Experiments have shown only that a healthy oyster cannot catch MSX from an infected one.

Since its life stages can't be charted, its origin remains a mystery. There are, however, some hazy hypotheses. Sieling summarizes them:

"There are two possibilities," he says. "One is that MSX may be something that has been here all along—something that underwent a sudden mutation and became lethal. But the chances of such a mutation, I feel, are rather remote. It would be like picking one star out of the sky.

"The other is that MSX may be something that has been introduced into these waters from another area—something that may have been a parasite in another animal, one that was resistant to it, that then found a happy home in the oyster. There are many chances for this to have happened in Delaware Bay, where there are so many oceangoing ships that may have had mollusks or fouling on their bottoms. I personally lean toward this theory."

The parasite could also have been introduced by humans, he suggests, much in the way milfoil, an exotic weed that has spread unchecked and clogged many a bay estuary, was dumped into local waters from fish bowls.

In an effort to replace the "X" with a good, long Latin name, research programs are underway in laboratories up and down the coast. Closely following MSX as it sweeps up the Chesapeake is the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries lab at Oxford. The program there is under the direction of Aaron Rosenfield, Ph. D.

"One of the first signs of infection is in the gills," Rosenfield says, adding that some biologists have thus concluded that the parasite is waterborne. "Oyster blood cells flock to the area of infection. This can be picked up on the microscope, so this is how we know that it infects the gills first."

MSX does its damage, however, in the oyster's digestive tract. It seems to settle there, multiplying and filling the space where the oyster's food should be. Apparently the oyster starves to death.

MSX is harmless to humans. "We've eaten infected oysters here in the lab," says Rosenfield, "and everybody's still walking around."

Many people have probably eaten infected oysters without knowing it. The parasite is tasteless. Its presence can sometimes be detected by a keen eye, however, for it blanches the digestive tract, normally a dark brownish-orange.

With so little known about the parasite itself, biologists are hoping to stem its advance and salvage the industry by discovering in nature (or learning to breed) an MSX-resistant oyster. Hopes are based on evidence that a resistant strain seems to be developing naturally in Delaware Bay.

Some 90 percent of the oysters there fell victim to MSX in 1957. Ten percent survived—either by resisting the initial onslaught of the parasite or, if attacked by it, managing somehow to "get well." (Rosenfield says that in the lab an oyster has been "caught in the act of 'spitting out' the organism.")

Biologists call survivors a "relic population," and they note that the progeny of such a population tends to maintain its parents' resistance or immunity. There is now, for instance, only 15 percent mortality among the progeny of the Delaware Bay relic population, whereas oysters from other waters, when put in the still-infested bay, die en masse.

What makes a resistant oyster different from a susceptible one? Rosenfield and his staff are trying to find out.

Rosenfield is spending most of his own research time making chromosomal analyses.

There may be, he says, chromosomal abnormalities in resistant (or even in susceptible) oysters, abnormalities similar to the one that produces mongolism in humans. If one exists, it could be possible to breed a new, MSX-resistant strain.

Chesapeake Bay Affairs and Oxford are cooperating in the anti-MSX campaign. Many of the samples with which the lab works are obtained by CBA. CBA also conducts continuous sampling programs in the bay, checking both salinities and mortalities.

"We're doing everything we can to keep track of it," Sieling says, "and we're tailoring our shell-planting program to areas not infected and to areas we feel won't be infected."

The dramatic and relatively sudden invasion of MSX has tended to obscure the fact that it is not the sole ravager of oysters. Rosenfield places a fungus called Dermocystidium on the list of lethal pests, particularly because it is more active here than it used to be. There are also Minchinia costalis, only recently identified, and Bucephalus cuculus, an organism which, although it doesn't kill an oyster, renders it unable to reproduce. Ironically, it improves the oyster nutritionally.

Nonetheless, because its invasion has been so sudden, dramatic and devastating, MSX has gained most attention. As Rosenfield says, "People don't care until it affects them." And in the past couple of seasons, MSX has affected a lot of Marylanders.

The United Nations Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Covington Virginian of Covington, Va., on Saturday, October 30, 1965, and written by the Reverend Richard W. Buckingham, of the Epworth Methodist Church, of that city, entitled "Year of Crisis or Year of Opportunity."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YEAR OF CRISIS OR YEAR OF OPPORTUNITY

(By Richard W. Buckingham)

This is United Nations Week. Twenty years ago last Sunday, on October 24, 1945, the United Nations became a reality, for on that date a majority of the signatories—including China, France, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States—had filed the necessary instruments of ratification. Hence, October 24 became United Nations Day.

We are a United Nations family; our son David, who was 20 years old last Sunday, was born the same day the United Nation became a recognized world force for peace. Not only so, the Atlantic Charter was issued "somewhere in the Atlantic" on August 14, 1941, and August 14 is my birthday. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference in Washington, D.C.—a forerunner of the United Nations Conference—concluded on October 7, 1944, and October 7 is my wife's birthday. And, the first United Nations Conference, attended by delegates from 50 nations, was held in San Francisco beginning on April 25, 1945; and April 25 is our daughter Mary's birthday.

So we are truly a United Nations family.

The United Nations will be a man, of age, its 21st birthday in 1966, as will my son on United Nations Day, October 24, 1966.

Now 1966 is a year of possible crisis, for in 1966 the United States will observe the 25th anniversary of its entrance into World War II.

Ever since this Nation was "conceived in liberty" by the War of Independence, each generation of American youth has fought in a major war.

To put it another way, in the 170 years from 1775 to 1945, when World War II ended, our Nation has been engaged in war about every 25 years.

And as a matter of record, World War II began in 1939, exactly 25 years after the start of World War I in 1914.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-six, then, may well be a year of crisis, for it is just 25 years removed—one generation—from 1941, the year we entered World War II. If history is to repeat itself, as it has for every previous generation of American youth, my son David and his generation can expect to enter World War III in about 1966.

It is a tragic fact that many of his classmates have already paid the supreme sacrifice, in the present world crisis.

What of 1966?

Will it be the year of great crisis, or is it to be the year of great opportunity? Will the United Nations, which just last Sunday ceased to be a "teenager," became "a man" and save the men of its generation from the catastrophe of another world conflict—a possible tragedy too horrible to imagine?

Or will the United Nations fail to measure up to its ideal for all mankind?

You can answer these questions by what you do or don't do in the next 12 months.

Will you help or will you hinder?

The U.N. needs and deserves your support. Will you help?

Vietnam: The Perimeter Theory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said about the United States retreating to the coast and then setting up defense in a few enclaves.

Mr. Max Freedman, a columnist for the Washington Post, presents some very cogent arguments why this is not proper action for the United States to take.

His column follows:

VIETNAM: THE PERIMETER THEORY

(By Max Freedman)

Neither a military nor a political case can be made out for fighting the war in Vietnam by withdrawing or limiting American power to Saigon and a few coastal areas. That is true despite the famous names, both in and out of Congress, that have spoken up these last few days in favor of this proposal.

In essence this plan is based on the mistaken military notion that it is sometimes easier to defend a perimeter than a citadel. In Vietnam today there are no citadels and few perimeters. The United States would be doomed under this plan to be an occupying power in part of South Vietnam after it had conceded and accepted defeat in the rest of the country.

If this plan were adopted, the United States would find its strong points dependent for its food supplies on a countryside that was either controlled by the Vietcong or by villages who no longer cared what happened to American troops. It is impossible to think of a single valid reason why the people in the villages should lift a finger to help us once we had withdrawn to our own selected positions.

What this plan means, therefore, is that we would seek a relatively stronger and safer position for ourselves by abandoning the rest of South Vietnam to the Communists. What assurance is there that we would in fact have any security? The Communists, scenting our weakness, and aided now by a population suffering from a sense of betrayal, would keep up the attack. Cooped up in stationary positions, caught in a sort of weak Maginot Line, unable to use the military asset of surprise or to take the offensive, the American forces would soon find that their strong positions were in fact dangerously weak.

But suppose this plan, in defiance of all military logic and experience, actually works? The United States, by its own decision, on its own authority, in defiance of its pledges, would be responsible for the partition of South Vietnam.

If there were any political leaders in cooped-up Saigon willing to work with us, they would form the most despicable of puppet governments. They would have no authority in the rest of the country with their own people. For the United States, in these changed circumstances, would have no power except the base and fleeting power of a military giant occupying part of a distant land that does not belong to him.

It is being said, rather late in the day, that the United States has no obligation to fight to the bitter end to vindicate the territorial integrity of South Vietnam. Putting aside that argument for a moment, what obligation have we to partition South Vietnam to suit our imagined miltiary convenience? If another country did this, we would denounce it as blundering and brutal imperialism, and we would be right.

We would not, in reality, have even a perimeter to defend for very long. The more this plan is examined the clearer it becomes that it is the prelude to a settlement based on retreat, withdrawal, and defeat.

The last touch of unreality is given to this plan when it is remembered that its advocates have used the loudest arguments in the past to tell us that no struggle against Communist subversion can be won by guns and military power alone. The war has to rest on foundations of political, economic, and social reality. Above all a successful war has to enlist the sympathy and support of the ordinary people.

The plan outrages every one of these principles. It thinks in military terms alone. It cares nothing for the unity of South Vietnam or for the welfare of its people. It cares only about saving American lives and easing American burdens.

It is not a candid and prudent limitation of American aims in a dangerous war whose end no one can foresee. It is selfish folly dressed up as a deceptive policy, and if it were ever tried it would be a shattering failure.

The worst thing about war is that it forbids easy solutions. It makes no sense to get out of Vietnam. It makes even less sense to get half out. There will have to be harder thoughts and harder battles before the end comes into sight.

President Nyerere of Tanzania Pays Tribute to Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, anyone who reads the newspapers knows that the United States is frequently criticized abroad. We must realize that in many cases this criticism is motivated by the fact that as the freest and most prosperous nation on earth we are a handy target. It is nice to know there are able leaders abroad who recognize the reasons why we occupy that position, and who are ready and willing to profit from our example.

One such leader is President Julius Nyerere, of Tanzania. In dedicating a hospital in Chimala built with a $70,000 donation from the members of the Church of Christ in Texas, President Nyerere told thousands of his fellow countrymen that "Americans are hard-working people and we in Tanzania must try to follow their example."

Religious organizations such as the Church of Christ are doing an immense amount of good work in hospital building and medical assistance in developing countries. The hospital in Chimala is the first one in the area. Its modern facilities, including a maternity ward and X-ray equipment, will serve thousands of people.

I am pleased that three Texans have been instrumental in planning and operating the hospital. Mr. Andrew M. Connally, of Arlington; Dr. Ron Huddleston, of Post; and Mrs. Florine Smalling, of Azle; each played important roles in bringing about the success of the project.

I wish to thank President Nyerere for his generous recognition of and kind words about the work done by Americans in his land. I hope that this is to be just one of many fruitful collaborations between Americans and Tanzanians.

I ask unanimous consent that an AP story from Dar-Es-Salaam and an article from the December 28 Fort Worth Star Telegram be printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Associated Press]

Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania.—The President of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, praised Americans Monday at the dedication of a mission hospital in Chimala.

"Americans are hard-working people and we in Tanzania must try to follow their example," he told thousands of Tanzanians attending the opening of the hospital.

The Church of Christ Mission Hospital was built with $70,000 donated by Church of Christ.

Nyerere said that through hard work Americans have become the richest people in the world and he told the Tanzanians that they also must work hard to make their country self-sufficient.

He said this was the first hospital in the area and he was pleased at the modern facilities, which include a maternity ward and X-ray equipment.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Dec. 28, 1965]

U.S. HOSPITAL IN TANZANIA CITED

President Julius Nyerere, of Tanzania, yesterday praised Americans during the dedication of a 50-bed hospital at Chimala for which funds were provided by 40 Church of Christ congregations in this area.

Andrew M. Connally, a Church of Christ missionary who has just returned for a furlough here from the east African country, said today the dedication marked the first time the President of a nation has opened a Church of Christ facility.

Connally was active in supervision of planning the hospital—the first in Tanzania.

Park Row Church of Christ in Arlington will supervise the hospital, and funds for its operation will be supplied by Churches of Christ in this area and individuals.

THREE YEARS ON DUTY

Connally spent 3 years in Tanzania. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. A. M. Connally, of 3222 Avenue H. Mrs. Connally's parents are retired Fort Worthy Fire Capt. and Mrs. Homer Franklin, of 4010 Avenue H.

Both the missionary and his wife are graduates of Polytechnic High School. Their parents, who are members of Polytechnic Church of Christ, were active in the hospital building campaign.

The Church of Christ now has 43 churches and about 5,000 members in Tanzania, Connally said.

Dr. Ron Huddleston, a native of Post, and a graduate of Baylor University Medical School, is the physician serving the hospital. He will be succeeded later by Dr. Raymond Wheeler of Wichita, Kans., who is on the development committee of Abilene Christian College and a trustee of Oklahoma Christian College.

REGISTERED NURSE

The hospital's registered nurse is Mrs. Florine Smalling. Her husband, Wayne, a former engineer at General Dynamics—Fort Worth, is an administrator at the hospital. The Smallings are from Azle.

An area with a population of 100,000 is being served by the hospital.

Some of the elders of the Park Row Church, accompanied by Connally, plan to visit the hospital next year.

"Americans are hard-working people and we in Tanzania must try to follow their example," Nyerere said at the opening of the $70,000 general hospital.

Nyerere said that through hard work Americans have become the richest people in the world and told the thousands of Tanzanians attending the ceremony that they also must work hard to make their country self-sufficient.

He expressed his pleasure at his country having the first hospital in the area and noted it included a maternity ward and X-ray equipment.

A Letter From a Serviceman in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I received a letter from Sgt. David L. Hogan, a resident of Pennsylvania's 22d Congressional District who is among the thousands of American servicemen assigned to combat in South Vietnam. Because it speaks for the many courageous men and boys exposed to the gunfire, machinations, and treachery of an enemy dedicated to the destruction of the United States and of freemen everywhere, it is important that every Member of Congress read this message carefully. Under unanimous consent I ask that it be inserted in the Record at this point:

October 20, 1965.

Hon. John P. Saylor,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Saylor: Here is a little letter that I'm writing for all of the U.S. servicemen in Vietnam.

AMERICAN FIGHTING MEN

I'm writing this letter because I, like so many other servicemen, serving in the Republic of Vietnam, are getting tired of getting the newspaper and reading about our fellow Americans putting on demonstrations back home, on the policies toward the Vietnam situation. It would be a lot nicer if when they got together, that they said a little prayer for the men in uniform that lost their lives over here fighting for the people back there in the United States, so that they can enjoy all of the freedoms that they now have.

I, like so many other American servicemen, am glad that I was given the opportunity to come over here, knowing that I was gladly serving my country and all that we stand for. It kind of gets to the man in uniform, when he passes by a little boy or girl of about three or four years old, and the little boy or girl stands back and gives you a salute as though you were a four-star general, instead of a dirty GI, that has just returned from a mission or patrol. It makes you feel wanted in this far-off country.

Mr. Saylor, I know that you have received many letters on this same subject, but I just want you to know that us servicemen that are from the State of Pennsylvania are always in there doing what we can and are always pulling for you and the President of the United States. Give the President my regards, and I'm wishing him a speedy recovery. This is just a very small portion of the way that the GI's feel over here toward the demonstrations.

Thank you for your time in reading this letter and your kind considerations toward others.

Sincerely yours,
Sgt. David L. Hogan, RA13539745.

Mr. Speaker, it would be gratifying if it were possible to report to our men in Vietnam that the demonstrations of last year to which Sergeant Hogan refers have by now been dissipated in the new surge of patriotic fervor experienced by the vast majority of this Nation's citizenry. Unfortunately, such is not the case. Isolated bands of misguided demonstrators, prodded by Communist propagandists, persist in attempts to torment and to confuse in the hope that the U.S. policy will be reversed at the expense of the free world.

Whether the strategy employed by our Commander in Chief and his advisers is wholly sound may be open to question. Many of us in Congress have expressed areas of disagreement in the conduct of the military mission in Vietnam. Yet we stand in solid support of our Government's decision to carry out the commitment to protect our allies against the perfidious and diabolical designs of the Red vultures in Hanoi.

Though our fighting troops have every reason to resent anything less than national unanimity in appreciation of their efforts, Sergeant Hogan's letter is far from acrimonious. If it is asking too much for the anti-Vietnam demonstrators to pray for the men who have lost their lives in the present conflict, perhaps the very suggestion should stimulate increased prayer among the rest of the people in this country.

It may be time for the churches of America to begin sounding their bells at an appointed time each day as a reminder to all men, women, and children that our men in uniform are putting their lives on the line in the crusade against an enemy of God and of freemen. The gesture would give further assurance to what Sergeant Hogan and his buddies have known all along: that most Americans are grateful for the contributions of their fighting men and are praying for their safety and success regardless of how much noise a few detractors may be able to create.

The 159th Birthday Anniversary of Gen. Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Frederic Shriver Klein, professor of history, Franklin & Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

The remarks made by Dr. Klein were on the occasion of a commemorative program of the 159th birthday anniversary of Gen. Robert E. Lee, sponsored by the District of Columbia Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, held in Statuary Hall, U.S. Capitol, Washington, January 22, 1966.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS ON THE OCCASION OF THE COMMEMORATION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTHDAY OF ROBERT E. LEE, BY FREDERIC SHRIVER KLEIN, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, FRANKLIN & MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

On the 1st of June 1962, on a battlefield only a few miles from Richmond, while the battle of Fair Oaks was still in progress, President Jefferson Davis turned to his companion and military adviser, and said, without warning, "General Lee, I shall assign you to the command of this army."

Two events that could have been called chance or might have been destiny, had unexpectedly brought a new figure to the stage of American history. A stray bullet and a piece of shell had wounded Gen. Joseph T. Johnston, commander of the Confederate forces defending Richmond; and his next in command, Gen. G. W. Smith, suffered an attack of what is now called battle fatigue.

Davis' statement at that moment meant that a man who otherwise might have played only a minor role in our Nation's military history was to take a position of responsibility which was to win for him a permanent place of honor and respect in the hearts of all Americans, as well as to make him a symbol of a way of life for all time. Robert E. Lee's military activities as commander of the Army of Northern Virginia lasted less than 3 years, and yet in that brief span of time he become a legend, not only for his army or for Virginia or for the South, but for all Americans for generations to come.

How did this man capture the imagination and win the devotion of soldiers and civilians alike, who knew little about him except that somehow he inspired their faith and confidence in his leadership? When he took command, he was not widely known for his military ability, although Gen. Winfield Scott, who had seen Lee's action in the Mexican War, had stated that Lee was the very best soldier he had ever seen in the field, and urged that Lee should be his successor in command of the Union Army at the outbreak of the war.

But Lee came to his command with some public criticism for his failure to drive the Federal forces out of western Virginia, and had even been referred to as "Old Granny Lee," because he had been overcautions. He had been in charge of the seacoast defenses of South Carolina and Georgia, without much success, and his routine insistence on the digging of defensive earthworks did not help his popularity with his troops. There were no enthusiastic cheers from the ranks when the news of his command was announced, but Jefferson Davis had the same confidence in Lee which had been expressed by General Scott. The new commander's ability as a great military strategist was yet to be demonstrated, but it did not take long to become apparent.

The Lee legend did not develop from inspiring statements or immortal phrases by Lee which crystallized the objectives of the southern cause into memorable slogans for a great crusade. He was not in the habit of making them. It seems strange that there are few, if any, statements from Lee which have remained in the memory of Americans to typify his character or his ideals. His letters to his family are informal, warm, and wholesome, his military orders are simple and direct, and his few formal statements are adequate but not immortal. Even the impressive General Order No. 9, his farewell address to his troops, was drafted by his aide, Charles Marshall, as normal staff procedure. His deeds were to be much more significant than his words.

Nor did the Lee legend develop because of any dramatic emotional appeal, for he was not an exciting personality who captured popular imagination with an image of a gallant, reckless cavalier. There was none of the swashbuckling, sword-waving comaraderie so often associated with the popular idea of the typical Civil War officer, galloping along the ranks or stirring his troops with fiery words. Lee was quiet, outwardly, but those who knew him best recognized the constant activity of his alert mind.

Lee's career in the 50 years before the Civil War throws some light on the development of the qualities which were to earn universal esteem in the war years. It is not strange that he has been held in somewhat of the same reverence which has been given to Washington, for there was much of the Washington tradition in Lee's life. There had been an intimate relationship between his father, Light Horse Harry Lee, and General Washington and the legend of Washington must have played a prominent part in Lee's boyhood days, even though Robert's father left the country as an invalid when Lee was only 6 years old. But the shadow of Washington was constantly near Lee, through his life in Alexandria and at Arlington, where he lived with his wife, Mary Ann Custis, a descendant of Martha Washington. It was particularly appropriate that the words which his father had used in describing Washington, "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," would be used with reference to Lee when he was formally appointed a commander of the Virginia military forces.

Like his father, Robert E. Lee was primarily a soldier, and within the relatively small circle of army personnel, he was recognized as an excellent officer. He was second in his class at West Point, efficient as an engineer, and skillful in military tactics during the Mexican War. His only position of administrative importance was his appointment as Superintendent of West Point Military Academy, but he had acquired some public recognition as the result of his suppression of the John Brown raid at Harpers Ferry in 1859, when he was called upon to command the troops sent to the scene of the insurrection.

So, in the fateful early months of 1861, Robert E. Lee was a colonel of the 1st Regiment of Cavalry, U.S. Army, highly regarded by his superior officers, but not well known to the rank and file or to the general public. He had not commanded large bodies of troops. He had no political experience and little political interest. He disapproved of slavery and of the idea of secession, but had made no impressive public statements. He loved his family, his Virginia home, and his chosen career in the Army. In these respects, there were many others like him. The responsibility of maintaining the Arlington estate occupied much of his time, and he seriously considered resigning from the Army to devote the rest of his life to the problems of managing a Virginia plantation. He could not have foreseen that when he left Arlington in April 1861 it would be lost to him forever.

What, then, was there about this man that was to mark him for a place in our Nation's history among the great Americans of all time? The 3 brief years of his Civil War career as an Army commander demonstrated almost immediately that he possessed two outstanding qualities that impressed friend and foe alike. His personal character represented the very best in the American tradition, and his military genius surpassed anything in American military history up to that time, and for many years to come.

The significant aspects of his personal character began to become apparent as soon as destiny selected him to lead the Army of Northern Virginia on June 1, 1862. Lee had a quality of quiet dignity which was as natural and normal to him as though he had been trained for a position of leadership during every previous moment of his life. It was a characteristic which became immediately apparent even to those who might have known him for only a short time, and which rarely failed to impress his associates. One of his acquaintances called him "the noblest looking man he ever saw," and the concept of nobility seemed to be associated with him constantly. It was recognized by contestants on both sides, and a northern newspaper, at the time of his death, only 5 years after the end of the bitter war, called him one of the few men who throughout the contest most nearly represented the idea of the true knightly soldier. Even at the height of the conflict, when both sides were hurling bitter and often exaggerated accounts of barbarities and atrocities, there was no chink in Lee's armor which could be attacked. "No man has so few enemies," wrote a British observer. Almost any officer could be, and usually was criticized for small personal vices, but Lee abhorred profanity, abstained from tobacco, and shunned alcohol. He was a large, handsome man, commanding in appearance, careful about personal details, and fond of neatness and order. He had a quiet humility which led him to take entire personal responsibility when failures occurred, and to refrain from criticism of others even when the faults were obvious. The New York Times commented, at the time of his death, "By his unobtrusive modesty and purity of life he has won the respect even of those who most bitterly deplore his course in the rebellion." It is significant that his former foes could deplore his stand, but they could not be angry or resentful toward him.

This knightly quality, so often romantically associated with the chivalry of the Old World, was a natural characteristic and not an assumed pose, as was so often the case with some of the military. He seemed to personify the aristocratic tradition—confident and assured on horseback on the battlefield, friendly and sympathetic to his troops, courteous and polite to his associates, gracious and gallant with the fair sex, and sincerely religious with simple and confident faith.

But it was not only the recognized nobility of character that raised the name of Robert E. Lee to a proud place in our history. Knightliness demands not only goodness and gallantry, but a knight must be able to fight and to fight well, and the work of a soldier was Lee's real love and life work. As a soldier, he had a sense of duty and responsibility which made the war a series of professional problems for which he had trained most of his life, and which it was his obligation to solve as efficiently as possible.

Strangely enough, although he became and will always remain the symbol of the Confederacy, Lee concerned himself not at all with the political or ideological aspects of the war. He was sincerely opposed to secession and it cannot be said that he was passionately interested in the permanence of the Confederacy. He had written, before the outbreak of the war, "There is no sacrifice I am not ready to make for the preservation of the Union, save that of honor * * * I wish for no other flag but the Star Spangled Banner."

But the web of fast-moving events in April of 1861 trapped Lee as it trapped many others. Lee's resignation from the U.S. Army took place not to join the Confederate Army, but because he could not accept the offer to command the newly raised Union Army which threatened the invasion of Virginia. There is reason to believe he might even have preferred to close his Army career and remain neutral, if that were possible, but he could not refuse service for the defense of his beloved Virginia, and when Virginia joined the Confederacy, her cause had become his. It had been a terrible and soul-searching decision for him to make, but when he had determined upon his duty, there was no thought of turning back, and his goal was clear to him—the dedication of his military ability to the cause of Virginia and the Confederacy.

While there was little opportunity during the first year of the war for demonstration of any exceptional military genius, he did become one of the few persons who enjoyed the complete confidence of Jefferson Davis, because Lee was tactful and diplomatic enough to understand the peculiar combination of military authority and political statesmanship which Davis embodied.

But his real ability became apparent within a few days after his appointment to full responsibility for the defense of Richmond. His special qualities of military skill had an immediate opportunity, and the characteristics which were to give him the reputation of a military genius became apparent at once.

The audacity of his first major campaign on the peninsula in 1862 was a dramatic prophecy of what might be expected from him in the future, for it was a daringly bold adventure that might have been disastrous. His army was outnumbered and faced by powerful forces within a few miles from Richmond. He divided his army, leaving only a token force in defense of the Capitol, and prepared to strike the Union Army on the northern flank, cutting off their base of supplies.

Ordering Jackson to threaten the Shenandoah Valley, and Stuart to threaten Union communication and supply lines, his brilliantly conceived and coordinated campaign resulted in 7 days of battle which turned almost certain defeat into decisive repulse of the Union Army. Never again were there to be charges that Lee was overcautious, for the success of this first major campaign won him the respect and confidence of the entire army.

In rapid succession, the actions of his army at 2d Manassas, Antietam, Fredericksburg, and Chancellorsville demonstrated that here was a new master of military strategy, and it was not long before Lee became the symbol of the hopeful invincibility of the Confederate Army. And yet Lee was not invincible, and there were defeats as well as victories, although the defeats were never followed by the bitter recriminations or criticisms which so often occurred when military plans went awry.

While today Round Table members and Civil War historians spend endless hours in pointing out the mistakes of Civil War generals, Lee would have wasted no time or argument on such matters.

He had always understood that command means responsibility, and never was this conviction more dramatically demonstrated than on the third day of the Battle of Gettysburg when Pickett's charge had been repulsed, and the long campaign had ended in failure. Many things had gone wrong on that third day, but Lee's only summary of the situation was contained in his simple statement, "It was all my fault." It must have been one of the most difficult moments of his career. The story is told that when he overheard some criticisms of the way in which the battle had progressed, he turned to the critic and commented, "Young man, why did you not tell me that before the battle? Even as stupid a man as I am can see it all now."

Lee's reputation as a great military commander came from a number of qualities—his quick grasp of the military situation, the simplicity of his plans, his prompt decisions about major objectives, and the confidence he placed in his subordinates to carry out his orders, which was not always justified. He concerned himself about details, reconnaissance and the abilities of his opponent.

He had learned an important lesson from his early military training—that the duty of a commander is to make the final decision and to stick to it. His military orders were simple and uncomplicated, and their eventual success depended on the amount of initiative and responsibility assumed by others. It was a way of permitting the men under him to exercise some of their own judgment, and to have them experience some of the problems involved in making significant decisions. He had learned to analyze a military problem with an unusual capacity to anticipate his opponent's probable actions, and no small part of his reputation came from the speed with which he determined upon his policies.

The admiration which Lee's troops gave their commander was inspired in large part by his air of quiet confidence and in part by the fact that he usually kept his army on the offensive, which is always more inspiring than the uncertain situation of waiting for an enemy attack. While the South itself was on the defensive Lee usually managed to turn a defensive situation into an offensive attack. The man who inspired the affectionate title of "Marse Robert" had the important quality which soldiers need—confidence in their commander, and this confidence did not come from grand reviews or inspirational speeches, but simply from the fact that Lee almost seemed to be a man of mystery who never by word or deed let the slightest impression grow that he had anything on his mind but the serious business of winning the next battle. He became the ideal father image to both officers and men, and the graying hair and beard which had now replaced the youthful black mustache of his earlier days added to the appearance of a patriarch.

It is interesting to compare and contrast the two men who became symbols of the two causes which came into conflict during the Civil War. There is a Lincoln legend, too, but it is doubtful whether any two men could be found in positions of leadership at the same time with more different characteristics.

Many of Lincoln's simple phrases have become a permanent part of the American philosophy, but there is little from Lee to quote. Lee was a soldier, concerned entirely and solely with his military responsibility, while Lincoln found himself deeply involved in military affairs, with very little experience or qualification. Lincoln was awkward, rough, often crude, and sometimes held in contempt even by his associates, while Lee seemed to enjoy universal respect.

Both Lincoln and Jefferson Davis were the subject of bitter cartoons and lampoons, but Lee could not be caricatured or ridiculed. And yet these two men whom chance had thrown into conflict had one great human characteristic in common—the quality of infinite patience in the face of towering problems.

There is sadness in both of them and with the sadness, humility. Both seemed constantly conscious of their inability to completely solve the task which Providence had given them, and yet both had unconquerable faith that they must do their best, as they saw it, and take the final awful responsibility for their actions.

They are a strange contrast, outwardly representing two entirely different personalities, but inwardly having much similarity in the common knowledge that they must bear the weight of their respective problems by themselves, must conceal the temptation to despair in times of darkness, and bear their misfortunes with silent patience.

We must be realistic with Robert E. Lee's place in history, as we must be with everyone. There is a constant temptation to deal in unqualified superlatives with national figures whose lives have earned them a significant place forever in our history, and perhaps to cloud some of the real truth with imaginary achievements. We should remember that Lee was not faced with the overall responsibilities which confronted Jefferson Davis, who had the problem of reconciling the unity of the new Confederacy with the sovereign rights of the separate States, in addition to his almost overzealous concern with military affairs.

Lee led only one army, and never had the opportunity to exercise the larger command which was awarded to him as commander in chief only in the last weeks of the war. Lee never found himself in the position of a political general, as so often happened in both the northern and southern armies.

It is all the more significant that this man, who stood in the spotlight of American history for only a few years, whose activities involved only one geographical area of a vast conflict, and who said rarely a word about the causes or objectives of the contest in which he was involved, should have emerged as a symbol of everything that could be admired in the human personality.

We honor and revere his memory for his purity of character, and for the influence it has left with later generations. There have been many other leaders who, in their words and their actions, presented only an image of violent and bitter rebellion, but Lee could only appear as the champion of a noble crusade, even though the war had some of both aspects. As a military leader, those who have chosen this as their profession will always study and hope to emulate his cool and daring initiative, which enabled an army to outmaneuver and often to defeat forces superior in numbers and training. We honor him for his sense of duty, his single-minded devotion to the task which faced him, and his refusal to be diverted by problems which were not his responsibility.

In paying tribute to Robert E. Lee on the anniversary of his birthday, we are faced with a mixture of emotions. The Nation can well be thankful that such a man emerged in a time of crisis to give us a model which we might well attempt to follow, but we are also reminded of a tragic war between brothers which we cannot help, but deplore, as we place it on the pages of our history. Shortly after the close of the war, it was written, "The glories achieved in a civil war are unenviable at best. The Romans never erected monuments on the battlefields of their civil wars, nor permitted orations to the returning conqueror in an internecine strife."

We cannot erase this century-old conflict from the pages of our history, but history gives us the lessons of both the best and the worst from our past. Lee can now be honored and respected by all Americans just as the tragic fury of civil war can be universally deplored. This man personified forever the ideal concept of that simple but expressive phrase, "an officer and a gentleman." It has been truly said, "He did his best, and left the rest to Heaven."

Nation Comes To Know Buffalo as a City of Music Ferment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation continues to emphasize increased attention to the arts, I am pleased to report that our city of Buffalo, N.Y., is surging forward in the musical field.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include below an article which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News on January 26, 1966, outlining some of our city's musical activities:

NATION COMES TO KNOW BUFFALO AS A CITY OF MUSICAL FERMENT

(By John Dwyer)

(Buffalo as a growing force in new music has come increasingly to national attention. This perspective on the Buffalo role was published in a recent issue of High Fidelity magazine, in its Musical America section, under the title, "New Frontier—The Word Is Out.")

It's an odd—but explainable—fact that some cafe loungers in Rome, conservatory far-outs in Warsaw, and the swinging electronic crowd in Cologne should know more about musical Buffalo than most Americans. As ever, public awareness lags behind a cultural upsurge.

On the other hand, nothing travels faster than a message on the international composers' grapevine. On this instant-relay system, the word is out on Buffalo.

The town has become a fermenting center of new music, a haven for young composers from a dozen countries, a large-scale producer of premieres, an academy for performers in quite new styles and techniques.

REFLECTS OLD VIENNA

The principal forums are the Buffalo Philharmonic under composer-conductor Lukas Foss and the State University of Buffalo music department under composer-educator Allen Sapp—with a strong assist from the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, under a noted expert on the open mind, Director Gordon Smith.

It has taken less than 5 years, this cultural transformation in a city which has reflected, so long and so graciously, old Vienna in its orchestra and the 19th century in its streets. It seems almost an afterthought that the city is rebuilding itself, after long and contended delay, as if to dress up in a hurry for the new era. Buffalo, an old frontier town, is establishing a new frontier.

SLEE BEQUEST MADE

The first national attention came last spring in press and quarterly accounts, and a spread of several pages in Life magazine, on Buffalo's first Festival of the Arts today. This was a jolting, week-long affair including surrealist nude dancers (well, wearing thin coats of mineral oil) and such realized hallucinations as a symphonic poem for 100 metronomes. There was music, too, some of it powerful

As a prelude to this 5-year span, there were some deceptively conservative moves.

First, Frederick and Alice Slee, of Buffalo, left the Slee bequest, yielding a yearly income of about $40,000, to bring one or two Slee composers a year, present the Budapest Quartet annually in a complete Beethoven cycle, and stage modern music programs and special events, with visiting artists.

ARRIVED IN 1961

Aaron Copland, the first Slee occupant, said it was the "other chair" besides the Charles Eliot Norton professorship of Harvard.

Other Slee professors to date: Carlos Chavez, Leon Kirchner, Ned Rorem, Allen Sapp, Alexei Haieff, Leo Smith, David Diamond, Virgil Thomson, George Rochberg, and the remarkable Mauricio Kagel of Argentina and Cologne.

Composer Allen Sapp arrived via Harvard and Wellesley faculties in 1961 to become chairman of State University of Buffalo music department, on the death of founder Cameron Baird of Buffalo. Then, the Budapest Quartet picked up and came to Buffalo to stay, as resident ensemble in the university. Last season, the members performed 50 works in 15 recitals, also appearing individually in various duo and trio programs with other artists.

NOW IN THIRD SEASON

Lukas Foss, now in his third season, took over the Buffalo Philharmonic baton from Josef Krips, who went on to the San Francisco orchestra after a Buffalo decade upgrading the orchestra significantly.

Foss promptly set the community on its ear with the American premiere of Karlheinz Stockhausen's "Momente" and music of the Polish avant garde. Dr. Sapp brought in composer-pianist Leo Smit to head the piano department, and Heinz Rehfuss for the voice department.

The great culminating force, now in its second year has been the Center for the Performing Arts in the university, launched with a Rockefeller Foundation grant of $200,000 and substantial money and services from the university itself.

IT IS A GOING CONCERN

It was designed by Foss and implemented by Sapp, and the two mentors shopped Europe and America for talent. There are no students involved. These are young, paid professionals from many States and several countries—composers, instrumentalists, singers and scholars. They earn $6,200 a year plus allowances, and their functions are to create and perform—no teaching.

The project's funding is passing gradually from the foundation to the university. It is a permanent, going concern. There were 19 of these young musicians, called Creative Associates last season—most of them returning this season.

Manhattan impresarios would weep at the amount and quality of performance offered Buffalo audiences on free admission, on the donors' philosophy that these events should not be overtly commercial.

EARNED PRAISE

The Creative Associates present the Foss-designed "Evenings for New Music" series in the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, repeating them a couple of nights later in New York's Carnegie Hall. The gallery, by the way, is also an international topic as a collector of abstractionist, kinetic, optic, and pop art.

Its chief patron is Seymour Knox, who is head of the New York State Council on the Arts.

The Associates are no inward-turning group. Violinist Paul Zukofsky made a very successful Town Hall debut and is starting on a concert career. Composed Fredric Myrow earned particular praise for a commissioned work in the Berkshire Music Center Festival.

PREMIERES LISTED

An interesting arrival in Buffalo is composer Vinko Globokar of Yugoslavia, and composer Michael von Biel follows Stockhausen and Kagel on the visiting list from Cologne.

Composer Sylvano Bussotti of Italy was well established before arrival, with several works played in Europe.

Premieres have included Mauricio Kagel's sensational "sur scene," music theater satire of mind-loosening effect, staged in a jewel of a new downtown salon in the Buffalo and Erie County Library; Bussotti's weird "Selon de Sade" in the gallery, "Tren," by Penderecki, of Poland, in Kleinhans Music Hall (the Philharmonic home), to name a few.

TO EXTEND SEASON

A true innovation opening this season was the university's week-long India Music Festival, with sarodist Ali Akbar Khan, tabla performer Shankar Ghosh, dancers, and forums on the music, thought, and art of India—perhaps the first thing of its scope in the country.

The current Philharmonic season under Foss offers works of Berio, Nono, Lutoslawski, Rolf Lieberman, among others. The season will be extended by 3 weeks in May—another large venture with Rockefeller Foundation assistance, with workshops in modern music and rehearsals on several Western New York campuses, followed eventually by performances in the Buffalo music hall.

EXCITING TIME IN BUFFALO

The Buffalo magnetism works in a curious way. Last spring, young Dr. Frank D'Accone, university musicologist, wrote an article on Buffalo music for Rome's prestigious Musica d'Oggi.

Its editor, noted Claudio Sartori, is now on the Buffalo campus, teaching and researching for the season. All in all, it's an exciting time in Buffalo, and for audiences as well, growing larger and somewhat less bewildered.

For a critic, it's a happy departure from oft-told tales. Some of it is preposterous and forgettable, some of it truly musical. All of it seems necessary, to produce that smaller, treasurable portion which is artistic and important.

Congressman Horton Salutes Lighted Schoolhouse Project in Rochester, N.Y., as "Effective Effort" in Combating Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with purposeful pride that I cast my vote in favor of the Economic Opportunity Act on August 8, 1964; and with anticipation of a renewed potential, I supported its continuation in 1965. It has been my hope that the enactment and implementation of this legislation would provide a truly effective avenue of advancement in the war against poverty in the district I have the honor to represent, as well as in our Nation as a whole. Certainly, the achievement of such a great goal as the elimination of poverty and its effects can be marked only by area accomplishments.

The Economic Opportunity Act is founded on several significant purposes, one of which is to provide programs which will prepare our young people for the responsibilities of citizenship. One of the necessities of this preparation is the evolvement of effective educational backgrounds for our citizens. With this necessity as its goal, the lighted schoolhouse project was undertaken in my home community of Rochester, N.Y.

I am pleased today to share a progress report on this project with my colleagues in Congress. The following article was published during adjournment in the November 1965, issue of Greater Rochester Commerce, the monthly publication of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce:

THE LIGHTED SCHOOLHOUSE PROJECT

The lighted schoolhouse project, sponsored by Action for a Better Community, Inc., the antipoverty agency of the city of Rochester and Monroe County, held what amounted to a "crash program" in July and August.

Nicholas R. Milella, on loan from the city school district, and Sister Jamesetta, similarly on loan from the Catholic diocesan schools, are codirectors of the lighted schoolhouse project. The Reverend William M. Roche, superintendent of schools for the Catholic diocese, and Dr. Herman R. Goldberg, superintendent of the Rochester public schools, have given carte blanche invitations to use the resources of their staffs and facilities. Dr. Walter Cooper, Eastman Kodak Co., and Dr. Walter Lifton of the public school system—both interim directors of ABC, Inc.—encouraged and supported the fledgling project during the initial organizational stages.

The directors think that the teachers who received the nearly 1,000 boys and girls into public and parochial schools this September are finding the lighted schoolhouse students "attitudinally better" in these specific ways.

(1) A greater feeling of security in his classroom—that school exists for him and that administrators and teachers are there to serve him.

(2) That he has a more aggressive attitude toward learning, for learning is an aggressive process.

(3) That he is unafraid, for fear may be an unsurmountable stumbling block to learning.

(4) That he has acquired a feeling of self-respect and worth as a person who can hope, dream, and plan for a decent future as his brother's equal.

(5) That he has caught on to the idea of involvement in school life, especially high school students—as so many find themselves worked out to the periphery of all the school's central activity. Once on the edge, these students have pretty much reached the point of no return and the next step is to fade out of school altogether.

Each center was staffed with a director, a guidance counselor, a speech therapist, a remedial reading teacher, a psychologist on call, music and art teachers, and the teaching staff to handle the basic instructional program.

From 300 applicants for teaching routines, 70 well-qualified persons were selected. To these about 25 volunteers, both professional and nonprofessional, were added. College and high school students who were free to serve in the summer program performed ably.

Aggregate daily attendance for the summer totaled 23,591. The total cost of staffing all centers this summer amountd to $39,609—the cost per pupil for instructional staff for 8 weeks amounted to about $1.69 per day. This low cost could not have been maintained if it had not been that nearly 5,000 hours of contributed services were rendered by volunteers. Cost for supplies averaged about $2 per pupil for the entire session.

Sister Jamesetta, S.S.J., codirector of the lighted schoolhouse project, holds a Ph. D. degree in educational psychology. She came to the project from Nazareth Academy where she was principal of this all-girl high school of 1,500 students.

Mr. Milella, former principal of the Horace Mann School, No. 13, emphasized the wholehearted nonsectarian cooperation in the lighted schoolhouse project:

"The five major centers found welcome housing in the educational buildings of three Protestant churches, the top floor of one parochial school which was not being used, and in the area of three storefronts and the rooms to be found immediately above. All the centers are situated in the deprived neighborhoods as centrally as possible.

"The satellite centers, which were usually one- or two-room affairs, were used by primary children as the distance to a major center might prove too great for these children to attend safely. An abandoned concrete block building once used as a small printing establishment, a small house owned by St. Lucy's Catholic Church, the Sunday school rooms of the Atlantic Avenue Baptist Church, and the library room of the Genesee Settlement House were secured. In so selecting centers within the neighborhoods where the bulk of the target population was to be served, we adhered as closely as possible to the philosophy that the message must be taken to Garcia in as unpertentious manner as feasible.

"It must be said that in talking to the church ruling bodies or to the heads of social institutions for space to operate the lighted schoolhouse project, that Sister Jamesetta and myself were most warmly welcomed and shown every courtesy. It is most enlightening and heartwarming to note that people of all faiths joined in the effort to help the less fortunate. Each group we approached for help said in essence, 'Come and use us and what we have in ways that you see fit.' The giant force for good to be found represented in our great religious faiths are facing up to facts and are lending a most helpful hand in ways of contributing talent and material resources so as to aid in the fight to right the moral wrongs which have perpetrated upon such a large segment of our society."

Group guidance sessions helped the lighted schoolhouse students to sustain the idea that they could learn, to be loved, and have hope for a promising future; that learning did not take place because of fear of failure, but because of individualized instruction in which not knowing was not anything of which to be ashamed, and small successes received recognition.

Our Rochester community has benefitted by this well-executed summer program and is most grateful to the administrators, teachers, and all who were responsible for its helpfulness and obvious success.

Conservation Districts Spark Resource Development in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, while in Kansas during the month of January, I had the opportunity to take a conservation tour within my district and learn firsthand of the accomplishments and needs of resource development throughout the area.

I wish to salute those farmers and ranchers in Kansas who make many sacrifices to serve as soil conservation district directors and to express the thanks of generations yet unborn to those who cooperate with the district in seeking the proper use and development of our rich resources of soil and water.

What these farmers and ranchers do in establishing conservation measures on their land benefits all landowners and operators.

The 15 counties in the Second District of Kansas are completely covered by soil conservation districts. District cooperators number 15,021 and own and operate more than 3.6 million acres of land.

They have installed about 34,000 miles of terracing, 10,000 farm ponds, 80,000 acres of grassed waterways. They have put 855,000 acres of range to proper use and converted 44,000 acres of cropland to grassland.

In addition, the local districts are extremely active in small watershed work under Public Law 566. Construction has been completed on two of the four projects approved for operations. These projects not only halt destructive floods but can also be developed for municipal water supplies, recreation, and agricultural water management.

Everyone within the water shed benefits—rural and urban interests alike.

For example, in the recently completed White Clay, Brewery, Whiskey Creeks project, both rural and urban land is protected. Before the project was installed, the city of Atchison stood in the shadow of damaging floods. Yearly flood damages in the watershed averaged $260,000. One disastrous flood in 1958 took three lives and caused damages in excess of $4 million.

Thanks to the new watershed project, this should never happen again. Last June, the project's effectiveness was tested during a 3.6-inch downpour and no damage occurred.

In addition to the four projects completed or under construction on 158,000 acres of land, six projects have been approved for planning assistance on 710,000 acres of land. There are an additional six applications on 378,000 acres awaiting action.

These projects are local undertakings. They are initiated and sponsored by local people through their soil conservation districts. I salute them for the work they are doing in conserving and developing our land and water resources.

Paper Surplus—18 Acres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, surplus farm commodities is not the only surplus problem confronting our Department of Agriculture.

According to an editorial which appeared in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, Secretary Freeman is wrestling with the problem of a huge surplus of bureaucratic paper created by his own Department. It consists of 155,000 filing cabinets, valued at more than $7 million and occupying about 18 acres of floor space. They contain "almost a million cubic feet of paper records" and, to say the least, "that is a lot of paper."

We do not know just how Secretary Freeman proposes to reduce this paper surplus. We are constrained to express the hope that it will not be done in some highly involved bureaucratic manner, that so typifies the Agriculture Department's operations, necessitating an increase in the number of employees.

There is already a surplus of employees with the Agriculture Department. They presently have 1 employee for every 32 farmers, whereas in 1933 there was 1 for every 203 farmers. I suppose we will now have a new division created in the Agriculture Department to dispose of the surplus paper records created by a surplus of employees.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting the Wall Street Journal editorial:

EIGHTEEN ACRES OF PAPER

Announcing plans for what he calls a "cleansweep" campaign, Agriculture Secretary Freeman has disclosed that the farmers are not the only people who can produce surpluses. It seems the Agriculture Department has been creating a rather remarkable surplus of its own.

The targets of "cleansweep," says Mr. Freeman, are 155,000 Agriculture Department filing cabinets. The cabinets themselves are valued at more than $7 million. They occupy 778,000 square feet of floor space, which is equal to about 18 acres. And they contain almost a million cubic feet of paper records. That is a lot of paper, and evidently a good bit of it is excess, for the object of the campaign is to eliminate 20 percent of the total.

We don't know exactly how the Department proposes to go about getting rid of its glut, but it's interesting to speculate that the agency might apply procedures it uses elsewhere. It might, for example, assign each of its many divisions a paper-acreage allotment and penalize those that exceed it. Or the Department might try direct payments to division chiefs who hold down their paper generation.

Perhaps such schemes might succeed. But given the usual bureaucratic ingenuity in paper production, they might not work any better in the files than they have on the farm.

Why the Reserves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly difficult to get all the facts concerning our situation in South Vietnam, but one fact is more than evident and that is that the enemy has greatly strengthened its position during the cessation of bombing by resupplying, regrouping, and bringing in additional materiel which they could do without molestation.

This view is set forth in Joseph Alsop's column published in the Washington Post on February 2. Since he is on the ground in Saigon, his advice and report on the situation are all the more important.

His column follows:

WHY THE RESERVES?

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—The reasons the President ought to be getting ready to call up the Reserves for the Vietnamese war are grimly simple. There are between 12 and 20 reasons already, and some more are probably on the way.

In brief, this country has now been invaded by a rock-bottom minimum of 12 North Vietnamese regular regiments, or the equivalent of 4 divisions of the North Vietnamese Army. This is not the official order of battle figure, to be sure, for that figure, so comforting to people in Washington, is generally about 14 months behind the harsh truth.

An invasion on a minimum scale of four division equivalents is the reading of much hard evidence by the Americans here who have been most nearly right in the past. There is a great deal of evidence, furthermore, not absolutely decisive but alarmingly persuasive, that the real total of invading North Vietnamese has now reached 15 regiments or 5 division equivalents.

Nor is that all. There is some evidence for the even higher total of 20 invading regiments, or close to 7 division equivalents of North Vietnamese. These last indications are pretty shadowy, as yet, but they deserve to be noted and weighed all the same.

In comparable situations in the past, unfortunately, the absolute maximum guess of the dimensions of the enemy buildup has usually, in the end, proved to be the correct guess. Furthermore, these acutely disturbing estimates of enemy strength "in country," as they say out here, are not the whole story, either.

Just north of the 17th parallel, on the very edge of the demilitarized zone, at least one additional North Vietnamese division is now in position. And if a second division has not moved up already, as seems most likely, it is quite certainly on the way and nearly in position. It may be added that the North Vietnamese have regularly been sending troops and cadres across the western end of the allegedly demilitarized zone for some time past.

Finally, the North Vietnamese have taken frenzied advantage of the bombing pause to accumulate very large forward stocks of military supplies on the border of the demilitarized zone. In this respect, the pause has been a golden boon to the enemy. Previously, there was no transport for such a buildup, since the most southerly provinces of North Vietnam had been under continuous attack for 8 full months.

When and if these consequences of the long pause hit the Marines at Phu Bai with painful force, as seems all too possible, it will be interesting to hear their reactions. Perhaps they will send a little round robin, beginning: "Thank you, Mr. President; thank you, Senator MANSFIELD and Senator FULBRIGHT; thank you, dear editors and analysts who have never set foot in Asia."

Such are the facts. They may be denied in Washington or even, on instruction, in Saigon, as such unpleasant facts have been denied in the past. But denials will not make them unfacts.

These are the facts, it should first be noted, primarily because the North Vietnamese Communist Government not merely called the reserves to the colors but also ordered general mobilization some time ago. Premobilization, the entire North Vietnamese Army consisted of only five divisions, plus enough independent brigades and regiments to equal a bit more than five additional divisions.

Two of the original divisions, the 325th and the 308th, were sent South in tact when the decision was taken to invade South Vietnam with regular units. Since then, the units remaining in North Vietnam have been rather rapidly giving off additional regiments to join the southern invasion. Thus the army in the North approximately retains its original strength, less two divisions.

The meaning of these facts is also all too plain. The people who think the President has an option to keep this war cozily uncombative are talking through their hats.

The enemy has been rapidly escalating, to use these peoples' favorite word. Since there is no evidence that the North Vietnamese leaders are insane, it has to be assumed that the aim of this heavy and increasing invasion of South Vietnam by Communist regular units is, quite simply, to win control of South Vietnam by naked force of arms.

Thus far, the invasion has had no openly dramatic consequences, mainly because of a brilliant series of spoiling attacks mounted by General Westmoreland. But since the enemy's purpose is so abundantly plain, and since his buildup is so ominously heavy, President Johnson has only two options. He can get ready to retreat and to surrender. Or he can get ready to fight in earnest, in which case he has a clear duty to call up the Reserves.

Men Against the Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, this editorial from the Indianapolis Star of January 30, 1966, speaks well for itself.

I intend to introduce legislation requiring the Internal Revenue Service to grant to a delinquent taxpayer, against whose income levy is being made, an exemption to meet the indispensable needs to maintain life.

I do not believe any tax delinquent should, at the sufferance of the Government, drink champagne and play the ponies.

But, neither should he be denied daily bread. Those serving life prison terms are treated better than that.

MEN AGAINST THE WALL

Both the Federal and State laws making it possible to confiscate entire paychecks or seize all of a person's assets to collect overdue taxes are harsh and unreasonable. They are due for drastic revision.

The suicide of a 24-year-old auto plant worker with a wife and child, whose pay was confiscated by State authorities to satisfy tax bills, brings an evil situation into sharp focus.

It cannot be shrugged off justifiably with a cavalier excuse that taxpayers who go deeply into debt and are unable to meet their obligations on time simply got themselves into the fix and so deserved to be punished.

This is not to say that taxes should not be collected or that anyone obligated to pay them should not be forced by law to do so. Nor is it to say that solvency and fiscal responsibility are not virtues and necessities in a sound economy.

But many thousands of young Americans have not been educated to be financially prudent, as the current large numbers of default judgments, foreclosures, and time payment default judgments show. They share the plight of Carl W. Clark, the auto plant worker whose paycheck was seized and who found himself beseiged by creditors. They have overspent and gone out so far on the credit limb that it finally snapped.

They should meet their obligations. And if they refuse to do so, the law should, as it does, let their creditors compel them to do so. This is certain.

But extreme economic pressure can be a cruel and even lethal force, whether it is applied deliberately by a government adventitiously by circumstances such as those that became so catastrophic in the early 1930's. During that troubled time, many men of means and substance, many magnates, tycoons, and executives as well as working people, were forced against the wall. Many, unable to see a way out, took their lives as Carl Clark did last week.

A young family man whose only income is from his job and who has blundered over the edge of insolvency should not be bludgeoned by the Government because he has not paid his taxes. The Government should not behave like a Mafia gangster trying to collect a gambling debt.

Both the State and Federal Governments should exact reasonable payments spread over a reasonable period. Tax debtors lacking means to support their families if their pay is seized should not be forced into the position of dispossessed serfs or beggars.

There is a sensible solution to this problem. It should be found and applied .

The current practice of stretching delinquent taxpayers on an economic rack smacks of the Dark Ages.

Cincinnati "War on Poverty" Has Long-Range Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a reporter, Margaret Josten, of the Cincinnati Enquirer, has written a seven-part series on the antipoverty program in Cincinnati. Today, I include the second part of her series to illustrate the kind of reporting that helps inform the public about the various antipoverty programs at work in our communities under the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

CINCINNATI WAR ON POVERTY HAS LONG-RANGE OBJECTIVES—TO EVERY MAN HIS CHANCE

(By Margaret Josten)

Even the most superficial look at Cincinnati's low-income neighborhoods would indicate the war on poverty has been little more than a light skirmish to date.

In spite of the gleaming changes wrought by expressways and public housing projects, the west end still harbors hundreds of tumbledown buildings crowded with the underfed, undereducated, and underemployed.

An estimated 35,000 persons still call the west end "home." For many Negroes, even today, it is their first stopping place when they migrate to Cincinnati from Southern States.

Rapidly replacing the west end as the city's chief eyesore is that section so colorfully named Over-the-Rhine. It contains some of the most dilapidated housing hereabouts. And police are increasingly concerned about the problems it spawns.

FROM THE HILLS

This area, too, is filled with transients. Many come from the barren hills and hollows of Appalachia, searching for a better life. Over-the-Rhine, once virtually an all-white neighborhood, is seeing an influx of Negroes as low-cost housing is demolished in the west end.

The Hamilton County Welfare Department finds the bulk of its caseload in the west end and Over-the-Rhine.

The third biggest concentration of public assistance cases is found in Walnut Hills, an area which has been in a state of flux for several years.

As is the case in such changing neighborhoods, sections of poverty border closely upon pockets of longstanding wealth, stability, and status. Crime is a problem here, too. Reports of prowlers and muggings are frequent. And who can forget the space scientist's wife who was strangled in the basement of her apartment building?

JUMPOFF PLACE

South Avondale, also a jumping off place, for Negro families displaced by west end progress, features much dilapidated housing. So does central Avondale. But it has some strong institutions, churches, and schools, which help to keep the bigger problems in check.

In all problem areas welfare rolls are about the same as they were a year ago.

So you ask why nothing seems to have changed, even though the war on poverty has been operating about a year?

R. Sargent Shriver, Director, U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, insists it is impossible to lick overnight a problem of centuries-long duration.

Dilapidated housing and crime are merely the manifestations of poverty. The OEO, central office of the war on poverty, is attempting to get at the things which cause poverty: lack of education and training, lack of economic development and job opportunity, poor health, poor environment, poor outlook on life.

PROGRESS SEEN

These are the things which are being attacked in Cincinnati, where Mr. Shriver does not hesitate to say, "extraordinary progress" has been made in the last year.

In all poverty pockets but one, programs have been initiated to get at the basics. Over-the-Rhine is that one still out in the cold, even though none would dispute it is sorely in need of help.

Programs contracted by the Federation of Settlements and the OEO, then sponsored by organizations within the neighborhoods themselves, are working with residents to solve problems of health, welfare, delinquency, joblessness, among others.

No two neighborhood programs are exactly alike. Each is geared to the particular problems of the area. All offer a variety of services aimed at motivating the residents to self-betterment.

LOCAL COST, 10 PERCENT

These are the programs in operation today with local sources supplying about 10 percent of the costs, mostly in personnel and buildings, and the OEO supplying the rest:

Victory Neighborhood Services project in the Walnut Hills area. Cost $66,950. About 35,430 to be served.

Lincoln Heights Neighborhood Services. Cost $192,693. About 7,785 to be served.

Mount Auburn and Northeast Basin Neighborhood Services project. Cost $95,769. About 30,000 to be served.

Neighborhood Services program in South and Central Avondale, sponsored by Seven Hills Neighborhood Houses. Cost $251,768. About 33,754 to be served.

Steele Subdivision Preschool and Neighborhood Services, sponsored by the West College Hill Civic Association. About 1,300 persons or 285 families to be served.

Neighborhood Services Project in the Heinold school area, sponsored by Cincinnati Union Bethel. Cost, $123,090. About 36,000 to be served in Millvale, Camp Washington, North Fairmount, South Cumminsville, and English Woods.

CFS GRANT

For its coordination and planning aid in these projects, the Cincinnati Federation of Settlements has received in original and renewal grants from OEO a total of $68,471. Here the local contribution was $7,500.

In what may be the worst of the city's poverty pockets the West End, the Seven Hills Neighborhood Houses, Inc., has received a total of $344,886 since January 1965, for a special services project.

The project has directly or indirectly reached approximately 27,353 residents of the West End. Emphasis has been placed upon community organization, formation of resident groups when needed, social-action programs to improve conditions.

MOTIVATION

Major emphasis in all these programs is placed upon motivation of youth—which many see as the only answer to the poverty problem in this Nation.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is perhaps one of the best examples of antipoverty help being extended to young persons.

Nearly 3,000 boys and girls in the critical 16-to-21 age group have jobs under NYC at $1.25 an hour.

About half of these are in work-study programs sponsored by the Cincinnati and Hamilton County boards of education.

The object of these educational aids, which will be dealt with in the next installment, is to give jobs which will keep needy youngsters in school.

The other half of the young persons enrolled in NYC programs are those who may have left school prematurely or who may not have the skills to get jobs in open competition.

They are getting experience working at such places as Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, general hospital, Rollman Receiving Hospital, juvenile court, and Jewish Vocational Service. Work is nontechnical.

AIDS NOT MAIDS

A number of young women are even assigned to the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority where they act as "aids not maids" to elderly residents. Their chores range from grocery shopping to cooking to escorting oldsters to doctors' offices.

CMHA is enthusiastic about the success of the latter program, as are most of the sponsors.

Last week, however, the city recreation commission and the city park board revealed many of their NYC assignees had not worked out. At the suggestion of Vice Mayor Eugene Ruehlmann, City Manager William Wichman is going to look into this part of the NYC program in an effort to improve it.

Harry Martin, executive director of the citizens committee on youth, which contracts for the out-of-school phase of the NYC program, says he welcomes Mr. Wichman's intervention.

MOST DO WELL

Mr. Martin reports, however, that 75 to 80 percent of the NYC workers are doing real well from the standpoint of their employers.

That portion of the NYC under the citizens committee on youth is costing $1,647,530, including $187,380 from local sources. Mr. Martin expects the U.S. Department of

Labor to renew the program in February or March, probably for approximately the same amount.

Dr. Carl Parrish, Head of Vassar's Music Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago an automobile crash took the life of Dr. Carl Parrish, head of the Music Department of Vassar College. This accident was a double tragedy, which not merely deprived his fine family of a beloved husband and father, but also deprived the entire world of a distinguished musicologist, author, composer, teacher, and authority on the history of music. Too often we remain unaware of the accomplishments of a man until we read his obituary. Sadly, this was also largely true of Dr. Parrish, whose reputation was well known in the academic community, but whose accomplishments and contributions to culture were largely unknown to his neighbors until they read the following article in the Poughkeepsie Journal:

DR. CARL PARRISH, HEAD OF VASSAR'S MUSIC DEPARTMENT

When an educator is a serious student of music, especially its history, he is called a musicologist, is highly respected, sometimes honored with intangibles—and usually hungry. When he learns this, he turns practical and starts teaching music, in one phase of it or another.

Dr. Carl Parrish learned this primary and unjust fact before he ever obtained the first of several degrees in music, and he also learned that being an author and composer brought more kudos but no groceries.

So, without giving up his honorary pursuits, he taught music all over the country until he landed on the faculty of Vassar College in 1953.

He was professor of music and chairman of the department at the girls school in Poughkeepsie when his life and career were ended Friday at 61 in a three-car crash on the Taconic State Parkway in Westchester Couny, near Briarcliff Manor and about 30 miles from his home on the Vassar campus in adjoining Dutchess County.

It was a clear, dry day and the car in which Dr. Parrish was riding was being driven north in the proper lane by his son and only child, David Caldwell Parrish, 21, when it was struck by a vehicle driven south in the same lane. A third car plowed into their head-on wreckage.

Dr. Parrish was killed instantly. His son and the unidentified driver of the third car were not hurt. Police identified the driver of the second car as Diana K. Brennen, 49, of nearby Chappaqua. She was taken to Grasslands Hospital in Valhalla, where her condition was listed as critical.

Dr. Parrish's financially unrewarding honors included a Guggenheim Fellowship in musicological research in 1958–1959, while he was earning his living at Vassar, and the award of the Knight Prize in chamber-music composition from Harvard University in 1938, when he was professor of music at Wells College in Aurora, N.Y.

He wrote, translated or annotated several books and anthologies on music, and composed various works for chorus and piano. Vassar itself awarded him a faculty fellowship in 1963 and 1964 for work on a book, a general study of music in the classical period.

Born in Plymouth, Pa., he went to Fontainbleau, France, in 1932, to study at the Conservatoire Americain. When he returned to this country, he went on a two-piano recital tour of the country with his sister, Dorothy, now Mrs. Anthony N. Domonkos of New York City. Like his serious research, the tour brought acclaim but little financial gain.

He obtained a bachelor of music degree from McPhail College of Music in Minneapolis in 1933, a master's degree from Cornell University in 1936, and a Ph. D. from Harvard University in 1939. Before he earned any of these degrees, he had become an instructor in music at Wells College in 1929, became a professor in 1938, and chairman of the department in 1941, a position he held for 2 years.

Other teaching positions he held before going to Vassar included professor and chairman of the department at Fisk University in Nashville, Tenn.; director of graduate studies at Westminster Choir College in Princeton, N.J., and chairman of the department at Pomona College in Claremont, Calif., near Los Angeles.

Dr. Parrish was the author of "Masterpieces of Music Before 1750," "The Notation of Medieval Music," and "A Treasury of Early Music." He annotated a translation of "Dictionary of Musical Terms by Johannes Tinctoris" and translated an edition of "Thoroughbass Method" by Hermann Keller only this year, his last literary effort in the field of music.

He was a member of the American Musicological Society and former secretary and treasurer of the Society for Music in Liberal Arts Colleges.

Surviving, besides his son and sister, is his wife, Mrs. Catherine Louise Caldwell Parrish. His son is a senior at Cornell.

M. C. BLACKMAN.

Concerning Appropriations for the House Committee on Un-American Activities

SPEECH

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Members who, on February 25, 1965, first voted to recommit for further study and public hearings, and then, when this motion failed, to deny appropriations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Since that date the committee has conducted an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan. A number of members of the committee showed considerable courage—both political and personal—in undertaking this investigation. I compliment them on their commitment.

However, I believe that the benefits which may accrue from such an investigation would better have been found in the courts. Certainly if the police and the courts in the States in which the Klans are a powerful force had been as active, in controlling the illegal aspects of the Klans, as they could and should have been, then the recent investigations would have been unnecessary. In other words, an alteration of the judicial environment is clearly required in these States.

As I stated a year ago, I believe that any necessary functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities should be within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. I continue to hold that belief and, therefore, again will vote against the appropriations for this committee. Further, I believe that the criticisms leveled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], regarding the hearings held recently in Chicago, and the criticisms advanced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] regarding the lack of legislative role and product, are valid.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact that there are still those in this country who would equate my unwillingness to vote funds to this committee with an alleged "softness on communism." The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the opposite is true: my unwillingness to support what I believe to be the undemocratic procedures and, indeed, mandate, of this committee stems from my profound fear that the single condition which would make our Nation most vulnerable to subversion by antidemocratic forces would be our own abandonment of our country's historic principles of free speech and the presumption of innocence until guilt is proven. Shorn of these principles, Mr. Speaker, we are no better than our adversaries.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, most adult Americans still harbor in their hearts a lingering grief over the death of two of our most illustrious Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Franklin D. Roosevelt. But few of them feel moved to express their thoughts in writing. There are, however, a few who are both willing to express themselves and gifted enough to do it well.

Therefore, I would like at this time to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following two poems, written by Mr. Leo Lipp of Seattle, Wash., in honor of those great Presidents. The eloquence of the poetry speaks for itself:

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

(By Leo Lipp)

A nation's idol, a nation's hero
Is enwrapped at last in the cloak of death.
He gave his life for the country he loved
And for suffering humanity he went to bat.

He challenged his enemies and sided with his friends:
To make a better world for mankind to live in was his aim.
He was sincere and courageous, even his foes will admit;
A warrior of a cause was he, and not of fortune or fame.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt,
You served your country with honor and might,
You piloted the ship through chaos and strife,
Safe in port you brought her through the darkness of night.

With the election of '32 a brighter dawn was breaking,
Giving new hopes to people who were forgotten before.
A new ray of life began pouring forward,
You master conqueror of darkness forever and ever more.

Now you lie in state and the Nation mourns
For their friend, protector and guider of democracy—cost what it may.
With pride we call your name,
Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who was President of the U.S.A.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Observer, Nov. 18, 1964]

A SYMBOL OF VISION

(By Leo Lipp)

(In honor of the anniversary of the death of a martyr, President John F. Kennedy.)

Electrifying were the words that pierced the hearts of men,
Exclaimed by his wife, Jacqueline, "Oh, no."
Throughout the world their sound reechoed,
People turned to each other, crying, "It cannot be. It is not so."

Yet it was true: The President of the United States was killed.
He fell a martyr at the hand of an assassin. Why?
The bullet which took his life left many desolate—
Millions believe as he did—this none can deny.

He was taken away from us in the prime of life
When he had so much to live for, and so much to give
To the people of the world as well as of our Nation.
Is this the reward for a humanitarian to receive?

We heard the solemn sound of feet marching to the beat of Army drums
On the avenue where he had walked not very long ago:
We saw the casket where his body rested, and the sad cortege.
America wept; and made a silent pledge to remember him in deeds
A happier world might know.

In Arlington an eternal light is burning,
A symbol that the road to freedom must never be dark.
Spiritual light is the guide to human happiness;
Its torch must burn with a penetrating spark.

Which will ignite the will in the minds of men
To turn toward that light for inspiration.
John F. Kennedy lived and died for more than integration—
His goal for all was true emancipation.

The Amazing Rebirth of Quincy Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the United States presently stands in 12th place among the shipbuilding nations of the world. The Soviet Union is building new merchant ships at a rate 14 times greater than ours and both Japan and Germany are far ahead of the United States in ship construction and registry.

As a result of long years of neglect, our merchant marine carries only 9 percent of our foreign trade. We do have a mothball fleet, and in the past 5 years have had to refit, at heavy cost, more than 50 ships. These refitted vessels are not the modern ships that we should have. More ships from this mothball fleet are being refitted, and still there has been no positive decision on a well-planned shipbuilding program in American shipyards. In lieu of this, our Departments of Defense and Interior have sounded out the possibilities of building ships in Britain and even in Poland. A decision of this nature could ruin an industry vital to national defense and economic prosperity.

In my 11th Congressional District in Massachusetts, there is the Quincy Shipyard, 83 years in existence and bought by the General Dynamics Corp. from the Bethlehem Steel Co. in 1963. Here is one company in the United States that had foresight in the needs of American shipbuilding and was willing to gamble in this purchase, that the United States would see fit to expand the American merchant marine in all categories and in 2 years has put itself in a position to assist in this needed expansion. I take this opportunity to include an article on the rebirth of the Quincy Shipyard from the January 14, 1966, edition of the Boston Sunday Herald:

THE AMAZING REBIRTH OF QUINCY SHIPYARD

(By Loretta Leone)

(NOTE.—Shut down only 2 years ago, the plant has bounced back under new management with $275 million in contracts and a $40 million payroll. What's behind the comeback?)

At the Quincy Shipyard on Fore River these days smokestacks send black jets into the sky. Steel-helmeted men climb ladders and platforms, working on nuclear submarines and ships. Giant magnets move back and forth carrying steel plates into welding shops for molding into ship hulls.

The flurry of activity is quite a contrast to the scene 2 years ago when on a cold, snowy and miserable day several hundred men closed down machinery at the former Bethlehem Steel Shipyard and, desparingly, went home—unemployed.

As the new General Dynamics Quincy Shipyard enters its third year of production, 6,700 workers pass through its gates each day and the help wanted sign is still out.

The yard holds about $275 million in contracts for submarines and surface ships, has a $40 million payroll and employs one-third of industrial workers in the Quincy area and one-fifth of those on the entire South Shore.

General Dynamics bought the then 80-year-old shipbuilding facility from Bethlehem Steel December 31, 1963, for an estimated $5 million after several months of negotiating.

Under Bethlehem, owners for 53 years, the former Fore River Shipyard boomed during World War II, peaking at 24,000 employees; had a peacetime high of 13,000 only 5 years ago, and then quickly dwindled in its last days to about 800 men.

Even in its waning years the plant had produced the Nation's first nuclear surface ships—the guided missile destroyer *Bainbridge* and the guided missile cruiser *Long Beach*. Yet it could not keep moving.

How could General Dynamics expect to establish a new operation at the same old stand and make it work?

With a will to win, answered Quincy Shipyard Manager Robert V. Laney, the other day. "It was the beginning of a new yard with different purposes and motives and a different spirit."

Laney managed the Bethlehem yard in its final years, heading projects which produced the *Bainbridge* and the *Long Beach*. He well remembers the despair and discouragement which settled on the men as production petered out.

General Dynamics already was successfully building the bulk of the Nation's Polaris submarine fleet in its Electric Boat Division in Groton, Conn. It foresaw a promising and profitable future in the surface ship field, and decided to distribute its eggs into two baskets in a dual operation.

It set out immediately on its new task, starting from scratch. It had bought only the physical plant: 175 acres and 89 buildings, 4 outfitting piers, a 10,000-ton floating drydock and 3 building basins.

First, General Dynamics closed the shipyard, severing all ties with the former parent. Then it gave it a new name—the Quincy Shipyard.

Forty keymen were brought up from Groton to assess the yard and start it moving again.

Laney still vividly recalls the hollow beat of the footsteps of these men and some 50 maintenance and security men on macadam and concrete as they walked through the deserted yard during its 6-week shutdown and reorganizational period.

Hiring for the new shipyard began in late January 1964. Some 4,000 persons showed up at the State employment office in Quincy that first day, the long line stretching down Parkway.

By mid-February, the first 200 new employees walked through the gate on East Howard Street and the yard began to come alive again.

First order of business was cleaning and rehabilitating machinery and tools which had been idle for weeks and even years, and redecorating the premises.

Some small production work was done on odd jobs around the yard, but it wasn't until April when some 500 employees were on the payroll that production really got underway.

Quincy Shipyard had inherited from Bethlehem a $61.9 million contract to build two nuclear attack submarines, the *Whale* and the *Sunfish*. The keel for the *Whale* was laid May 27, 1964. In addition, two nuclear attack subs, the *Greenling* and the *Gato*, were towed up from the Groton facility into the Quincy building basins for lengthening.

The men in the yard began to feel the shipyard stir.

Four months later, in September, General Dynamics won a $65 million NASA contract to convert three World War II Navy T-2 tankers into floating electronic islands for tracking the Nation's astronauts on their trek to the moon. The bulk of the award for the Vanguard, the Redstone, and the Mercury went to the Quincy yard for hull structural work. Electronics and instrumentation are being handled by two other G.D. divisions.

The future began to look brighter for Quincy, but there were problems, too.

At is first birthday, in January 1965, 5,200 persons were on the yard's payroll. Half of the men in the yard were former Bethlehem employees.

Since General Dynamics bought only the physical plant, the men began work without benefit of a labor contract. From the start they were disgruntled over pay and seniority.

The discontent erupted during contract negotiations and 3,000 production and clerical workers walked off their jobs one day to protest lack of progress in negotiations.

Today Laney and other Quincy Shipyard officials point with pride to the negotiated contract that followed the work slowdown. The Nation's first 4-year labor contract in the shipbuilding industry, it gave a 32-cent-an-hour pay raise over that period, nine annual paid holidays, 2-week vacation after 1 year, and other benefits.

"We probably did do some injustice to workers in the beginning, without a contract," admits one General Dynamics official (not Laney) today. "But based on our own evaluation, it appeared a lot of the workers were overrated. If wage rates were too high at the start, we wouldn't have had a chance of being competitive or making the thing go."

Quincy had hired many men back in lower classes and refused to take over all retirement programs for long-term Bethlehem employees. But under the new contract, the yard agreed to give seniority after 4 years shipbuilding experience and also agreed to review ratings on men with much more experience.

Generally labor is pleased with the 9-month-old contract.

"We're satisfied with the outlook for the future, though we're not satisfied with everything," says George McPherson, executive secretary of Local 5, Shipbuilders Union, which represents most of the workers in the yard. "Any grievances we have, we think can be bargained out." He explains labor is bargaining with management on about 300 grievances.

"We think this will turn out to be a top yard. Things looked pretty grim after Bethlehem closed," he muses.

The yard is busy, the company is still hiring, and work has not yet begun on $141 million worth of contracts the shipyard won in 1965.

The contracts are for two ammunition ships, one submarine tender, and two fleet replenishment oilers. Ironically the ammunitions ships' contract was won over Bethlehem Steel's Sparrows Point, Md., yard, although a couple of weeks ago Quincy lost out to the same yard for two more of the ships.

Last year Quincy workers also produced a harbor hurricane gate for Stamford, Conn., a missile launching trainer for the Navy's Polaris submarine crewmen, two new floating heavyweight shock platforms and also transferred midbodies from the T-2 tankers under conversion to two commercial tankers.

With 1966 just a few weeks old, Quincy plans five key layings, two launchings and possibly two deliveries in the next 12 months. The plant also is going shopping for a share of the Navy's $1.9 billion shipbuilding program for the remainder of the current fiscal year and will keep its eyes open for the fiscal 1967 list due to be announced at the end of this month.

"We'll go after the big ones," says Laney.

The Quincy yard also is setting its sights on an estimated $1,5 billion "total package" contract for a fleet of new, fast Navy cargo ships and already is developing proposals for the job.

Whoever wins the contract likely could hold the reins on future building of surface ships. The new concept gives one shipbuilder a single contract to design, construct and develop the new ships.

"We're determined to get the contract, despite keen competition," emphasizes the tall, slim yard manager. "It would make a big difference in the yard, give us a chance to plan ahead for several years. It would stabilize the workload."

Laney, a man accustomed to measuring success on a day-by-day basis, by no means thinks the Quincy yard has turned the corner toward success.

General Dynamics has put $1 million into the operation; not a substantial sum in terms of multimillion-dollar industrial investments, but substantial enough to show the parent company's interest in its young branch.

The single most important factor in Quincy's upward swing thus far, believes Laney, is the transfer from Groton of a bright, young, aggressive and fresh approach.

"There is a belief in the future of the yard. Many employees are working in the same spot they were 2 years ago, but they are producing more."

Yet, he cautions: "Our 6,700 employees is better than 2 years ago when there weren't any, but that doesn't spell success. Remember, we haven't completed our first ship yet."

Quincy, however, has quite a few good things going for it.

One of these, in Laney's view, is the 4-year labor contract which gives the company a firm springboard in seeking major contracts. Serious labor problems and large labor demands were reasons, and maybe the primary ones, for the downfall of the Bethlehem yard.

Another reason for the upswing might be found in the two words "Cost Reduction." Continually General Dynamics surveys the yard, checking out and eliminating waste in electricity, telephones, steam heat, and other areas. Last year 116 million gallons of water (enough for 900 families) was conserved as a result of such a survey.

Laney himself daily walks through a portion of the yard to see the operation firsthand. Another top executive inspects the entire yard from 5 to 7 a.m. each day.

"If we're going to be successful in competitive bidding, we've got to cut all the fat out of the operation," says Laney, a former Navy captain, who has spent most of his life in shipbuilding.

Still another reason for the positive outlook at Quincy is its interdependent relationship with its sister shipyard in Groton.

Quincy got its first boost in talent and equipment from that yard and may draw on that yard whenever needed. "Each yard has a dominant interest, but each is capable of working in the other field," says Laney.

"One of the most interesting things in the development of the Quincy operation has been the mixture of the shipbuilding and submarinebuilding people. The difference in building each is like the difference between building an airplane and a submarine."

Half of the current workload at Quincy is in submarine construction. The *Whale* and the *Sunfish* are expected to be launched this year, and the *Greenling* and the *Gato* are being outfitted with equipment.

Little if any additional submarine construction is planned at Quincy, though there may be additional submarine repair work.

Quincy will concentrate as originally intended, on surface ships.

Already the *Vanguard*, the first of the three Apollo instrumentation ships, is scheduled for sea trials later this month. The *Redstone* is being outfitted with electronic and marine equipment and preliminary hull work is underway on the Mercury.

And there are the contracts for those five other surface ships.

Yet the Quincy shipyard is operating at only one-third capacity, and that's the way the company wants it.

Laney expects the current work force of 6,700 to remain steady for the next year at least. He conservatively predicts a high of 8,000 employees for the yard. But, he hastily adds, "It all depends on contracts.

"We won't be able to tell which way the yard is going for at least another 2 or 3 years. While contract price remains frozen and fixed, other things can change during the contract life. Dangers are escalation of costs, bad weather and loss of employees."

The manpower situation, in fact, constantly plagues the yard. It faces a critical shortage of experienced shipfitters, electricians and outside machinists and is constantly advertising these positions. To curb the crisis somewhat, it is training 105 young men in 10 different trades in its own apprentice program and retraining another 50 under the U.S. Manpower Development and Training Act.

"Only the best shipbuilders can be successful," say Laney. "Profits are sparse. We're caught in an economic squeeze. Since World War II, 20 private shipyards have folded and most today are operating at half capacity.

"Quincy will have to get a number of major new contracts if it's going to turn that corner toward success. But we're determined to get those contracts."

Management, labor and certainly the South Shore and even Greater Boston communities are in agreement on that philosophy.

The rebirth of the shipyard has shown up dramatically on the South Shore area where 75 percent of its $40 million payroll is distributed.

The Quincy Chamber of Commerce reports an increase in apartment house construction, hotel and motel business and retail business. The Quincy Shipyard shares in that impact with other growing industries in the area.

Not bad for a 2-year-old toddler.

A Marine's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD a letter from Cpl. Lawrence Torrez, of California, now stationed in Vietnam.

Corporal Torrez is the brother of Mrs. Ray Inda. Mr. Ray Inda is the president of the G.I. Forum, which is a great public service organization.

Two months ago, I traveled to Vietnam and met with over 400 U.S. servicemen there. The morale of our troops in Vietnam was excellent. I was never prouder to be an American than to hear the troops with whom I spoke declare to a man that we must not leave the people of South Vietnam to Communist domination.

I believe that the letter from Corporal Torrez sums up very well the feelings expressed to me by most of the soldiers I spoke with. They were all very concerned about demonstrations here in the United States and many asked if there was not something which could be done about them. I believe Corporal Torrez expresses in his letter that a majority of the people of the United States support our efforts to allow the people of South Vietnam to determine their own destiny.

Corporal Torrez is obviously a young man of intelligence and dedication who represents the best in the idealism of American youth.

A MARINE'S VIEWS

(By Cpl. Lawrence Torrez)

EDITOR OF THE SUN-TELEGRAM:

My name is Cpl. Lawrence Torrez, and I am a U.S. marine stationed in Chu Lai, Vietnam. Along with me, there are 12 other marines from other parts of the United States, with Sgt. Thomas W. Conrad from North Hollywood, who is in charge of our small group.

I am a resident of San Bernardino. I attended school in San Bernardino all through the years until I graduated from SBHS.

We read the Stars and Stripes newspaper daily, and we have all discussed with each other our feelings toward all the demonstrations going on all over the United States about the war in Vietnam. I would like to let you know our personal opinions and what we think of it.

It seems that our real enemies are back home—not here in Vietnam. I have read about communism and have seen what it does just by looking at these people here in Vietnam, plus the fact there are people trying desperately to leave Communist worlds like East Germany, Cuba, Red China, and so many more.

Do these college students feel they know more than these people who have actually experienced the ways of communism?

We heard of the welcoming our marines have been receiving as they arrive in the United States from Vietnam. They (welcoming group) called our marines murderers and a lot of other dirty names, not getting any gratitude for what they had been through.

I'd like to see every one of those punks drafted, but I'd hate to see them be in the U.S. Marine Corps. But if they ever did come into this outfit, I guarantee you this, the Marine Corps would square them away—and mighty fast.

I'm glad the real "citizens" of the United States are on our side, and are giving us their support in stopping communism from spreading.

This letter is not intended to criticize all the people of the United States—not by a long shot. Only those few who have the shoes that fit.

Mr. Truman's Gloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent comments made by our former President on the state of the world are sad but true.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a fine editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on January 27:

MR. TRUMAN'S GLOOM

Out in his hometown of Independence, Harry Truman the other day made some very poignant remarks about the state of the world as it has become since his own active efforts ceased.

Surveying things as they are and comparing them with things as they were in his administration, the former President said sadly, "It all seems to have been in vain. Memories are short and appetites for power and glory are insatiable. Old tyrants depart. New ones take their places. Old differences are composed. New differences arise. Old allies become the foe. The recent enemy becomes the friend. It's all very baffling and trying."

It is very baffling and trying. Almost every sentence in Mr. Truman's elegy is an accurate statement of events in the world during and since his administration. Except one: the first. It has not been in vain.

Americans generally fought through World War II with an expectation of permanent peace to follow victory. It was a great wrench to see Soviet Russia, our ally, arise as a new threat to peace. Mr. Truman boldly and decisively met that threat in Greece, in Persia, and elsewhere. He met it, too, by the economic aid which restored Europe to health and made communism an ideological curiosity in the West rather than a possible alternative.

And then, yet another tyrant and new difference arose in the East. Again, in Korea, Mr. Truman met this new threat with determined resistance. He established a line and the line has held.

The international relations of the United States in the years since World War II have been infinitely complicated and give promise only of further complexity. But peace of a sort has been preserved. The line has been held.

The nature of life itself is to have one new peril swifty replace an old one contained. Mr. Truman did what had to be done, and deserves freedom from sad second thoughts in his twlight years.

Dr. William B. Edwards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Lakewood, Ohio, which I represent, was shocked and saddened Monday by the unexpected, untimely death of Dr. William B. Edwards, nationally known educator and the superintendent of our Lakewood school system since 1955.

Lakewood's young people are the finest memorial Dr. Edwards could have to his intense concern for quality education. His standards were the highest and the city's schools reflect those standards in outstanding curriculum and student scholarship. In all his striving for academic excellence, he never lost the human touch which endeared him to those who knew him.

Dr. Edwards was unsparing of himself in his community interests. He was a member of the Lakewood Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Club, past president of the South Euclid Kiwanis Club, president of the executive council of the Greater Cleveland Chapter of the Boy Scouts and a member of the American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association, and the Horace Mann League.

The Cleveland Press and Plain Dealer have paid high editorial tribute to Dr. Edwards' achievements in the decade he served the Greater Cleveland area.

The editorials follow:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Jan. 31, 1966]

WILLIAM B. EDWARDS

The death this morning of William B. Edwards, Lakewood's superintendent of schools, removes from the scene one of this area's ablest, hardest working, and most distinguished educators.

Edwards, 56, took over the Lakewood job in 1955. At that time Omar Ranney, late press staffer who was on the Lakewood School Board, said: "We feel we have obtained one of the Nation's top school administrators."

Today Ranney's son Phil, who is himself on the school board, said of Edwards: "What made him such an excellent superintendent was the fact that he didn't get bogged down in details to the extent that he forgot that the main thing he was dealing in was boys and girls."

Edwards came to Lakewood after heading the school systems in South Euclid-Lyndhurst and later in Peoria, Ill. He was known for his leadership in civic affairs on a countywide basis and vigorously fought for school levies against often-determined opposition.

Edwards was gregarious, articulate, and likeable. His enthusiasm for his work and his keen concern that boys and girls get the best education possible made him a truly outstanding educator.

His concern for education took many forms. He was quick to offer Lakewood's facilities for Ohio branch colleges in 1951. And just recently he instituted a course of Afro-Asian studies in the suburb's schools because he thought youngsters need to know about cultures other than those of the Western World.

There are not many William B. Edwardses. He will be sorely missed.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Feb. 1, 1966]

DR. WILLIAM B. EDWARDS

Dr. William B. Edwards was a creative and deeply devoted superintendent of Lakewood schools for more than 10 years. His sudden death at 56 is a severe blow to Lakewood and to the entire metropolitan community.

All Greater Cleveland is indebted to Dr. Edwards for the enthusiasm and diligence he brought to his work with the Boy Scouts, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Community Chest and such important cultural activities as the Great Lakes Shakespeare Festival, which he served for a time as president.

The Lakewood school system will miss him not only for his fine qualities as a man but for the spirit of useful innovation and the emphasis on excellence that marked his decade in the superintendent's chair.

Dr. Edwards knew that no school system could be better than its teachers. He therefore gave great attention to in-service training. And he devised and won school board approval for a plan that gave career teachers summer pay every fifth year for university study.

Lakewood schools were among the first in the area to offer foreign languages in the fifth grade of elementary school. They were among the first to pursue "modern math."

Lakewood High School was the first in the State to require driver training of all its students and this too was a step inspired by Dr. Edwards.

Dr. Edwards' life was one of immense usefulness in a field he loved. The community will miss him.

The 1964 Income of Male Cold War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include further statistics provided by the Veterans' Administration on the 1964 money income of male cold war veterans:

TABLE 2.—*Money income in 1964 of male cold war veteran families, by age of head, in the United States*

[Age of veteran family head in March 1965]

Income in 1964	All family heads				Family heads with wife present											
					All				Wife with earnings				Wife with no earnings			
	All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over	All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over	All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over	All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over
Number (thousands)	[1] 2,279	435	1,791	[2] 45	[1] 2,252	426	1,773	[2] 45	[1] 1,115	257	836	[2] 18	[1] 1,137	169	937	[2] 27
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	--------	100.0	100.0	100.0	--------	100.0	100.0	100.0	--------	100.0	100.0	100.0	--------
Under $500	.5	1.7	.2	--------	.5	1.9	.2	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	1.1	4.4	.4	--------
$500 to $999	.4	.6	.3	--------	.4	.7	.3	--------	.2	--------	.3	--------	.7	1.7	.3	--------
$1,000 to $1,499	1.2	2.6	.8	--------	1.2	2.8	.8	--------	1.1	1.5	1.0	--------	1.4	4.4	.7	--------
$1,500 to $1,999	.4	--------	.5	--------	.4	--------	.5	--------	.2	--------	.2	--------	.6	--------	.7	--------
$2,000 to $2,499	1.3	2.6	1.0	--------	1.4	2.8	1.1	--------	1.2	1.8	1.0	--------	1.6	3.9	1.1	--------
$2,500 to $2,999	2.4	4.1	1.9	--------	2.4	4.2	1.9	--------	2.2	2.6	1.9	--------	2.6	6.6	2.0	--------
$3,000 to $3,499	3.6	6.6	3.0	--------	3.6	6.5	3.1	--------	2.1	2.9	2.0	--------	5.1	12.7	3.9	--------
$3,500 to $3,999	4.7	6.7	4.2	--------	4.7	6.6	4.3	--------	3.1	2.6	3.4	--------	6.2	12.7	5.1	--------
$4,000 to $4,449	5.7	8.6	5.0	--------	5.7	8.7	5.0	--------	6.7	10.9	5.3	--------	4.7	5.5	4.7	--------
$4,500 to $4,999	5.1	5.8	5.0	--------	5.1	5.9	4.9	--------	3.7	3.6	3.7	--------	6.4	9.4	6.0	--------
$5,000 to $5,499	7.9	12.2	7.0	--------	8.0	12.2	7.1	--------	8.3	14.9	6.5	--------	7.6	8.3	7.6	--------
$5,500 to $5,999	7.5	8.8	7.3	--------	7.5	8.9	7.2	--------	6.9	10.2	6.0	--------	8.1	7.2	8.4	--------
$6,000 to $6,499	8.0	7.9	8.2	--------	8.0	8.0	8.1	--------	6.5	9.4	5.7	--------	9.4	6.1	10.2	--------
$6,500 to $6,999	5.5	5.6	5.6	--------	5.6	5.4	5.6	--------	5.2	3.6	5.7	--------	5.9	8.3	5.5	--------
$7,000 to $7,999	11.5	11.2	11.6	--------	11.6	11.3	11.7	--------	11.7	14.2	11.0	--------	11.5	7.2	12.3	--------
$8,000 to $8,999	10.3	3.6	12.0	--------	10.3	3.7	11.9	--------	11.8	6.2	13.6	--------	8.9	--------	10.5	--------
$9,000 to $9,999	7.4	2.7	8.2	--------	7.3	3.3	8.2	--------	9.0	5.4	9.7	--------	5.7	--------	6.8	--------
$10,000 to $11,999	9.0	4.9	9.8	--------	9.0	5.2	9.8	--------	10.4	7.3	11.4	--------	7.6	1.6	8.4	--------
$12,000 to $14,999	4.5	2.2	5.0	--------	4.2	1.2	4.9	--------	5.9	1.8	7.1	--------	2.5	--------	2.9	--------
$15,000 to $24,999	2.8	.6	3.1	--------	2.7	.7	3.1	--------	3.6	1.1	4.3	--------	1.9	--------	2.1	--------
$25,000 and over	.3	--------	.3	--------	.4	--------	.3	--------	.2	--------	.2	--------	.5	--------	.4	--------
Median [3]	$6,620	$5,450	$7,000	--------	$6,600	$5,400	$7,000	--------	$7,220	$5,950	$7,660	--------	$6,220	$4,310	$6,450	--------

[1] Includes cold war veterans under 20 years of age.

[2] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

[3] Computed from unrounded data, and rounded to the nearest $10.

NOTE.—Rounds to zero.

TABLE 3.—*Money income in 1964 of male cold war veteran unrelated individuals and of cold war veterans living in a relative's family, by age, in the United States*

[Age in March 1965]

Income in 1964	Relatives of family head				Unrelated individuals			
	All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over	All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over
Number (thousands)	[1] 840	465	338	[2] 6	[1] 208	[2] 77	127	[2] 2
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	--------	100.0	--------	100.0	--------
Under $500	12.9	14.5	8.5	--------	1.0	--------	1.3	--------
$500 to $999	9.9	11.7	6.4	--------	3.4	--------	--------	--------
$1,000 to $1,499	9.9	13.3	4.7	--------	1.9	--------	3.1	--------
$1,500 to $1,999	8.7	8.9	8.5	--------	6.7	--------	3.8	--------
$2,000 to $2,499	10.4	14.9	4.5	--------	4.3	--------	1.9	--------
$2,500 to $2,999	7.1	9.9	4.3	--------	5.3	--------	3.2	--------
$3,000 to $3,499	4.3	4.0	4.7	--------	8.2	--------	6.3	--------
$3,500 to $3,999	5.8	3.8	9.2	--------	7.2	--------	5.7	--------
$4,000 to $4,499	6.2	7.8	4.3	--------	9.6	--------	9.4	--------
$4,500 to $4,999	5.5	3.2	5.5	--------	8.6	--------	8.2	--------
$5,000 to $5,499	4.5	3.8	5.7	--------	2.9	--------	3.1	--------
$5,500 to $5,999	3.1	1.0	5.9	--------	8.6	--------	7.6	--------
$6,000 to $6,499	4.6	1.6	9.2	--------	5.3	--------	6.3	--------
$6,500 to $6,999	1.5	.6	2.8	--------	4.8	--------	7.6	--------
$7,000 to $7,999	3.0	1.0	5.9	--------	11.1	--------	16.3	--------
$8,000 to $8,999	1.7	--------	4.0	--------	4.3	--------	5.0	--------
$9,000 to $9,999	.2	--------	.7	--------	1.0	--------	1.3	--------
$10,000 to $11,999	.5	--------	1.2	--------	2.9	--------	5.0	--------
$12,000 to $14,999	--------	--------	--------	--------	1.0	--------	1.9	--------
$15,000 to $24,999	.2	--------	.7	--------	1.9	--------	3.1	--------
$25,000 and over	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Median [3]	$2,420	$2,060	$3,960	--------	$4,640	--------	$5,790	--------

[1] Includes cold war veterans under 20 years of age.

[2] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

[3] Computed from unrounded data, and rounded to the nearest $10.

NOTE.—Rounds to zero.

SOURCE AND RELIABILITY OF THE ESTIMATES

Source of data: Information about the 1964 income of male civilian noninstitutional cold war veterans in the United States was derived from the Bureau of the Census matched February–March 1965 Current Population Survey sample of approximately 25,000 households. The family relationship data were obtained for families headed by male cold war veterans, for cold war veterans living alone or with nonrelatives, and for cold war veterans living in the family of a relative. The work experience data were collected for year-round, full-time workers, part-year and/or part-time workers, and for nonworkers. The income—family relationship and the income—work experience distributions by age were applied to the independent VA estimates by age of the male civilian noninstitutional cold war veteran population in the United States to develop the data presented in this report. Although income and work experience data are for the year 1964, the age and family relationship refers to March 1965. (For details of the survey see Consumer Income, Current Population Reports Series P-60, No. 47, Sept. 24, 1965, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.)

Money income was the sum of money wages and salaries, net money income from self-employment, and money income other than earnings such as social security, veterans' payments, interest and dividends, annuities, etc. The income of families (table 2) was the amount received by all members of the family. The income by work experience (table 1), and the income of cold war veteran relatives of the head and cold war veteran unrelated individuals (table 3) was that received by the veteran alone. All families includes family groups in which the cold war veteran was married (wife present or absent), or he was widowed, divorced, or never married, but still the head of a family. Husband-wife families are only those in which the cold war veteran was married and his wife was present.

Cold war veterans are men who entered the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, have been separated from active duty and are now in the civilian noninstitutional population. Cold war veterans in penal institutions, chronic disease hospitals, nursing homes, and the like are excluded.

Reliability of the estimates: Since the estimates are based on a sample, they may differ somewhat from the figures that would have been obtained if a complete census had been taken using the same schedules, instructions, and enumerators. As in any survey work, the results are subject to errors of response and of reporting, as well as being subject to sampling variability.

The standard error is primarily a measure of sampling variability, that is, of the variations that occur by chance because a sample rather than the whole of the population is surveyed. As calculated for this report, the standard error also partially measures the effects of response and enumeration errors but does not measure any systematic biases in the data. The chances are about 68 out of 100 that an estimate from the sample will differ from a complete census figure for less than one standard error. The chances are about 95 out of 100 that the difference would be less than twice the standard error. The first table below shows the approximate standard error of an estimated percentage computed by using sample data for both the numerator and denominator of the percentage. The size of the standard error depends upon both the size of the percentage and the size of the class upon which the percentage is based. The second table shows the approximate standard error of selected median incomes.

Standard errors of estimated percentages

[68 chances out of 100]

Estimated percentage	Base of percentage (thousands)						
	75	125	250	500	1,000	2,500	5,000
2 or 98	3.4	2.6	1.8	1.3	0.9	0.6	0.4
5 or 95	5.1	4.0	2.8	2.0	1.4	.8	.6
10 or 90	6.7	5.4	3.8	2.7	2.0	1.2	.8
15 or 85	8.3	6.4	4.6	3.2	2.3	1.4	1.0
20 or 80	9.3	7.2	5.1	3.6	2.5	1.6	1.1
25 or 75	10.0	7.8	5.5	3.9	2.8	1.8	1.3
35 or 65	11.1	8.6	6.1	4.3	3.1	2.0	1.4
50	11.8	9.0	6.4	4.5	3.2	2.0	1.4

Approximate standard error of selected median incomes

[68 chances out of 100]

Item	*Error*
Personal income, total	$110
Year-round, full-time workers	130
Part-year/part-time workers	240
Did not work during year	430
Family income, total	200
Husband-wife families, total	200
Wife with earnings	270
Wife with no earnings	170
Relatives of head	180
Unrelated individuals	420

The One-Man Displaced Persons Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of the Nation to the following article which appeared in the Paterson News, on January 24, 1966. It deals with the fine work of my valued constituent, Tscherim Soobzokov.

Mr. Soobzokov has been of great service to me, not only with regard to displaced persons, but with regard to immigrants and new citizens generally. He has served as a link between my office and these persons, and has helped prove to them that in a democracy, public officers exist to serve the people, not to master them.

I think that Mr. Harry B. Haines, publisher of the Paterson News, and Michael Ardis, president of Local 945, are to be commended for joining to let the people of Paterson know of Tscherim Soobzokov's untiring and dedicated work.

The article follows:

UNION CITES IMMIGRANT FOR AIDING REFUGEES

A little guy stood very tall as a group of big guys gathered together to honor him and say that he really was big in his own right.

Tscherim "Tom" Soobzokov, of 704 14th Avenue, was presented with a framed citation by Michael Ardis, president of Teamster Local 945, "for the outstanding job he has done in aiding displaced persons forced out of their native country to find a new life and democracy in America."

Among the list of notables was Harry B. Haines, publisher of the News, who said the presentation "was an inspiring occasion since our country is made up of little guys. Yet our honored guest is not really a little guy but really big in 'patriotism and having proven how you love this country and democracy by aiding others from foreign lands arriving in this country.'

"The foundation of our country was and is made strong by Tom and people like him who have come to find freedom here," Mr. Haines said, mentioning that as a card bearer and lifetime member of the pressmens' union he did not feel out of place with the Teamster Union officials.

ESCAPED FROM RUSSIA

Soobzokov, a Russian by birth, escaped from the Soviet Union after World War II and lived in Jordan before coming to this country in 1955. Since that time he has helped more than 1,000 refugees find jobs and settle down in the New World.

A veritable one man displaced persons bureau, Soobzokov, who speaks Russian, Italian, German, and Arabic, said "my doors were open because I know that the doors of the unions which had helped me, would be open for others like me."

"All I did," said Soobzokov, who worked for many years with the Colorite Co., "was to repeat the kindness that Americans had shown to me." Soobzokov, and his wife Cathy, have five children ranging from 5 to 20 years of age. The eldest, Kazbek, is studying political science at Bridgeport State College, Connecticut.

The Soobzokov home on 14th Avenue has become a haven for those in the area who have just come from the other side. People arrive from all places at all hours and Tom is always ready to help them fill out citizenship applications and find a job.

Accepting the citation, Soobzokov in an emotional speech said: "We adopted this country of our own free will and are willing to give our blood to protect it." He praised the Teamsters "for how you have helped me and others like me."

Union officials, dignitaries, and all present felt it was Tom who deserved the thanks. Harry Schoen, counsel for the Democratic Party in Passaic County, said that many testimonials were phony, "but this one is sincere for Tom is truly deserving. He likes the Stars and Stripes and has helped others to do the same."

Michael Ardis spoke on the same note when he said "often those of us born here, like the draft card burners, don't appreciate the United States as much as we should and it takes someone like Tom to show us how great democracy and our country are."

Others who spoke were Charles Van Wager, personal representative of Mr. Haines, who told the audience that it wasn't often that the publisher of the Paterson News felt so strongly about the good work being done by one man.

Fred Ardis, secretary to State Senator Anthony Grossi and Larry De Angelis, secretary-treasurer of local No. 999 praised the honored guest. The latter gave Soobzokov a gold watch with the Teamster emblem on it.

The citation reads:

"Whereas Tscherim Soobzokov, of the city of Paterson, N.J., has labored industriously and long among the newcomers in our community; and * * *

"Whereas the language, ethnic, and national origin barriers have since the founding of our Nation, have been a constant barrier to the progressive evolution and growth of all people and nations; and * * *

"Whereas local No. 945, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, has been deeply involved in the hammering out from the melting pot of mankind a society engaged in the mutual aspiration of progress in peace; and * * *

"Whereas local No. 945 desires to cite for commendation those distinguished citizens of our community who share its aims, purposes, and efforts * * *: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That Tscherim Soobzokov is herewith bestowed the citation of local No. 945, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, as a distinguished servant of all mankind and has thus earned the gratitude of his fellow men."

Mass Transportation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills already introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The bills primarily aim at broadening the Mass Transportation Act to make possible direct Federal subsidies of the operating deficits of commuter services in urban areas. Of course, I do not advocate subsidies with no strings attached. The legislation I propose today makes direct subsidy of operating deficits possible only after the commuter service has submitted and had approved a plan to get back on its financial feet within 10 years.

Many people dislike the idea of direct subsidies to underwrite operating deficits. I share that dislike. I propose the direct subsidy idea only because I think that realism dictates nothing less. No amount of capital grant handouts will put the commuter railroads of our huge eastern cities back on their feet. Direct subsidies are needed. There are those who will protest giving this money to the East or to the cities.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that western and rural railroads have had their share of Federal aid and more. They were built with it. The land and money given to the railroads spanning the continent during the mid-19th century and late 19th century was stupendous. Rural transportation has also been the beneficiary of vast sums spent by the Federal Government on roads. I hope that this year the Congress will extend a helping hand to the urban and suburban commuter who is in dire need of help.

Constitutional Amendment Needed To Abolish Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, once again the Congress is moving toward a debate on the electoral college system, the outdated and extremely precarious method by which the United States selects its President and Vice President.

Early next week, hearings on the electoral college will begin before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, and it is my understanding that Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee also plans hearings later this session.

The electoral college has long been a subject of congressional and public debate; it is, by almost general agreement, one of the least satisfactory provisions of our Constitution. And yet, with all its defects, the electoral college is still with us.

I sincerely hope that the forthcoming hearings will be the prelude to constructive action, not merely inconclusive debate; and that before the 89th Congress adjourns it will have approved and sent to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment abolishing the electoral college.

In the area of constitutional reform, nothing is more urgently needed, I think, than such an amendment. For it is my firm conviction that the Constitution now contains serious defects which could throw a presidential election into an abyss of disorder and delay.

This conviction is based partly on personal experience, since I served in 1964 as one of Iowa's nine presidential electors, and it has been reinforced by a close study of the electoral college and its potential dangers.

And so it is my hope that this session of Congress, as it considers proposals for constitutional reform, will give top priority to passage of an amendment that will abolish the electoral college and replace it with a rational and realistic presidential election process.

In drafting such an amendment, I feel that the Congress should act with moderation; the best approach, it seems to me, is to reform but not radically change our present system.

The Congress has before it a number of proposed amendments dealing with the electoral college. Last session, 7 amendments on this subject were introduced in the Senate and 15 in the House. These include House Joint Resolution 327, which I introduced on February 17, 1965.

The pending proposals are not identical in detail, but they can be divided into four general categories.

First, there is the proposal for direct election by popular vote, thereby eliminating the electoral college, electoral votes, and State lines as voting factors.

This plan has the merit of insuring that the candidate with the most popular votes will automatically be elected. However, even the advocates of the proposal admit that it has little, if any, chance of adoption.

Electoral votes, as the Constitution has always provided, are allocated to the States on the basis of representation in the Congress. Thus, no matter how small a State's population, it is assured of at least three electoral votes. And it is hardly likely that the smaller States would ratify an amendment abolishing a voting system weighted in their favor.

Second, there is the proposal to retain the electoral college, but with the express requirement that most electors be chosen on the basis of single-member districts.

Each State, under this system, would have as many electoral districts as it has Congressmen. Another two electors, like U.S. Senators, would be elected at large in a statewide vote.

This proposal is directed mainly against the general ticket system, under which a State's entire bloc of electoral votes is cast for the candidate who carries the State.

It is argued that this method of counting electoral votes, also called the unit-rule system, works unfairly to the benefit of the more populous States with larger blocs of electoral votes.

The truth of the matter, however, is that the existing electoral voting system is actually weighted in favor of the less populous States. This is because each State, regardless of population, is allotted two electors by virtue of its representation in the Senate.

Thus, based on 1960 census figures, 36 States have a greater weight in the presidential election than they would have had if electoral votes were distributed solely on the basis of population.

In Alaska, for example, each electoral vote represents 75,389 persons. But in New York, each electoral vote represents 390,286 persons. From the standpoint of population, an electoral vote in Alaska is worth more than five times as much as an electoral vote in New York.

Furthermore, the district proposal would not abolish the general ticket system universally. In Alaska, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming, all States with only one Congressman, the candidate who carried the State would receive all three electoral votes.

The district proposal has other serious drawbacks. It would open the door to the possible gerrymandering of electoral districts and, in the process, divide the Nation into 481 separate presidential voting units.

Third, there is the proposal to eliminate the electoral college by automatically awarding a State's electoral votes to candidates on a formula proportional to the popular vote.

Advocates of this plan contend that, because it would distribute electoral votes more closely in line with the popular vote, the system would be more democratic.

But this system could have exactly the opposite effect. If this system had been in operation during 1960, a Congressional Quarterly study showed, Richard Nixon would have received 266.075 electoral votes to 265.623 for John F. Kennedy.

Thus Nixon would have been elected President, even though Kennedy had a greater number of popular votes.

In addition, it is quite likely that such a proportional voting system would weaken our two-party system. Unit voting by States serves to discourage zealous political activity among minority factions, since these groups have little chance of obtaining enough popular support in any State to bring them electoral votes.

If the proportional voting system were in effect, it could very well remove the moderating influence of our two-party structure. For third-party movements, by obtaining a small number of electoral votes in several States, could become a major factor in the final outcome of a presidential election.

The result would be political instability. Proportional voting, in fact, is similar to proportional representation, an electoral system that caused governmental havoc in such European democracies as the French Fourth Republic.

Finally, there is a fourth approach to presidential election reform. This approach, which I believe to be the wisest, would preserve the basic structure of our existing system but remove its flaws.

Under House Joint Resolution 327, three basic changes would be made in the existing provisions for presidential elections.

It would, first of all, abolish the electoral college and the office of elector. A candidate with the greatest number of popular votes in any State would automatically receive that State's full electoral vote.

This would remove the possibility that an individual elector might substitute his own particular wishes for the popular will of the people and vote for someone other than the winning presidential candidate in his State.

By custom, and in some States by law, electors are expected to vote for their party's candidate. But there is no assurance, under the Constitution, that they will do so; and in five presidential elections, most recently in 1960, electors have broken faith with their party and the people by casting their ballots for a man who was not the popular choice of the voters.

As early as 1826, a Senate committee headed by Thomas Hart Benton concluded that the electoral college was no longer worth preserving and described presidential electors in these words:

> They have degenerated into mere agents, in a case which requires no agency, and where the agent is useless if he is faithful and dangerous if he is not.

This is equally true today. The electoral college is totally useless as an institution, and yet the discretion given to individual electors is a potential threat to orderly and democratic government.

The second basic change under House Joint Resolution 327 provides that the candidates with the greatest number of electoral votes, whether a majority or plurality, would be declared President and Vice President after a routine count by the Congress.

Under existing provisions, the leading presidential and vice-presidential candidates require an absolute majority of electoral votes for election. Failing that, the election is thrown into the House of Representatives.

This has happened twice in our history, once in 1800 and again in 1824. On the first occasion, Aaron Burr was very nearly elected President over Thomas Jefferson. And in 1824, Andrew Jackson obtained a plurality of popular votes but lost the election in the House to John Quincy Adams.

There is general agreement that selection of the President by a vote in the House, under present constitutional provisions, is highly undesirable. The procedure is hardly democratic, since each State delegation, regardless of size, has only one vote in deciding the outcome.

Nevertheless, so long as the election of a President requires an absolute majority of electoral votes, there is always the danger that the House will be called upon to decide the contest.

In 1960, for example, a total shift of only about 20,000 popular votes in 2 States wolud have left Kennedy with less than an absolute majority of electoral votes. He still would have had more popular votes than Nixon, but the election would have been thrown into the House all the same.

The dangers connected with selection of the Chief Executive in the House can be removed by simply requiring that the greatest number of electoral votes, whether a majority or a plurality, is sufficient to elect a President.

The plurality provision is necessary, I think, to give the greatest possible assurance that the electoral vote count will reflect the results of the popular vote. In a close election, such as 1960, it is possible that the candidate with the most popular votes might nevertheless fall short of the constitutional requirement of a majority of electoral votes.

If that happened, the people would not have elected a President; and it is quite possible that the House, as it did in 1824, might pick a Chief Executive who trailed behind the leading presidential candidate in terms of popular votes.

Actually, there is nothing harmful in elevating a man to the White House with only a plurality of electoral votes. We find nothing wrong in inaugurating a President who has received only a plurality of popular votes. If we honor the plurality principle as to the popular vote, which is considered the presidential mandate, there is no logical reason why we should not do likewise as to the electoral vote.

The third basic change proposed by House Joint Resolution 327 provides that if the electoral vote ends in a tie the Senate and the House of Representatives, meeting in joint session and with each Member casting one vote, would select the President and Vice President from among the two slates of leading candidates.

The chances of a tie in the electoral vote are extremely remote. But it is always a possibility, so long as there is an even number of electoral votes, and under this provision the Congress would not be entirely dislodged from a post in the presidential election process.

I drafted House Joint Resolution 327 so as to avoid making any fundamental revisions in the practical workings of our presidential election system, as it operates today under normal and expected circumstances.

It is, I think, a sound compromise between what may seem ideally desirable and what is realistically possible, and I hope it will receive careful consideration by the Congress.

Among the other electoral college amendments proposed last session are Senate Joint Resolution 58 and House Joint Resolution 278, both of which are identical to the draft of an amendment sent to the Congress by President Johnson.

This amendment is basically the same as one introduced in 1956 by John F. Kennedy, then a Senator from Massachusetts. This proposal, Kennedy explained at the time, would not drastically alter our present constitutional system.

The administration-sponsored amendment would abolish the electoral college. It does, however, retain the requirement that a candidate obtain an absolute majority of electoral votes in order to be automatically elected President.

In connection with this proposal, I would like to call attention to an analysis of Senate Joint Resolution 58 and House Joint Resolution 278 published in the July 1965, Bulletin of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

This analysis, prepared by the association's Committee on Federal Legislation, points out some possible technical difficulties in the administration-sponsored amendment. Since it may prove useful to my fellow Members, I hereby include the analysis in my remarks:

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ABOLISHING ELECTORAL COLLEGE AND MAKING OTHER CHANGES IN ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

(By the Committee on Federal Legislation)

INTRODUCTION

Senate Joint Resolution 58 and House Joint Resolution 278, 89th Congress, 1st session (1965), sponsored by the Johnson administration[1] and introduced by Senator BAYH and Representative CELLER, respectively, would amend the Constitution so as to effect four major constitutional changes in the election of President and Vice President.

1. The electoral college would be abolished and, instead of selecting electors, the people would be given a direct vote on a single ballot for President and Vice President.

2. The electoral vote of each State, computed under existing procedure, would be cast as a unit for the presidential and vice-presidential candidates receiving a plurality of the popular vote in the State.

3. If a majority of electoral votes were not obtained, the House and Senate, in joint session, would choose by plurality vote the President and Vice President.

4. If the winning presidential candidate were to die before the official counting of the electoral votes in early January, the winning vice-presidential candidate would become President, and Congress could provide by law for the case of the death of both winning candidates.

We support the thrust of the proposed amendment, and we suggest below various changes which we believe will improve it. The whole subject is of great importance to the Nation, and we believe that all aspects of it should be carefully considered at future hearings.

THE PRESENT SYSTEM

The present constitutional system for election of President and Vice President is embodied in article II, section 1, and in the 12th, 20th, and 23d amendments. At a time which Congress may determine, each State appoints "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct" that number of electors equal to the total number of Senators and Representatives to which it is entitled.[2] On a day which Congress may determine and which shall be uniform for all States, the electors meet in their respective States and ballot separately for President and Vice President, "one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves." The electoral vote of each State is then certified and transmitted to the President of the Senate, who opens the certificates during a joint session of Congress. A majority of the electoral vote is necessary for election to each office.

In the absence of such majority, the House of Representatives "immediately" chooses the President from among "the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three" of the electoral vote for President. In such balloting, each State casts but a single vote with a majority of all States required to elect. A quorum consists of one or more members of the House of Representatives from two-thirds of the States.

Absent a vice-presidential electoral majority, the Senate chooses the Vice President "from the two highest numbers on the list" for Vice President. Two-thirds of the Sena-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

tors constitutes a quorum and a majority of the entire membership is necessary for election.

Finally, with respect to death or other failure to qualify, the Constitution provides that if, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of office (January 20), the President-elect has died, the Vice-President-elect shall become President, and if, by such time, the President has not been chosen or the President-elect has failed to qualify, the Vice-President-elect shall act as President until a President qualifies. Congress is empowered to provide by law for the case where neither a President-elect nor a Vice-President-elect qualifies, declaring who shall act as President or the manner of selection of an acting President. The person selected shall act only until a President or Vice President qualifies. Likewise, Congress may provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from among whom the House of Representatives may choose a President and the Senate a Vice President, whenever the right of choice so devolves.

Congress has exercised some of its constitutional powers in enacting laws relating to the electoral process. Thus, the Tuesday next following the first Monday in November has been designated as the time of appointing electors, 3 U.S.C. Sec. 1; the Monday next following the second Wednesday in December (i.e., 41 days after "election day") has been designated as the day on which the electors meet and vote, 3 U.S.C. Sec. 7; and January 6 has been designated as the date for the official congressional counting of the electoral vote, 3 U.S.C. Sec. 15. With respect to the death or failure to qualify of both the President-elect and Vice-President-elect, the succession statute is made applicable, which establishes the order of priority of the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the members of the Cabinet, 3 U.S.C. Sec. 19. Congress has not exercised its power to provide for the case of death of any of the persons from among whom the House may chose a President and the Senate a Vice President.

The electoral college system has almost from its inception not functioned as envisioned by the Constitional Convention. The Founding Fathers, after much debate and compromise, looked toward the selection, primarily by the State legislatures, of distinguished citizens who in turn would exercise independent judgment in selecting a President. But the development of political parties and the growth of democratic ideas have produced a quite different system. The ties of party loyalty, quite early in our history, caused electors to announce in advance of their selection their support for particular candidates and to be elected simply as agents morally bound to vote for such candidates. And the spread of democracy caused the States to provide for the popular election of presidential electors. Finally, although some States experimented with election of presidential electors by districts, the statewide ballot or general ticket came into universal use, in recognition of the fact that more political weight was given a State that could deliver its entire electoral vote to one candidate. Thus, there have evolved the essentials of the present electoral system: the people of each State voting for automaton electors (in some 30 States they are not even separately listed on the ballot) whose entire vote is cast for the candidate receiving a plurality of that State's vote.[3]

CRITICISMS OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

The present electoral college system has been criticized for presenting the potential of election of a President who is not the first choice of the voters.[4] This result could be brought about by four factors, acting singly or in combination: electors exercising their claimed constitutional prerogative to act independently; the allocation of electoral votes to the States on a basis not proportionate to population or number of voters; the winner-takes-all system of each State which "wastes" all of the loser's votes within each State; and, where mandated, the selection of a President by the House and of the Vice President by the Senate on a basis of numerical equality among all States. A related criticism is that the concentration of electoral strength among the larger States has certain political effects which, to some, are undesirable: the selection of and campaigning by nominees with emphasis on key States and "swing" voters within those States.

Other criticisms are that, in the event of the death of a winning candidate after his "election" by the people in November but before his official election by the electoral college in December, the electors would have to exercise their discretion without guidance from the people;[5] that if the selection of the President and Vice President devolved upon Congress, the House and Senate might well choose candidates of opposing parties and political views;[6] and the perhaps lesser criticisms that, to the extent the office of elector has significance, the constitutional disqualification of Federal officeholders is undesirable, and that the electoral college entails expense and needless formality in the requirement that the electors assemble within each State.

The foregoing criticisms of the electoral system have created perennial proposals for reform. The present session is no exception. Thus, at least 20 resolutions have already been introduced which, among them, would do the following: abolish the electoral college in favor of direct election of the President; abolish the office of elector but retain the present system of electoral count; retain the electors but bind them to vote for the popular choice of the voters; allocate the electoral vote of each State in proportion to the vote of that State; choose electors by districts within each State, except for two to be chosen at large; and combinations of the foregoing. The proposals vary as to the vote required to make final the selection of a President: a plurality may be sufficient, thus requiring no alternative procedure; or some mechanism may be established if the winner of a plurality does not receive either 40 percent or a majority of the vote. Such mechanism consists, in the case of one proposed popular election system, of a runoff popular election between the two highest candidates; and, where the electoral vote is retained, the proposals include the present system of House vote by States, a House vote by Members, and a joint session of Congress in which each Member has one vote, the selection to be among either two or three candidates. Some of the resolutions also deal with certain problems presented by the death of the winner of the November election before taking office.[7]

This Committee has previously considered proposed changes in the constitutional method of electing the President and Vice President. In 1949, we reported on the Lodge-Gossett resolution, which proposed to abolish the office of elector (but not the electoral vote) in favor of a direct popular vote for the candidates and to allocate the electoral vote of each State among all candidates in proportion to the popular vote, Senate Joint Resolution 2 and House Joint Resolution 2, 81st Congress 1st session (1949). We endorsed the abolition of the electoral college as such, as well as the proposed constitutional guaranty of popular voting in presidential elections. However, we disapproved the proposal for a proportionate division of the electoral vote in view of the uncertainty about its operation and consequences. The report was approved by the association at its annual meeting held on May 10, 1949.[8]

In 1961, we considered various alternative proposals then pending in the Senate for electoral college reform. Our report endorsed the abolition of the electoral college and of the discretion of electors in casting votes, disapproved proposals for dividing the electoral vote of a State (either by prorating the popular vote or by a districting system), approved a proposal for a joint session of the House and Senate to name the President and Vice President, by a majority of the votes of the Members, in the case where no candidate received a majority of the electoral votes, and did "not recommend the substitution of a direct popular vote system for the present electoral votes system at this time." The report was approved by the association at a stated meeting held on January 16, 1962.[9]

SUMMARY OF CELLER-BAYH RESOLUTION

The CELLER-BAYH resolution would repeal the first through fourth paragraphs of article II, section 1 of, and the 12th amendment and section 4 of the 20th amendment to the Constitution. The substance of certain repealed provisions is incorporated in the resolution, as well as the following:

1. A popular election for President and Vice President would be held in each State on a day to be determined by Congress; absent such determination, such day would be "election day" as now defined. The voters in each State would have the same qualifications as required for voting for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

2. Each voters would cast one ballot for President and Vice President, and no person's name could be placed on any ballot without his consent.

3. A State's electoral votes would be cast for whichever candidates received a plurality for their respective offices, except that in the case of a State whose voters supported presidential and vice presidential candidates, both of whom were residents of that State, the second-place vice-presidential candidate would receive the electoral vote.

4. Within 45 days after the election, or such other time as Congress directed, each State would certify and transmit its returns to the President of the Senate.

5. On January 6, or such other day not earlier than January 4, nor later than January 10, determined by Congress, the President of the Senate would open the various certificates before a joint session of Congress and the electoral votes would then be counted.

6. If a majority of electoral votes were not received for either office, "then from the persons, not exceeding three, having the highest number of electoral votes for such office," the House and Senate in joint session, a quorum being three-fourths of the entire membership, would immediately choose by plurality the President or Vice President, as the case may be.

7. If the winning presidential candidate should have died after the election but before the official counting of the vote in January, the winning vice-presidential candidate would become President. Congress could by law provide for the case of both the winning presidential and vice-presidential candidates dying.

PROPOSED ABOLITION OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE

We adhere to the previously expressed views of this committee and of the association endorsing proposals for the abolition of the electoral college as such. The system of pledged electors has long since made the electoral college an anachronism. Moreover, with electors able to exercise discretion, the electoral college is a potentially dangerous anachronism in some circumstances. The possibility of electors repudiating their agency is real and, since 1948, two Democratic and one Republican electors have voted independently, although elected on a regular

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

party slates.[10] Moreover, campaigns have been organized—even after election day—to try to persuade electors to vote other than for their party's nominee, the most recent being the close election of 1960.[11]

Abolishing the electoral college would also eliminate the possibility of the people even consciously delegating their right to choose the President, as was done in Mississippi and, to some extent, in Alabama in 1960.[12] Although in a limited sense restricting freedom of choice, a requirement that the people vote for presidential candidates directly, instead of being allowed to delegate their decision to unpledged electors, seems more truly democratic and consonant with the realities of national campaigns. Moreover, it would insure that the electoral decision would be promptly known and not postponed for some 7 weeks until the electors met.

RETENTION OF ELECTORAL VOTE

The Celler-Bayh resolution would retain the present systm of allocating electoral votes among the States and would elevate to a constitutional requirement the present practice of giving the entire electoral vote of each State to the winner of the popular plurality within that State.

The allocation of the electoral vote, on its face, works against the people living in the more populous States and in favor of those living in the less populous States. Thus, based on the 1960 census, New York has 1 electoral vote for each 390,286 persons, while Alaska has 1 electoral vote for each 75,389 persons. Such allocation is, of course, at odds with the equal population principle applied by the Supreme Court in *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (1964), and in *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964).[13] But the likelihood of 38 States agreeing to a constitutional amendment that would curtail the relative strength of a majority of the States[14]—without some other and compensating change—seems sufficiently remote to preclude serious consideration of reallocation of the electoral votes on a basis which better reflects population. Similarly, without regard to the merits of direct nationwide popular election of the President and the Vice President, we do not believe that adoption of such a plan by constitutional amendment is politically feasible in the foreseeable future, and we adhere to the prior position of this committee and the association in not now recommending the substitution of a direct nationwide popular election plan.

It has been contended that the unit rule provides amelioration in terms of political power for the larger States, and advocates of dividing the electoral vote within each State argue that the present electoral system, in practice, favors the larger States and groups within those States. In any event, rather than leaving to each State the power to determine whether there should be a division of its electoral votes, which the Constitution now permits, it would seem wiser to make the unit rule mandatory, as the Celler-Bayh resolution does, so as to prevent State legislatures, in anticipation of a particular forthcoming election, from adopting a system for partisan advantage at the expense of an impending majority of voters.

PROPOSAL GUARANTEEING POPULAR VOTE FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The provision of the Cellar-Bayh resolution which provides a constitutional guaranty of the right of the qualified voters in each State to participate in the election of the President and Vice President should not be subject to controversy. Selection of electors by direct popular vote has for many years been the practice of all States, acting under the existing constitutional provision which leaves the method of selection to the State legislatures. Elimination of the electoral college would hardly accomplish its purpose if the States were free to substitute another intermediate body between the people and the actual presidential vote.

Problems, however, may arise from the provision that the voters in each State "shall have the qualifications requisite for persons voting for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." The provision is modeled on the provisions of article I, section 2, and the 17th amendment, regarding the qualifications of those voting for Representatives and Senators. Its obvious purpose is to retain the present uniformity within each State of the qualifications for voting for all officials. Nevertheless, we believe that certain existing exceptions from such uniformity should be preserved.

One exception relates to the poll tax. The 24th amendment to the Constitution bars payment of a poll tax as a requisite for voting in Federal—but not State—elections. That amendment, of course, supersedes and modifies the "most numerous branch" provisions already in the Constitution. It may be argued, however, should the Celler-Bayh resolution become part of the Constitution, that the 24th amendment has been impliedly repealed to the extent that a State which exacts a poll tax as a requisite for voting for the lower house of its legislature may do likewise in presidential elections. Although the explicit language of the 24th amendment in its reference to the right to vote "for President or Vice President," as well as for electors, may be held to prevail over a later general provision regarding qualifications, express clarification would be advisable.[15]

Another exception relates to the relaxation of residence requirements in the balloting for presidential electors below those normally imposed by the State in elections, as is accomplished, for example, by article 14-A of the New York Elections Law and the Uniform Voting by New Residents in Presidential Elections Act. Since such extension of the suffrage to persons who have recently moved into or within the State is salutary, it would be appropriate to allow the States to set less stringent residence requirements to vote for the President and the Vice President.

PROPOSAL FOR ELECTION BY CONGRESS IN ABSENCE OF MAJORITY OF ELECTORAL VOTES

The Celler-Bayh resolution provides for a joint session of the Senate and House to name the President and Vice President when no candidate has obtained the requisite majority of electoral votes. Such a joint session would determine the matter by a vote of all Members among the persons (not exceeding three) having the highest number of electoral votes for the particular office. Three-quarters of all Senators and Representatives would constitute a quorum and the person receiving the greatest number of votes on the first ballot would be chosen.

The change proposed would give each State—but not the District of Columbia—the same proportionate weight in the election when it devolves upon Congress that that State has in the electoral vote. The existing provision, which gives all States an equal voice, is archaic and has nothing to commend it.

Other aspects of the proposal would seem to call for further examination. The requirement of a three-quarters quorum has the inherent danger that a minority could prevent a vote; a provision that, regardless of the absence of such a quorum, a majority of all members could elect would therefor be desirable. On the question of action if a quorum is present, our 1961 report considered a proposal which provided that the vote of a majority of the members of the House and the Senate would be necessary for action, and that proposal was approved. The requirement of a majority may offer advantages in terms of enhancing the acceptability of the result to the Nation. The Celler-Bayh resolution doubtless decided in favor of a plurality (an alternative not discussed in our 1961 report) on the theory that an expeditious result was desirable, and there might be a delay in obtaining a majority. We believe that this point should be one of those explored carefully in the hearings.

There is ambiguity in the requirement that balloting be among "the persons not exceeding three, having the highest number of electoral votes," in that it is not clear what would occur in the event that a number of candidates were tied in electoral votes. For example, three candidates might conceivably be tied for second place, so that the choice would have to be among four persons if the person in first place was not automatically the winner. We think it advisable to make clear that the vote is to be taken among the three highest ranking candidates in electoral votes, or a greater number to allow for ties.

The Celler-Bayh resolution, insofar as the vote by Congress is concerned, would make election of President and Vice President of opposing parties much less likely than the present system where the House and Senate vote separately for President and Vice President, respectively, and the Senate's choice is limited to the two highest electoral vote winners. However, we think that further protection against such an eventuality would be desirable. The Celler-Bayh resolution would require each voter in general elections to cast his vote for President and for Vice President by one ballot, and would permit the name of any person to be placed upon any ballot for President or for Vice President only with the consent of such person. We believe that the resolution is thus intended to assure that candidates for those offices are willing both to run and to serve together. The underlying policy behind such provisions would seem to be furthered by requiring a joint ballot for President and for Vice President when the election devolves upon Congress, but only as the candidates have consented to serve with one another.

DEATH OF CANDIDATES

The Celler-Bayh resolution would solve certain existing problems connected with the death of presidential candidates. Constitutionally, the death of candidates prior to the December balloting by the electors or subsequent to the official canvass by Congress in January presents no problem. In the first case, however, the electors would either have to exercise discretion or to rely for guidance upon party machinery in determining how to cast their votes. In the second case, the provisions of section 3 of the 20th amendment would apply and the Vice President-elect would become President.

The death of the winning candidate after the December electoral vote but before the January canvass might present a constitutional problem under present law. The 20th amendment deals with the death of the President-elect and although there is support in the legislative history for the proposition that that term, which is undefined, is intended to cover a candidate from the time he has received a majority of the electoral vote,[16] it might be argued that no one becomes President-elect until Congress counts the electoral votes and that such votes cannot be counted for a dead man.[17] If so, no person would have a majority of the electoral votes and the decision would devolve upon the House of Representatives.

The Celler-Bayh resolution would solve such constitutional and practical problems. The electoral college would be eliminated, and by providing that the winning vice-presidential candidate would become President upon the death of the winning presidential candidate prior to the canvass of the electoral votes, the resolution undoubtedly conforms to the reasonable expectation of the

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

voters and is sound. Death of the President-elect after the January canvass would still be covered by section 3 of the 20th amendment—the Vice-President-elect would become President—as would be the death of both the presidential and vice-presidential electoral winners. In the latter case, the 20th amendment gives Congress the power to act, which it has done by the establishment in 3 United States Code section 19 of a priority of succession identical to that obtaining on the death of both the President and the Vice President.

The Celler-Bayh resolution would also reenact the provisions of section 4 of the 20th amendment empowering Congress to provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from among whom Congress may choose a President or Vice President. This power has not been exercised.

The problem remains of the possible death of a candidate occurring on or so close to election day that a substitute candidate cannot be designated under the then existing political machinery or qualify to have his name put on the ballot in the various States. Such a development would have seriously disruptive consequences, and if the death of a presidential candidate occurred on or shortly before election day but he nevertheless "won" there should be presented the question whether the votes for him were valid and his vice-presidential candidate was entitled to become President-elect.[18] There would be a like problem in the case of the death of a vice-presidential candidate. Neither the Celler-Bayh resolution nor the proposals with respect to the electoral college discussed in the prior reports of this committee referred to above deal with such problems.

If Congress at the time of such an emergency was in a position to act expeditiously and was disposed to do so, it could act to postpone the election. However, it may be unrealistic to expect such action in many circumstances. We suggest that Congress give consideration to provision in advance of a possible solution. Perhaps there could be a brief automatic postponement of an election if a presidential or vice-presidential candidate died or withdrew within a specified time before election day. In order to avoid delaying an election if a candidate of a "minor party" died, the automatic postponement might be limited to changes in the tickets of the "leading parties," which would present problems of definition and possibly constitutional questions. Another possibility is that a vice-presidential candidate would automatically be deemed to replace the head of his ticket who died or withdrew a short time before election day, but there would remain the theoretical possibility of the death of both the presidential and vice-presidential candidates shortly before an election.

Remote as these contingencies may be, it should be recognized that the existence of the electoral college could provide a mechanism for solution, with the electors exercising their discretion, presumably in the light of factors of party loyalty. We believe that the Celler-Bayh resolution correctly eliminates the functioning of the electoral college in the normal case where nothing happens to the candidates before the election. Retention of the office of elector for the very limited purpose of functioning in the special circumstances of death or withdrawal of a party's candidate within a specified short time before election day offers a possible manner of dealing with the problem, although it may be said to be unduly complicated machinery for the contingency.[19] At any rate, we believe that the problem should receive consideration since the Celler-Bayh resolution and the presidential inability amendment now pending in Congress deal with the other principal aspects of presidential election and succession.[20] At all times the mechanics selected should result in a President and Vice President who agreed in advance to serve together.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF CELLER-BAYH RESOLUTION

The provisions of the Celler-Bayh resolution not separately discussed above, including the mechanics of casting, certifying and counting the vote, seem satisfactory.

We recommend that the Celler-Bayh resolution be amended to make clear that no implied repeal is intended of the 23d amendment, which gives the presidential vote to the District of Columbia. Although the Celler-Bayh resolution, in its section repealing particular constitutional provisions, makes no mention of the 23d amendment, its voting scheme refers exclusively to the States. We recognize that the 23d amendment provides that electors appointed from the District are to be considered electors appointed from a State, but the Celler-Bayh resolution abolishes the office of elector. We do not believe that the resolution is intended to take the vote away from the District—which we would oppose—and we think that clarification would be in order.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, we support and endorse the basic purpose of the proposed constitutional amendment embodied in the Celler-Bayh resolution, whereby (a) the electoral college and the office of elector are abolished, and the people are guaranteed the vote for President and the Vice President on a single ballot; (b) the present electoral vote system is continued and the unit rule is made mandatory; (c) a joint session of Congress decides elections in the absence of an electoral majority; and (d) the winning vice-presidential candidate becomes President on the death of the winning presidential candidate.

We recommend, however, that changes be made in the Celler-Bayh resolution, so that (a) there will be no question that the 24th amendment, abolishing the poll tax in Federal elections, is continued for presidential elections; (b) States will be allowed to shorten residence requirements for presidential elections; (c) in contests determined by Congress in joint session (i) the three-fourths quorum requirement will not apply if a majority of all members concurs in the selection of a President and a Vice President, (ii) the balloting will be among the three highest ranking candidates in electoral votes or a greater number to allow for ties (with consideration to be given to whether the vote of a majority of the members of Congress or a plurality should be required), and (iii) the President and the Vice President will be voted for on a joint ballot, but only as the candidates have consented to stand together; and (e) the substance of the 23d amendment, giving the presidential vote to the District of Columbia, will be continued. We also recommend that Congress give consideration to providing in advance for the problem of death or withdrawal of a candidate shortly before election day.

Respectfully submitted.

Committee on Federal Legislation, Fred N. Fishman, Chairman; Sidney H. Asch, Charles R. Bergoffen, Eastman Birkett, Benjamin F. Crane, Nanette Dembitz, Arthur J. Dillon, Sheldon H. Elsen, Leonard Epstein, Elliot H. Goodwin, Andrew N. Grass, Jr., Jerome E. Hyman, Robert M. Kaufman, Ida Klaus, John E. Massengale, John E. Merow, George Minkin, Gerald E. Paley, Mahlon F. Perkins, Jr., H. David Potter, Albert J. Rosenthal, Arthur I. Rosett, Peter G. Schmidt, Henry I. Stimson.

---

[1] President Johnson asked for reform of the electoral college system in a message to Congress on Jan. 28, 1965, New York Times, Jan. 29, 1965, p. 1, cols. 6–7.

[2] Under the 23d amendment, the District of Columbia has that "number of electors * * * to which the District would be entitled if it were a state, but in no event more than the least populous State," which electors "shall be considered * * * to be electors appointed by a State."

[3] See Joyner & Pedderson, The Electoral College Revisited, 45 Sw. Soc. Sci. Q. 26, 28 (1964).

[4] A candidate not receiving a plurality of the popular vote was elected in the Jackson-Adams election of 1824 (Adams), the Hayes-Tilden election of 1876 (Hayes) and the Harrison-Cleveland election of 1888 (Harrison). See Peterson, A Statistical History of the American Presidential Elections, 18, 46–47, 55–56 (1963).

[5] At least until the electors officially cast their votes, the "winning" candidate on election day in November is not President-elect and therefore the provision of the 20th amendment, whereby the Vice-President-elect would become President upon the death of the President-elect, are inapplicable. Only once have the electors been required to act without instructions—on the death of Horace Greeley, the losing candidate for President, in 1872, shortly after election day. See Petersen, supra at 43.

[6] The 12th amendment, requiring the electors to cast a single ballot for President and Vice President, in practice prevents such a result in the electoral vote. The danger of such a result in the separate balloting by House and Senate stems not only from the possibility of the different political composition of the two Houses and from the State-unit method of voting in the House, but also from the fact that the House may choose among those receiving the three highest, and the Senate among those receiving the two highest, numbers of electoral votes for President and Vice President, respectively.

[7] See S.J. Res. 4, 7, 11, 12, 28, 58, 62; H.J. Res. 27, 28, 30, 43, 60, 111, 148, 169, 184, 237, 278, 299, 301, 327; all 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965).

[8] 4 Record of N.Y.C.B.A. 180 (1949). Subsequent to be publication of our report, the Lodge-Gossett resolution was amended to provide that if an electoral plurality of 40 percent were not obtained, Congress in joint session would select the President by majority vote. As so amended, the Lodge-Gossett resolution was adopted by the Senate on Feb. 1, 1950 by a vote of 64 to 27. Thereafter, the resolution was defeated in the House on July 17, 1950, by a vote of 134 to 210. 96 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1278, 10427 (1950).

[9] 1 Reports of Committees of N.Y.C.B.A. Concerned with Federal Legislation 1 (1962) (hereinafter cited as reports), 17 Record of N.Y.C.B.A. 92 (1962).

[10] In *Ray v. Blair*, 343 U.S. 214 (1952), the Supreme Court held, in a 5–2 decision, that the Alabama Democratic Party could bar from the primary a candidate for presidential elector who refused to pledge himself in advance to support the nominees of the Democratic National Convention.

[11] See Kefauver, "The Electoral College: Old Reforms Take on a New Look," 27 Law & Contemp. Prob. 188, 208–09 (1962); Pomper, "The Southern 'Free Elector' Plan," 45 Sw. Soc. Sci. Q. 16 (1964); Silva, "State Law on the Nomination, Election, and Instruction of Presidential Electors," 42 Amer. Pol. Sci. Rev. 523 (1948).

[12] See Petersen supra at 112–13; Pomper, supra.

[13] See this committee's Report on Proposed Constitutional Amendments and Jurisdictional Limitations on Federal Courts with Respect to Apportionment of State Legislatures 4 Reports 1 (1965), 20 Record of N.Y. C.B.A. 229 (1965).

[14] See Kefauver supra at 195.

[15] At the time of preparation of this report, it is not known what provisions on the poll

tax will ultimately be included in the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 now before Congress.

[16] See 22 Cong. Q. 2466–67 (1964).

[17] Electoral votes for Horace Greely in 1872 were not counted because he had died prior to the casting of those votes. Ibid.; Petersen, supra at 43.

[18] See Annot., 133 A.L.R. 319 (1941); 29 C.J.S. Elections secs. 227, 243 (1965).

[19] One member of the committee thinks that the basic purpose of the Celler-Bayh resolution can be accomplished without abolition of the electoral college by a constitutional requirement that electors pledge their absolute allegiance to party candidates for President and Vice President prior to election, such pledge to be revocable only if one or both candidates is dead or otherwise unavailable at the time of the electoral canvass. He takes the position that the electoral college would thus remain available to deal with the highly remote but nontheless serious contingencies discussed above.

[20] See S.J. Res. 1 and H.J. Res. 1, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965); S. Rept. No. 66, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965); H.R. Rept. No. 203, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965). This Committee's "Report on Problems of Presidential Inability and Vacancy in the Office of Vice President," approved by the association, appears in 3 Reports 35 (1964), 19 Record of N.Y.C.B.A. 311 (1964).

The Honorable Oren Harris

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have this opportunity to pay tribute to our colleague, Oren Harris. But it is also an occasion of regret, for no longer will the House have the benefit of his outstanding abilities and character and his effective, dedicated leadership.

For 25 years, Oren Harris has served his State and the Nation with rare distinction and capability.

When I came to the House in 1948, Oren Harris was one of the first colleagues I had the pleasure of meeting. As a freshman Representative, he guided and assisted me, with great kindness and generosity, in learning the duties of a Member of Congress. He has a multitude of friends and I am proud to count myself as one of them.

Through the years I have always respected his knowledge, his deep moral convictions, and his fine performance as both an individual Member of Congress and as chairman of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In this latter role, Oren Harris has developed and guided to enactment vital measures in many areas to better the lives of all Americans.

In thinking of Oren Harris, it is impossible not to recall the classical ideal of "a sound mind in a sound body." Not only on the House floor, but as a leader of the gymnasium brigade, he has given us an admirable example of living by this magnificent principle.

We will miss Oren Harris. But it is heartening to know that our judicial system will be strengthened by the wisdom, courage, and experience it will acquire with the addition of Oren Harris as a new Federal judge. My warm regards and best wishes go to Judge and Mrs. Harris as he undertakes this most important and challenging new task. I know he will discharge his responsibilities to reflect the highest credit on himself and the Federal bench.

Peace Corps in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message several weeks ago, President Johnson indicated that he would propose several new programs to increase our aid to developing nations overseas by increasing the opportunities open to their young men and women for education and work experience. In a recent report he has described his "Exchange Peace Corps" proposal. It is an excellent proposal. Our Nation will benefit from the program as much as the nation it aids. I shall be pleased and proud to be able to support the corps.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Washington Post today, describing this program, be printed in the Record.

PEACE CORPS IN REVERSE

The President has announced that his projected International Education Act will provide for a new "Exchange Peace Corps" designed to bring foreign youths to the United States in a reverse twist of the 5-year-old Peace Corps program. Initially, the emphasis will be on helping plug the teacher gap in burgeoning primary and secondary school language courses. In California, for example, where most schools have singled out Spanish to meet a new language requirement in the fifth and sixth grades, a shortage of Spanish teachers has developed, and the Peace Corps is looking into the possible utility of Latin American exchange volunteers when the new program gets underway. But the underlying idea behind the Peace Corps in reverse goes beyond the schools. It envisages foreign youths working side by side with Americans in the war on poverty and other domestic social action programs in a partnership of equals.

This is an imaginative new departure, and one that could acquire symbolic importance in the entire U.S. relationship with the developing countries. It is no disrespect to what has been in many cases a record of admirable accomplishment to say that the Peace Corps has suffered from a built-in missionary flavor which has greatly weakened its appeal in the host countries. The idea of a one-way traffic of Americans has implicitly suggested a sort of latter-day white man's burden attitude, irrespective of whether or not individual volunteers have had such an attitude; and most of them, of course, have not. With the traffic running in both directions, the whole Peace Corps program will be on a strengthened psychological footing. And American communities will be brought closer to the world by the educative presence of foreign guests.

The new program should, however, be inaugurated in slow, experimentally phased stages with a realistic recognition of its limitations. More than a decade of experience in the foreign student exchange program has shown the pitfalls involved in bringing large numbers of young people from abroad and suddenly dumping them down in Middletown, U.S.A., without adequate preparation on their part or in the localities concerned. Many have failed to make the adjustment to life in a strange environment where they have been given the same independence accorded to American students. Many have gone home embittered, with a sense of alienation from the United States, thus defeating the basic internationalist objectives of the exchange effort.

The new Exchange Corps may be spared some of the inherent problems of foreign student exchanges in that its volunteers will be less likely to drift into isolated emigre islands cut off from U.S. life. Their jobs will by their nature bring them into direct contact with Americans on a daily basis and compel their interpenetration of our society. At the same time, for this very reason, there will be a peculiarly acute need for careful screening of the volunteers to find individuals meeting what should be exacting standards of maturity and motivation.

W. Meriwether Taken by Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has come to greatness because in every generation there have been gallant Americans who devoted their lives to their country, communities, and to their neighbors. One such American was William Winston Meriwether, of Paragould, Ark.

Bill, to countless friends throughout Arkansas, served gallantly in wartime and just as valiantly in time of peace. His passing on January 23, 1966, takes from this generation one of its greatest athletes and outstanding fine citizens. The news article from the Jonesboro, Ark., Evening Sun, of January 24, gives an account of his rich life and efforts in behalf of the Nation.

W. MERIWETHER TAKEN BY DEATH

William Winston (Bill) Meriwether, 61, of Paragould, retired merchant, member of a pioneer Greene County family and former commander of the Army Reserve battalion headquartered in Jonesboro, died Sunday.

For many years he was associated with his father, the late Robert W. Meriwether, in the operation of Meriwether Hardware Store in Paragould.

The store was started by his grandfather and was one of the first businesses to open in Greene County.

During World War II, he served in France and Germany, and he returned to active duty during the Korean war. After the Korean war, he became commander of the Reserve battalion headquartered here, retiring as a lieutenant colonel several years ago.

He was a private flier and active in the Paragould Airport Commission. He was civil defense director for Greene County.

He attended Paragould schools and graduated from Hendrix College at Conway, where he was an outstanding athlete. He set shotput and punting records in Arkansas that stood for many years. He played professional football at Memphis.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Rosalie Diffey Meriwether; a son, Bob Meriwether, of Conway; a daughter, Mrs. Eugene Rapley, of Fort Smith; two brothers, Ray Meriwether, of Paragould and Lilbourn Meriwether, of Colorado; and six grandchildren.

Graveside services will be held Tuesday morning at 10:30 at Linwood Cemetery at Paragould. Heath Funeral Service is in charge.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Bill Meriwether was a great natural athlete in football, baseball, and track. Especially was he adept when it came to punting a football. Bill established a record for having punted a football farther than any other person who ever lived. He starred on Hendrix College teams. His prowess as a baseball player brought eager scouts from major league teams who sought to sign him up. He was also a great swimmer. Bill Meriwether was a friendly and likable man. He loved his family; he loved his city, his State, and his country. I have lost a true friend in his passing.

Mr. Fred Wulfkuhler, editor of the Paragould Daily Press, on January 26 paid his respect to this giant:

VACANCY

Paragould is going to miss Bill Meriwether.

We're going to miss him behind the scenes—at the very next Belles 'n Beaux production, at the next Greene County Fair, at the next civil defense session, at the next airport commission meeting, and so forth. I could go on and on.

He, more often than not, was that unsung hero who got things done while others took the credit.

He was the artist who worked night and day to make sure that the hospital auxiliary could put on a professional production with professional scenery.

He was the guy who envisioned an airport that would do Paragould proud—and saw that it got off the drawing board and became a reality.

He was the architect for the Methodist parsonage, for the remodeling of the courthouse, and courtroom, for a new country club clubhouse, for a new motel * * *.

He was the fellow who could make thought buds bloom with his probing questions.

He was a man who, somehow, managed to leave his mark on a lot of people in his own way and in his own time.

He, according to Early Maxwell, longtime Memphis sports promoter whose proud Tigers once clawed the world champion Green Bay Packers, "could kick a football farther than any man who ever lived."

Only a Johnny Weismuller, when he was undisputed world champion, could beat Bill Meriwether at swimming.

He probably could have been a major league baseball pitcher, if he hadn't heeded his father's admonition to "come on home."

His AIC shotput record stood up for more than 30 years, and his discus mark also weathered many State track meets.

He was probably proudest of his hours as a Scoutmaster prior to World War II. And, if you don't think he was the best Scoutmaster ever—just ask one of the many men around town that served under him.

He was too young to serve in World War I. But, he made up his mind that he wasn't going to be too old for World War II. He volunteered as a private shortly before his 38th birthday and worked himself up—with combat action in both France and Germany—to the rank of major.

He commanded the Jonesboro National Guard unit, after the war, and then was called back to active duty during the Korean conflict. For nearly 2 years he led one contingent of Korean natives after another through combat training exercises like a "commando" some 20 years younger.

He was the proud grandfather who left an "atomic bomb" (war surplus rubber pontoon) up all summer so that his grandchildren and other youngsters could bounce to their hearts content—despite what it did to his lawn.

He was a real prime mover for Paragould—always behind the scenes, letting someone else take the bows, never asking for plaudits, ducking those who would laud his efforts.

He was, above all, an individualist who did what he wanted to do—and, could do anything well that he set his heart on doing.

Yes, Paragould is going to miss Bill Meriwether.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Nation and Arkansas also are going to miss Bill Meriwether. Mrs. Gathings and I would like to express condolences to the members of his family. My colleague, Hon. WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, an alumnus of Hendrix College, and a close friend of Bill and his family throughout the years, joins in these expressions and conveys sorrow at the news of his death.

The Bombing Resumes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in the Washington Daily News yesterday—and, I understand, in all the Scripps-Howard newspapers across the Nation—strongly supported the decision of President Johnson to resume the bombing of military targets in Communist North Vietnam.

The editorial pointed out, and I think all Americans should agree, that no nation in history has ever paused in the midst of war to make so many conciliatory overtures to an enemy. It went on to state, correctly, that "no enemy has been less provoked and more wrong, morally, in its aggression."

Under unanimous consent of the House, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD, so all may read it, the full text of this excellent editorial in support of our President:

THE BOMBING RESUMES

After 37 days of deliberate restraint, the United States—in agreement with the South Vietnamese—has resumed bombing military targets in Communist North Vietnam.

This is, quite plainly, a military necessity. Most Americans, in our judgment, would say it is about time. The risks of not trying to disrupt Communist supply sources, infiltration routes, and other assets of the North Vietnam invaders are substantial from the standpoint of the safety of the allied forces in the south.

But the South Vietnamese and the United States took these risks to give the Communists every opportunity, beyond doubt, to agree to something: a cease-fire, negotiations, a slowdown in the fighting.

President Johnson's statement yesterday morning summed up the situation exactly: We were urged to wait 10 to 20 days for a response from Hanoi. We waited 37 days, and got nothing. Meanwhile, Communist violence against the South Vietnamese and our own forces went on, even during the one-sided New Year truce.

The Vietnamese and our troops are anxious for peace, "but while there is no peace they are entitled to the full support of American strength and American determination."

Still, Mr. Johnson is not giving up on the hope that "talking is better than fighting." We have asked the United Nations Security Council to meet especially to deal with the Vietnam war. What the Security Council can do, or is willing to do, is a question. But the proposal shows how far this country has been willing to go in an effort to supplant the battle with debate at a conference table.

Surely no nation in history in the midst of a war ever made so many conciliatory overtures to an enemy. And no enemy has been less provoked and more wrong, morally, in its aggression.

The bombing may not persuade Ho Chi Minh and his backers to come and talk. It will help take the heat off the troops in combat.

But since the Communists won't even give a civil answer to the overtures for negotiation, or to world opinion, the only choice is to try another proposition—military pressure.

Our only objective is peace and freedom in South Vietnam. If this is not possible by negotiation, we simply will have to achieve it the hard way, by force.

Outstanding Citizen of 1965 Award to Hon F. Elwood Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of January 15, 1966, during its annual dinner at the Washington Hilton Hotel, he 47-year-old Kalorama Citizens Association presented its Outstanding Citizen of 1965 Award to my great and good friend, the Honorable F. Elwood Davis, president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

It has been my good fortune to know Mr. Davis for many years and to observe his progressive work in furthering the interest of the Nation's Capital. The award was well deserved and I congratulate the Kalorama Citizens Association upon its excellent choice.

Mr. Davis rightly deserves a lion's share of the credit for bringing about ratification of the 22d amendment to the Constitution which brought national suffrage to the citizens of the District of Columbia; and today he is laboring for District of Columbia representation in the House of Representatives.

He is a past president of the Kalorama Citizens Association; a past president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce (Jaycees); he is a distinguished member of the bar; he was chairman of the District of Columbia Committee for National Suffrage and he has performed numerous other valuable service for the people of the District of Columbia and the Greater Washington area.

Stanton C. Crawford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished American educator died recently, Acting Chancellor Stanton C. Crawford of the University of Pittsburgh.

It was Dr. Crawford who gave this great institution of higher learning strong leadership at a time of financial crisis, at a time of great turmoil. He had been associated with Pitt as a student, as a teacher, and as an administrator for more than four decades. To many he was the epitome of all that is great about this university.

Under leave to extend my remarks I ask that two editorials on Dr. Crawford be included at this point in the Record, the first from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 27, 1966, the other from the Pittsburgh Press of the same date.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, Jan. 27, 1966]

STANTON C. CRAWFORD

When the University of Pittsburgh needed a steady hand, Stanton C. Crawford was there. As acting chancellor during the university's dark days of fiscal instability, Dr. Crawford's experience, gained in over 40 years with Pitt, provided continuity with the past while becoming a rallying point to meet the troubled present. His sudden death yesterday is a sad blow, for Pitt still had need of his abilities.

No man could have welcomed the wearying task of holding the university together until a permanent chancellor could be selected. It was a difficult job presenting many problems. While seeking increased State support, the university was challenged to maintain the best of its curriculums, instructors and services in the face of transition. Dr. Crawford met the challenge.

He was a quietly competent administrator whose serious look was warmed by a kindliness that many teachers and students knew well. Dr. Crawford would have wanted to turn over his office in the best condition possible, under the circumstances, to his successor; but this was not to be. Instead, the university is left with the memory of his long and devoted stewardship. That is no small legacy.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Jan. 27, 1966]

STANTON C. CRAWFORD

The death of Acting Chancellor Stanton C. Crawford comes at an unfortunate time in the affairs of the University of Pittsburgh. No one was better qualified to represent the university, especially in a period of turmoil and transition.

Dr. Crawford had been at Pitt as student, teacher, and administrator since 1922. He had the rare ability to see the ups and downs of the university in perspective. To him, growth at Pitt was a constant process, not the result of any one regime, not the reflection of individual personalities.

His 7 months in the chancellor's chair at Pitt were demanding, perhaps too demanding for a man, 68, with a history of heart trouble. Many of the trustees were amazed at the vigor with which he assumed the leadership of the university.

The lasting contribution of Dr. Crawford was more than administrative, however.

He probably knew, and was admired by, more people in and around the Pitt community than anyone in town. There has been a great deal of genuine sorrow at his death, because he had many friends. The university will miss him, and so will we.

Never Forget the Year 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Minneapolis Spokesman carried an excellent editorial summing up the accomplishments during the past year in the area of Negro rights. The editorial was written by the editor and publisher of the Minneapolis Spokesman, Cecil E. Newman.

The editorial states:

> Slavery was abolished by constitutional decree in 1865. In no year since then has there been more effective legal and practical implementation of this decree than in the year just ending, 1965: The centennial of the ending of slavery * * *.
>
> This has been a year to remember. It is a year that belongs to history as a time of tremendous strides by and for the Negro people, and by the same token, of all downtrodden people, everywhere. Let us never forget it.

Much was accomplished last year, but much more still remains to be done. With this year of progress behind us, we Americans should go on to much greater achievements during 1966 and succeeding years. We must hurry, for we are very late in redeeming the promises made in 1865.

Under unanimous consent, I include the full text of the Minneapolis Spokesman's editorial.

NEVER FORGET THE YEAR 1965

Slavery was abolished by constitutional decree in 1865. In no year since then has there been more effective legal and practical implementation of this decree than in the year just ending, 1965: the centennial of the ending of slavery.

Voting rights, job rights, the rights to full educational opportunities, the rights to the privileges and duties of first-class citizenship—all of these moved many steps forward during 1965. We got not only the Civil Rights Act, we got also a determined and effective Federal program to enforce it. We got not only substantial progress against massive resistance to school integration, we got also a very tough policy from the Office of Education toward backsliding school systems—including St. Paul's.

Aside from constitutional and legal protections, we saw during the year a great flowering of Negro and civil rights endeavor to do for ourselves what the law could not, and to make the fullest possible use of the law. Thus the Negro voting power outside of the big cities has become for the first time a formidable force because Negroes have braved the terror of the southern white supremacists to register and vote. They did this in surprising numbers, knowing that the penalty could be loss of jobs and credit, eviction from homes and farms, abuse, mutilation and murder.

Surely, in the entire history of human aspiration for freedom there has seldom been such a demonstration of fortitude and determination as we have seen during the year just ending. Southern arrogance and tyranny have been met with massive, passive resistance; southern violence with courageous and determined nonviolence.

Progress was not only in the South. The attacks on discrimination made unemployment, discrimination made substandard housing and discrimination made substandard schooling are already getting results on a monumental scale, North, and South—results we would not have dreamed of at the beginning of 1965.

This has been a year to remember. It is a year that belongs to history as a time of tremendous strides by and for the Negro people, and by the same token, of all downtrodden people, everywhere. Let us never forget it.

Matching Skills to Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 11167, the Human Investment Act, I am pleased to note the editorial support that this and other identical bills have received from an outstanding newspaper such as the Chicago Daily News. I insert, therefore, in the Record at this point in my remarks, the editorial of January 24 in that paper:

MATCHING SKILLS TO JOBS

The U.S. Department of Labor estimates that there are some 100,000 job openings in the Chicago-Gary area. Yet 90,000 persons are without work, and some have remained unemployed for weeks and even months.

John D. deButts, president of the Illinois Bell Telephone Co. and chairman of the Chicago Merit Employment Committee, has pointed to a principal cause of this poverty amid plenty: The low skills of the unemployed do not match the requirements of the available jobs.

The national unemployment rate is now 4.1 percent, the lowest in almost 9 years. Most of the 2,900,000 without jobs are in specific economic backwaters, particularly Negro areas of the big cities, where education is poor and skills low. Unemployment in such areas runs upward of 25 percent.

DeButts urged local businesses to adopt a hire-first, train-later policy to get the unskilled off the relief rolls and onto the productive payrolls as soon as possible.

This policy, too, formed part of the GOP "state of the Union message," of House leader, Representative Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan. He urged enactment of the Republican-sponsored human investment bill that would grant a 7-percent tax credit to encourage businesses to employ and train persons with limited education and skills.

Such a tax credit parallels a 7-percent allowance enacted more than 3 years ago to spur investment in machinery, plant, and equipment.

The GOP bill stipulates that a successful trainee must be offered a job. It applies only to persons at the bottom of the skills and income ladder. Industry could not use the tax credit, for instance, in the training of professional, management, or advanced scientific personnel.

This approach is more promising than many now used in the war on poverty. It combines, in Ford's words, "compassion with competence"—compassion for the needy with the competence of American business to train men economically.

The bill requires no increased Federal control, and avoids the waste of collecting tax money and then disbursing it.

Developing skills and matching them to available jobs is a key to clearing out stubborn pockets of unemployment and poverty. Congress should pass the human investment bill.

Saving the Hudson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the conservation of scenic and historic areas throughout our Nation is one of the major programs of the Johnson administration. In my own State of New York we are faced with a serious crisis in the efforts to preserve the beauties of the Hudson River Valley.

It is my belief that the Federal Government must assist in this particular project and I have sponsored H.R. 10898, which would provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York.

An excellent editorial pointing up some of the problems involved appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 1, 1966, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

SAVING THE HUDSON

The Hudson River Valley Commission, appointed by Governor Rockefeller last March and headed by his conservationist brother Laurance, comes to commendable grips with a great public question. The issue is simple: shall New York State develop a program for saving and enhancing the Hudson Valley's manifold values, or is this great asset to go on to destruction? The commission replies forcefully in favor of a permanent organizaton of New York, New Jersey, and the Federal and local governments for vigorous guidance of future growth in line with best interests of all concerned.

The first value of the present report is that it recognizes facts. Pollution, scarring, industrial squalor, billboards, and uncoordinated sprawl are all seen plainly, but not condoned. The need is stated for zoning and selective development, for the easement principle in private conservation and the cluster idea in residential subdivisions. The report is concerned with the requirements of industry and transportation, but equally with beauty and recreation.

The challenge is to devise an effective plan "to anticipate the potential conflicts before they reach the collision stage." Here the objective is action by prevention. The proposed intergovernmental commission would lead the planning efforts, but it would also be able to act instantly in saving scenic and historic areas now threatened. A $100 million joint fund is proposed for the long pull. Thus money is the first lever. As another source of pressure the permanent commission would review all projects, such as utility plants, and trust that an adverse report would so arouse public opinion that the river and valley would become secure.

Mr. Laurance Rockefeller's commission is optimistic about foresighted management and the public's inherent force. As a case in point, would Con Edison have proposed the Storm King Mountain plant if the State had been on guard earlier? We doubt it. For the Rockefeller report says specifically that economics isn't everything, that scenery comes first at Storm King, and that "the plant should not be built if a feasible alternative can be found." This contradicts Governor Rockefeller's espousal of Con Edison, but the commission argues that "we should not necessarily destroy one value to create another."

For vigor and courage, the program is to be applauded. By proper planning and investment, a great resource can and will be protected for the future.

First Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, when the mighty Maginot line crumbled we read a lesson for all time to come.

A nation may build big guns and mightly walls of defense, but the first defense of a nation lies in the hearts and minds of the people.

In America we realize this when we strive to build a Great Society. We wage wars on poverty and ignorance and disease. We strive to provide the best education for our children, to provide them with all opportunities to find the good life.

It was fitting that President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, made it clear that if financial sacrifices are required for Vietnam, they should not be required from the poor and underprivileged. These people must be given every chance to be brought into the mainstream of life.

It would be, as the President said, a victory for the Communists if they should succeed in forcing discontinuation or reduction of efforts to improve the lot of the American people who need help. The Houston Post commented on this and other aspects of the state of the Union address. I offer the article for the Record.

L.B.J. EXPRESSES MOOD OF NATION

President Johnson, in his state of the Union message to Congress, succeeded admirably in giving expression to the prevailing mood of the Nation at this time. It is a mood in which there is commingling of frustration, hope, confidence and determination, all overshadowed to some extent by a strong element of uncertainty as to precisely what the future will bring. The result is a mood that is somber and serious but definitely not despairing.

There was frustration in the speech because of the lack of any encouraging response to this country's efforts to end the fighting in Vietnam and to help men everywhere achieve a better life. There was hope that ways yet can be found to substitute humaneness for savagery in human relations.

There was confidence that this country is big and strong enough to do whatever it must do in Vietnam and elsewhere abroad without abandoning its domestic goals. There was a firm statement of the Nation's determination to continue to defend freedom and the national interest by resisting Communist aggression and keeping the commitments it has made to others.

But overhanging all this still was the uncertainty about what future developments will require.

Buried in the President's discussion of the war in Vietnam and not emphasized especially was what amounted to an alternative offer to the Communist leaders of North Vietnam if they are unwilling or unable to participate in formal peace negotiations at this time. The President said that this country would respond to any reduction in the use of force in Vietnam. He suggested that there could be a deescalation rather than escalation of the war, without any formal agreement or peace discussions at all.

There always has been a possibility that this is what might happen in Vietnam if the Communists ever became convinced that they could not succeed at this time in their efforts to take over South Vietnam by force, terror and subversion. It has happened elsewhere, notably in Malaya. And it is consistent with the overall Communist strategy of pushing hard at selected points believed or hoped to be weak spots in the free world's wall of resistence to Communist expansion and then withdrawing if it is found that headway cannot be made at the particular time and place.

Domestically, although the President made a long list of legislative recommendations and called for unabated efforts to build the Great Society and fight poverty, no large-scale new spending was proposed. Because of a belief that prosperity and sound economic growth will continue, he does not think that the Nation must make a choice between guns and butter, or at least not very much of a choice.

His answer to those who have been saying that welfare programs must be curtailed because of the cost of the war in Vietnam was a very high estimate of Federal revenues in the 1967 fiscal year, which, if realized, would result in an almost balanced budget without any major tax increase.

The real heart of the message was in this statement: "I believe that we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam. But if some do not believe this then, in the name of justice, let them call for the contribution of those who live in the fullness of our blessing, rather than strip it from the hands of those in need."

Or, to put it bluntly, the poor and the underprivileged should not be the ones required to pay the cost of the war if financial sacrifices are required.

It would be, as the President said, a victory for the Communists if, as a result of their aggressive efforts in Vietnam and elsewhere, they should succeed in forcing discontinuation, abandonment, or reduction of efforts to improve the lot of the American people so that all can share in the good life that is possible.

Contempt Proceedings in the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, like the vast majority of my fellow American citizens, I oppose the violence and extremism that has been characteristic of the activities of the Ku Klux Klan just as I resist the conspiratorial efforts of the far left. The issue before us in the recommital motion presented by my Republican colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable Silvio Conte, represents an effort to improve and make more fair the contempt proceedings of the House of Representatives as these procedures will apply to all parties falling within the jurisdiction of this House.

Pure and Simple Juggling in Budget Preparation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert the following article from the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News of January 25, 1966:

Pure and Simple Juggling Is the Primary Talent in Budget Preparation

(By Jack W. Gore)

In attempting to analyze President Johnson's new budget, there are several points which must be kept well in mind before any firm conclusions can be drawn.

To begin with, it must be recognized that Federal budgetmaking can hardly be termed an exact science. At best, even the most conscientious budgetmakers can only come up with educated guesses in regard to Government income and expenditures, as they can no more foretell the course of future events than anybody else.

It should also be remembered that the budget presented to Congress by the President yesterday covers a fiscal year that doesn't start until next July 1 and doesn't end until June 30 of 1967. Thus, any number of things can happen over the next 18 months to alter just about everything in this massive estimate of Government revenue and Government spending.

Another point to remember is that figures can be juggled around to prove most anything any President or his advisers want to prove. Revenues can be overestimated and expenses underestimated in such a fashion as to make it appear the Government is only going to operate on a minor deficit level when just the opposite situation is almost certain to prove true.

To emphasize this fact it is only necessary to note that President Johnson asked the Congress just a few days ago for some $12 billion more than had originally been requested in his current budget to meet the soaring costs of the war in Vietnam. Much of this extra money will not be used during the current budget year, but by requesting the funds now Mr. Johnson has been able to reduce next year's military budget sufficiently to brag about the small deficit his new budget predicts.

This is bookkeeping juggling pure and simple, yet by resorting to this sort of thing Mr. Johnson hopes to persuade the Congress that this Nation can well afford not only to fight a very costly war but also to greatly increase the amount of money he wishes to pour into the expansion of his Great Society program.

The President is also hoping to achieve another objective through his figure juggling techniques. The prospect of just a small budget deficit in the upcoming fiscal year is nowhere near as frightening from an inflationary standpoint as a great big deficit would be.

And since the President has declared war on inflation, he hardly wants to put himself in a position of advocating such a tremendous budget deficit next year as to give powerful impetus to the inflationary cycle that has already started.

In this respect it must be noted that Mr. Johnson has carefully prepared an escape hatch for himself should his present estimates of spending an revenue prove to be highly unrealistic. He has stated that should higher expenditures become necessary to carry on the war in Vietnam, or should a strong inflationary trend develop, he will not hesitate to ask Congress for additional money or to seek higher taxes.

Thus, the President hasn't put himself so far out on a limb with his new budget he can't crawl back to safety should it start to snap. If the figure juggling he has done backfires on him later in the year, he can then ask for more money and higher taxes and still say it is in line with what he said he would do when he presented the budget to Congress.

In the meantime he can claim credit for coming up with an almost balanced budget without sacrificing either guns or butter. The fact that this accomplishment was made possible through such sleight-of-hand practices as speeding up tax payments to provide the Government with an additional $4.5 billion in revenue without actually raising taxes will largely be overlooked for the present as most people tend to look at results instead of how such results are to be accomplished.

President Johnson has never been one to give the American people bad news in one big jolt. He likes to parcel it out a little at a time in the manner he has done in regard to the Vietnam conflict. Last summer, it will be recalled, he permitted all kinds of stories to circulate about how he was preparing to declare a national emergency, call up the reserves, and greatly increase the draft call in order to meet our added commitments to Vietnam. Thus, when he took to the airwaves to announce that a troop buildup had become necessary but that it wouldn't yet require the declaration of a national emergency, calling up the reserves, or greatly increasing the draft call, the collective sighs of relief from our people just about obliterated the full significance of what the announced troop buildup would eventually demand in the way of extra money, extra manpower, and added risk.

Now the President is using the same soft-sell techniques with his new budget. By juggling figures, postponing tax cuts and creating the impression we can fight a war and still pour more money into the Great Society, he glosses over the bad news in his budget which is reflected in the fact that even the President cannot say he won't have to come back later and ask for new taxes to cover the profligate spending he has asked the Congress to approve.

South Vietnam and Social Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I fear that in our preoccupation with the military aspects of the war in Vietnam, we have forgotten that we are dealing with what is essentially a revolutionary situation. The New York Post, in a perceptive editorial based on the experiences of one of its writers in the field, reminds us of the deep discontent that has made the Vietnamese people vulnerable to the penetration of the Vietcong. I commend this editorial to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent for permission to insert it into the Record.

[From the New York Post, Jan. 28, 1966]

From Our Man in Saigon

Post Columnist Pete Hamill's dispatches from Vietnam have given us all a more concrete and human understanding of somber Vietnamese realities.

His report yesterday brought into sharp focus the underlying frustration of the U.S. effort in Vietnam. Hamill's account of the Vietcong doctor who defected to the south only to discover that General Ky's officialdom will not permit him to practice medicine in an area starved for medical services led Hamill to a grim conclusion about South Vietnam's bureaucracy. It is a dreary lot and "we find ourselves as a nation defending the status quo in a situation that begs for revolution."

Hamill added: "In a country that is 90 percent agricultural, where 45 percent of the land is owned by 2 percent of the people, neither we nor our allies will ever whisper the words 'agrarian reform.'" Why?

U.S. spokesmen speak of "aggression from the north." Certainly Hanoi has fueled and fanned the flames of discontent in the south. But they may become a raging bonfire because of the inability or unwillingness of the privileged thin crust ruling Saigon to accept the view that governments exist for the benefit of their people. And this may be the heart of the problem we confront—larger than any debate over strategic military moves.

Federal Tax Plan Would Erode State Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for reprinting in the Congressional Record, an editorial from the Florida Times-Union, on the subject of proposed uniform tax systems set forth in H.R. 11798, entitled "Federal Tax Plans Will Erode State Powers." The editorial gives a clear, but disturbing picture of the effect of the proposed legislation in Florida and elsewhere. In this connection, attention is called to the fact that Florida State Comptroller Fred O. Dickinson, Jr., appeared Wednesday, February 2, before a House Judiciary Subcommittee in opposition to the measure.

The editorial follows:

Federal Tax Plan Would Erode State Powers

The appearance of Florida's two top officials in the field of finance and taxation as protesting witnesses as congressional hearings tomorrow on a proposed uniform taxation system bears testimony to the justifiable concern with which Florida authorities view the scheme.

State Comptroller Fred O. Dickinson, Jr., will appear as spokesman for the State government, and will be accompanied in his presentation by State Revenue Commission Director J. Ed Straughn.

The bill purports to eliminate multiple taxation on businesses operating in several States by setting up a system requiring such firms to file a single report with the Federal Government, on the basis of which States concerned would collect taxes due.

In attempting to relieve a relatively small problem, however, the proposal would impose new and far more restrictive limitations on the taxing power of the States beyond those now accepted by the courts. It would make mandatory sweeping changes in State tax policies and practices, which officials estimate would cost Florida taxpayers about $72 million a year. Finally, the bill is viewed with alarm by State officials as a further intrusion of Federal power into State affairs which would lead to the ultimate destruction of State fiscal sovereignty through imposition of Federal controls.

Under the bill, for example, States would be prohibited from imposing income taxes, capital stock taxes, and gross receipt taxes on out-of-State businesses operating within their borders unless their legislatures adopted the uniform tax system set up under it.

Governor Burns and the full cabinet have formally gone on record in opposition to the proposal, as has the interim State tax study commission headed by Senator B. C. Pearce, of Palatka.

The proposal is another notable example of using some ostensibly desirable reform as an appealing front to accomplish a purpose which the public would never willingly accept if advanced forthrightly.

If the present system for collecting State taxes on out-of-State businesses imposes undue hardships on such businesses, it should be relatively simple to provide relief without wrecking the system and imposing shackles on the States in the process. The provisions of the bill which extend beyond that stated purpose, however, support the strong suspicion that its real purpose is not to eliminate inconvenience to a limited number of businesses, but to drive another deep wedge to separate the States from the administration of their own affairs.

Message of Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the entire country was reassured when its President expressed his view that this Nation and its people are strong enough to meet our commitments abroad and face up to our obligations at home at the same time.

In his state of the Union speech, President Johnson made an expression of confidence of the ability of this Nation.

The President said, quite simply:

> I believe we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam.

The sweep of his domestic proposals was startling, the Houston Chronicle stated editorially.

The editorial, one of many in praise of the state of the Union message, will be of interest to my colleagues, and I offer it for the RECORD.

THE STATE OF THE UNION

President Johnson was eloquent in his state of the Union address last night although he offered the Nation no surprises in his assessment of the war in Vietnam. On the domestic front, however, the sweep of his proposals was startling. He has asked Congress for enough new legislation to keep its second session almost as busy as was the frantic first session. Those who expected a letup in the Great Society were put straight almost from the moment the President began to speak.

This was Mr. Johnson's first full-scale television address since early October. He appeared healthy and physically up to the occasion. His face seemed more deeply lined than usual perhaps. His demeanor was enthusiastic when he spoke of his domestic program; sober and measured when he spoke of Vietnam.

The Nation, perhaps, had hoped Mr. Johnson could reveal some dramatic new development in the Vietnam conflict. In that sense, his words were disappointing, for clearly nothing new has occurred since the beginning of his peace offensive to justify high hopes for a negotiated settlement. Instead, the President reiterated the now familiar U.S. stand—peace as soon as possible, but peace only after aggression is halted.

"Let me be absolutely clear," he said in one of his most dramatic passages. "The days may become months, and the months may become years, but we will stay as long as aggression commands us to battle."

Mr. Johnson clearly has rejected the guns-or-butter choice which many have said has been forced on the country.

"We will not permit those who fire on us in Vietnam to win a victory over the desires and intentions of the American people. This Nation is mighty enough—its society healthy enough—its people strong enough—to pursue our goals in the rest of the world while building a Great Society at home."

Few had expected the President to be so ambitious in his request of Congress. In the field of civil rights, he was especially bold. He asked legislation to end discrimination in jury selection—a highly controversial issue; new laws to punish in Federal courts those who murder, attack, or intimidate civil rights workers; new legislation to ban racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. There will be a battle, surely, over these measures.

He asked, also, for a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation; for 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives; for development of a supersonic transport airplane to fly three times the speed of sound; for new measures to deal with strikes which threaten the national interest—this, incidentally, to considerable applause from Congress; for a new attack on river and stream pollution; for Federal highway safety legislation; and on and on.

In the foreign field, the President seeks a much needed "new and daring direction" to the foreign aid program and also an expansion of trade between this Nation and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The former will be welcomed, no doubt, but the latter will make the sparks fly.

And so will Mr. Johnson's proposal to increase taxes on telephone service and new cars—cut just 2 weeks ago. That increase would help finance the rising cost of the war, but it is evident that Mr. Johnson has no desire for widescale tax increases in this election year. He expects the Federal budget to rise to $112.8 billion—the highest ever—but he intends to hold the deficit to a slim $1.8 billion. If he can do this, he will surprise many doubting Thomases.

In sum, it was an ambitious, exciting domestic program which the President outlined, and a restrained, though straightforward appraisal of the future in Vietnam.

Bombs and Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made the only possible choice in resuming the bombing of North Vietnam. The United States pursued every honorable means during the bombing lull in an effort to secure a cease-fire and the negotiation of a peaceful settlement.

We were answered with denunciations instead of negotiations.

As pointed out in the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 1, 1966, President Johnson has coupled the resumption of bombing raids with a further effort toward peace. I know his efforts will continue.

I commend the Tribune editorial to the attention of our colleagues:

BOMBS AND RESOLUTIONS

In announcing the resumption of bombing attacks on North Vietnam, President Johnson made it plain that this was the result of the considered judgment of the responsible military and political agencies of the American government. And that judgment can only be seriously contested on the assumption that the United States has no business in Vietnam at all.

For the bombing pause failed to produce any hint from Hanoi that it was willing to sit down at the conference table. It not only continued to insist on acceptance of its original four points (which would mean total victory for the Vietcong) but has added, as the British Foreign Office terms it, "a new and even more unacceptable prior condition"—recognition of the Vietcong as "the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam."

Since Ho Chi Minh insists on war or surrender, he must have war. No American can feel happy at being presented with this choice. But since it has been made so abundantly clear by the rejection of President Johnson's peace overtures, few Americans would want to endanger the lives of their men in Vietnam by a continued withholding of the means to strike at North Vietnamese supply routes, or allow Ho to work his wicked will from sanctuary.

At the same time, the United States is fighting this war to end it, and the President has given renewed evidence of American determination in this respect by taking the case formally to the United Nations.

This has not been done before for several reasons. In the first place, the only international body which had been seized of the Vietnamese dispute was the Geneva conference of 1954. That body could be recalled to discuss the problem; the British Government, as one co-chairman, has been trying to do so. The Soviet Union, the other cochairman, has refused.

There is also the fact that neither North Vietnam nor Red China, the power prodding Ho Chi Minh toward continued war, is a member of the U.N., and both have repeatedly and explicitly denied that the U.N. has any role to play in their affairs.

The American resolution, however, does not set forth specific terms for a settlement, or even outline fixed steps toward a settlement—which would almost certainly have brought immediate rejection by Hanoi. Rather, the American proposal would place the Security Council officially in back of a general search for peace, such as the United States has already, informally, asked the U.N. to undertake. This would include a conference, with the objective of applying the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 (the latter concerned Laos) and of setting up and supervising a cease-fire. Composition of the conference is not spelled out; the door remains open for mediation or arbitration, as suggested by Pope Paul.

The effect of such a resolution would bring pressure upon the Soviet Union to do what it has thus far refused to do—sponsor another session of the Geneva conference. It would also, if adopted (or even if accepted by a majority and lost through a Soviet veto) furnish Security Council support for American peace efforts. And in any case, by accompanying the bombs with a resolution, President Johnson dramatizes anew the American position: to fight if necessary; to negotiate if possible.

Resumption of Bombings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep disappointment and regret that President Johnson felt it necessary this week to resume the bombings in North Vietnam.

Some time ago I joined with several of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in voicing to the President our considered thought on this vitally important subject. In our letter, we enthusiastically endorsed the month-long bombing pause over North Vietnam as an imaginative and integral part in the President's worldwide diplomatic peace offensive.

Specifically, we declared:

> While the response from the other side has not been encouraging, we do not believe we should yet assume that the door has been firmly closed. We cannot expect that a conflict which has raged so bitterly for so long will be quickly or easily resolved. Neither can we ignore the alternative to negotiations, a prolonged and probably expanded war with attendant costs in human suffering and material resources. * * * We recognize that there are those who urge a resumption of bombings of North Vietnam and a premature abandonment of our peace efforts. We are, however, concerned that unless we can halt or reverse the escalation of the last months it will become increasingly difficult to achieve a further pause, a cease-fire, and meanginful negotiations. We urge you, therefore, to continue your present determined search for peace until such time as it becomes clear that no reasonable hope remains for a just settlement by peaceful means.

Because of the great danger of continued escalation of the conflict in southeast Asia, I had joined in the hopes and prayers of millions of Americans that it would not be necessary to resume the aerial bombings in the North.

It was our fervent desire that the initial pause could be followed by a more general reduction in hostilities both on the ground and in the air—in the south as well as in the north—and that the other side would join us in such a de facto deescalation of the fighting, which in turn could lead to some kind of cease-fire with unconditional discussions of the overall problems of peace in that entire area.

Certainly, the President is to be congratulated on his decision to bring the situation in Vietnam before the United Nations as an additional step in his effort to explore every possibility of promoting the cause of peace in that war-torn part of the world.

But it seems to me that it was most unfortunate that the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam was not deferred at least until there was some evidence of the success or failure of the President's outstanding effort to enlist the help of the U.N. in finding a peaceful and honorable settlement of the conflict in Vietnam.

A Vanishing Breed: The Good Policeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are sinister forces at work throughout the country attempting to undermine basic respect for law and order, which has been one of our fundamental national virtues.

Columnist John Vrtis, writing in the Suburban Life, devotes attention to the very crucial question, that of the maintenance of an effective police force by our local communities. His direct comments apply to communities in suburban Cook County, Ill., but the overall question under discussion is pertinent to all areas of the country.

A VANISHING BREED: THE GOOD POLICEMAN

(By John Vrtis)

Unless the trend is reversed almost immediately, the current population in the western suburbs is likely to be smothered by a breakdown of law and order.

With the almost infinite stealth of a burglar, an alarming situation has crept upon us where quality policemen are a vanishing breed.

Examples are legion in Chicagoland and elsewhere, but one of the most dramatic illustrations can be found in Downers Grove where eight positions in the force, over one-fourth of the total complement, will soon be unfilled.

Five patrolman positions have been open since January 1, 1965, a sergeant left in November, a patrolman left this month, and another officer has tendered a resignation which becomes effective this week.

There may have been others who have left, but it is kind of hard to keep track of departures from a given police force these days.

Not so with the comings. Not one policeman has joined the Downers Grove force since January 1, 1965, and this situation is not unusual elsewhere.

Why? There is the irritating, but minor, case of a village police and fire commission which refused to publicize a recent civil service test for police candidates beyond the legal minimum, despite an obvious need.

The principal causes, however, extend far beyond shortsighted officials and touch each of us. Even in today's courts, few of us could escape indictment on at least one of the following six charges.

(1) Respect for law and order is out of fashion. Ask any cop and he will tell you that today's youngsters and many adults think more of Darwin's law of the survival of the fittest than of the Ten Commandments. Where once the officer on the corner was like a John Wayne with the kiddies, today he is on a par with Mickey Mouse in meaning, if not in amusement, among members of the "beat" generation.

(2) Court and legislative support for policemen is virtually nonexistent. Volumes could be printed on this, but any conscientious officer has got to be demoralized when many of his best crime-fighting techniques are inadmissible in court; when a single technicality will overturn an "airtight" case; and, where convictions are obtained, see light sentences imposed that can only serve to encourage present and would-be criminals.

It appears that the present stream of legal and legislative decisions protecting rights of individuals is pushing the right of a community to law and order into the gutter as just so much "rubbish." Police state measures can never be permitted under our form of government, but neither can unbridled individual freedom. Some balance between extremes must be sought * * * and found.

(3) Policemen are often more on the defensive than the offensive. Recall last year's unfortunate incident in Chicago where a much decorated officer was put "on the carpet" for defending himself against assault by a prisoner.

Front-page publicity did manage to conjure a stream of protest, but the incident only brought more clearly into focus the erosion of self-respect and authority that once was the hallmark of a police officer.

(4) Policemen are not paid enough. Almost any union man makes more than he does, yet a police officer is called upon to have the wisdom of Solomon, the mercy of Christ, and the courage of a frontline marine.

If the cop ever does anything wrong, he is held up for public ridicule like a Judas, and when he does something right, it usually goes unrecognized until he fails to do it in the future.

Yet all of this time the same cop is packing a gun to protect us and the quality of his performance will surely reflect itself in the community. His low pay does not make sense.

(5) Youngsters are "smart" enough to look upon police efforts to maintain order as a challenge rather than a necessity. Elementary schools, to the extent that they push youngsters to new educational peaks before they have the maturity to wield their knowledge responsibility, share in the blame. Maybe proportionately more time should be "wasted" on teaching youngsters a sense of responsibility.

(6) Parents and adults are failing in their responsibilities. Discipline begins in the home, but where parents abandon their children night and day, or otherwise fail to give them the care and affection they need, it can be no wonder that the kids will grow up with an "independent" mind. Ask any officer how many parents have said to them, "I never thought it would happen to my child." Will you be the next to say it?

Of course, there is no pat answer to the disintegration of respect for law and authority which confronts us, except perhaps if we were to listen more to the pleadings of our ministers and priests.

But it is safe to assert that recognition of the problem and interest in its solution will help. An avalance can be started by a small piece of snow, once set in motion.

Start the ball rolling. Set an example of respect for authority, and instill it in your children. Then let your municipal officials know how highly you regard the maintenance of law and order in your community.

Would we do less if anything other than a lack of quality policemen threatened the safety of our homes and communities?

Is There an H-Bomb Under Your Bed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Soviets are working on a program under which U.S. military and industrial installations could be blown up by "pocket" nuclear bombs planted by Communist agents in our country.

The Soviet Secret Police, the KGB, are in charge of this guerrilla nuclear bomb operations through an organization named the Partisan Directorate. Their weapons delivery system is called multiple ambulatory nucleonics—MAN for short.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to introduce in the RECORD an article detailing this threat to our survival by Columnist Ralph de Toledano, of the King Features Syndicate, and distributed under the title "Is There an H-Bomb Under Your Bed?"

The article follows:

IS THERE AN H-BOMB UNDER YOUR BED?

(By Ralph de Toledano)

"Peaceful coexistence" is a term which in the Communist world translates as "subversive warfare." No matter how much and how often the Kremlin protests that it is seeking peaceful competition with the free world, it cannot deny that one of the most important functions of its KGB—successor to the MKVD secret police—is the partisan directorate.

This may sound inocuous enough, but it represents the Soviet Union's major effort against the West. Every guerrilla unit under Communist discipline gets its direction from the partisan directorate. Every Communist Party member may be tapped by this arm of the KGB for subversive work or sabotage. The Kremlin spends untold millions of dollars on the training of effectives for its insurgency program. Schools are run in the Soviet Union to teach the fine points of this kind of underground warfare.

What has this got to do with you and me? We don't expect an American version of the Vietcong or the Castro 26th of July movement to begin operating in the Black Hills or Okeefenokee Swamp. And in another era, we could brush aside the possibility of having partisan directorate units at work in the United States.

But something new has been added—nuclear weaponry. And that makes all the difference. Years ago, Medford Evans, recently out of the Atomic Energy Commission, warned that portable components of a nuclear bomb could be smuggled into the United States and assembled here. This would make ICBM bombing of our cities by the Soviet unnecessary. Instead, these bombs could be planted exactly where they would do the most damage and then detonated at the will of the Kremlin.

Mr. Evans received the sneers and contumely of the liberals for his efforts to alert the American Government and people. But his predictions were not fantastic at all. From a variety of reliable intelligence sources comes the report that portable atomic demolition bombs have been under production in the Soviet Union for some time.

These reports are highly detailed. The Soviets have one atomic demolition bomb that weighs about 75 pounds, is less than 20 inches in length, and packs a wallop equivalent to 100 tons of TNT. A far more powerful bomb, with a yield of five-tenths of 1 kiloton (or 500 tons of TNT), is a two-part infernal machine. Each part weighs about 75 pounds and can be put together in less than half an hour.

According to one intelligence source, these partisan directorate atomic weapons have been stored in Cuba, for easy entry into the United States. Soviet embassies in several Latin American countries—including Mexico—have also become arsenals of these hand-carried nuclear weapons. They are equipped with timing devices to protect those who plant them.

The potential of this partisan directorate activity can best be assessed if one recalls an FBI estimate of several years ago. According to this estimate, there are some 5,000 trained agents of the Kremlin in the United States with ready access to our critical industrial and military installations.

Bringing these nuclear demolition devices into the country offers few problems to the Kremlin. All shipments to the Soviet Embassy in Washington are protected by diplomatic immunity. If the State Department succeeds in getting Congress to approve a new consular treaty with the Soviet Union, then there will be hiding places for these bombs in the Nation's key cities. Several of these bombs could devastate New York Harbor and the Golden Gate of San Francisco.

Even without the convenience of consular offices, portable nuclear bombs can be stashed away at secret locations purchased by front men for the Communist apparatus in the United States and manned by partisan directorate personnel. Intelligence experts are reasonably sure that these bombs have not yet been brought into the country—but the operative phrase here is "not yet." Obviously, the Kremlin will not begin to move its nuclear demolition forces at a time when it is trying to lure the American Government into acceptance of its peaceful intentions. But it would be only a matter of days between a decision to move them in and the accomplished fact.

The Communists don't waste their manpower in so futile an exercise. What we may have at any moment is an H-bomb ready to blast where we lay our military and industrial heads to sleep.

Let's Act Quickly on Vets Benefits Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent adjournment of Congress, it was my great privilege to visit with members of our Armed Forces on the battleline in Vietnam.

The most common question asked of me by these valiant young men was whether, in my opinion, this Congress would enact a Veteran's benefit bill to enable them to pursue their education, and ease the burden of readjustment to civilian life. I assured them that from my personal conversations with many of my colleagues, in my judgment, this Congress would not ignore the great need to help the veterans who have sacrified so much in the cause of freedom. And I gave them my promise that I certainly would do all I could to help in getting such legislation passed.

Today, I keep my promise to these valiant men who serve our Nation in our Armed Forces.

Today, I have introduced a bill to provide educational assistance for all veterans who served after January 31, 1955, and to provide for loan guarantee provisions for housing. This bill also makes a number of miscellaneous provisions, in my judgment, long needed to assist the veterans regardless of whether their service was classed as peacetime or wartime. My bill is identical to that introduced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Representative OLIN TEAGUE, the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

This bill provides a permanent program of education assistance for individuals serving after January 31, 1955, on the basis of a month of training for each month, or fraction thereof, of service, not to exceed 36 calendar months. The rates for full-time training set at $100 per month for a single veteran, $125 for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 for a veteran with more than one dependent, and proportionate rates for less than full time.

The education provisions are effective June 1, 1966, and education must be completed within 8 years of the date of discharge.

This bill provides for guaranteed and direct loans, with the VA guaranteeing as much as a maximum of $7,500 of any loan by private lenders, and authorizes direct loans where private financing is not available to a maximum of $17,500.

Among the miscellaneous provisions of the bill:

Extends presumptions on chronic and tropical diseases.

Grants medical care for non-service-connected veterans.

Provides job counseling and job placement assistance.

Authorizes a flag to drape the casket of veterans of this service.

Grants preference in Federal employment.

Amends the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act to increase the protection of individuals who are renting homes when they are called into service from the $80 monthly rental to $150.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I do not serve on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I certainly do not class myself as an expert on veterans legislation. I introduce this bill today because I have a deep concern for the sacrifice we are asking of our young men at a most critical time in their lives.

We have, as my colleagues well know, enacted broad programs for those veterans who served in wartime. But I say to you that the wounds are just as deep, the blood just as red, and the grave just as final a resting place in the Dominican

Republic, or in Vietnam, as it was on the battlefields of a formally declared World War II.

All of us here know there will be some opposition to enactment of this program. There are those, both in and out of the administration, who will oppose it primarily because of the cost.

But I say to you—if this Congress and the American taxpayers can be asked to underwrite the massive cost of educating the ignorant of the world—then we have the duty to see to it first that those veterans who gave so much to protect the world receive first consideration.

Mr. Speaker, no man in Congress is more aware of the needs of our veterans than our distinguished friend, "TIGER" TEAGUE. He has earned the respect and admiration of all Americans for his able and dedicated leadership, and under his guidance, our program of veterans' benefits has become a model for the civilized world to follow. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the bill he has introduced, and which I am proud to coauthor. It is my earnest hope that Chairman TEAGUE's committee and this House will take swift action in passing this legislation.

Wealth Can't Replace Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Palos Regional, an independent publication serving southwest suburban Cook County, Ill., has become known throughout the Chicago area for its pertinent, thoughtful, and progressive editorial commentary. In the issue of January 27, it carried a most timely, philosophical commentary on the proper evaluation of freedom. It properly places freedom as the most valuable heritage of our land:

WEALTH CAN'T REPLACE FREEDOM

We live, as every follower of the news media has been told on innumerable occasions, in an affluent society—perhaps the most materially affluent in history. Just about everything has been going up and up, seemingly without pause or end—family income, investment and savings, the gross national product, the enormous sums devoted to industry expansion and betterment of facilities, consumer spending and so on. This, the economists in form us, has been a prosperity unparalleled both in its extent and in the length of time it has continued without a recession.

The Nation has cause to take pride in all this. But it would be morally and practically wrong to look only at the myriad dollar signs and thoughtessly conclude that all is right, and there is little for the majority of Americans to worry about.

In a far away nation that comparatively few of us could spot accurately on map, we are engaged in one of the cruelest wars in our experience. It is a war which has grown beyond all expectations and, unless every sign is wrong, is destined to grow to a much greater extent still. Soldiers of the United States are dying in tragically increasing numbers in that war. It is making heavy demands on our wealth and our materials, and far larger demands are yet to come. How many of us here at home, during the past holiday season in which every sales record apparently was broken, gave more than passing thought to that war and the vast sacrifices it is demanding of the few? How many of us feel, and share as best we can, the responsibilities that those few are discharging for us all? How many of us realize that there is small affluence—save an affluence of weapons—in Vietnam?

And how many of us realize that, here at home, the odds are heavy that we shall have to abandon many an ambitious government program if we are to maintain this Nation as a bastion and arsenal of freedom in a world where tyrannies are on the march.

The warning signs are up. The prospect of more tax reduction, held out a short time ago, has all but vanished. Informed talk now is of possible tax increases. The welfare state plans, whatever one may think of their desirability, will, it seems certain, be cut back. At the highest levels of government, new and urgent fears of more inflation have recently found a place—and there is more and more realization of the fact that protection of the dollar is absolutely essential to this Nation's strength and even survival.

It is easy, in a time of general prosperity, for a people to avoid problems—to look away from clouds on the horizon. It is also fatal, as history has proven over and over again. The strength of the United States cannot be measured merely in material gains. These, in the long run, are the least of the story. That strength must be measured in moral and spiritual values that place freedom above all things, and a determination to protect our freedom whatever the costs. The mass man is destined for a well-deserved obscurity. Respect for the individual, a knowledge that no two of us are precisely alike, a profound belief in the worth and dignity of each of us—these were the principles on which this Nation was built. They must be sustained if this Nation is to endure.

Let us enjoy our material advantages. But, above all, let us put them in perspective—and never forget that a life of freedom means infinitely more.

Howard Davis (Jack) Todd: Distingushed Merchant, Civic Leader Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, an extremely capable and distinguished business executive turned the tables on his employees when he retired recently at Charleston, S.C.

Instead of permitting his devoted employees to give him the traditional "surprise party," Howard Davis (Jack) Todd, manager of Sears, Roebuck, honored a number of his longtime workers at a dinner. Perhaps this is an unusual twist in retirement ceremonies, but certainly it is typical of the devotion this esteemed merchant holds for his fellow man. Well known for his tireless efforts in behalf of his firm and community, Mr. Todd is an outstanding example of the kind of man our free enterprise system breeds. His interests and activities are extensive—ranging from commercial to charitable and cultural projects. His career is an example after which our American youth could well pattern their lives. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert an editorial and news story from the News and Courier in tribute to a great American:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier]

FRIEND TO CHARLESTON

An able and tireless merchant, Howard Davis Todd, during more than three decades of residence in Charleston, has found time and energy also for countless civic duties. He has shown interest in zoning, commercial, cultural, and charitable enterprises. His good humor has made him a popular as well as a respected citizen. In retiring January 31 after 32 years as manager of the Sears, Roebuck store here, Mr. Todd intends to keep his Charleston residence, though he will spend much of his time traveling, or enjoying outdoor life at his country place on Edisto Island.

The Sears business has grown tremendously at Charleston under Mr. Todd's management. When the company decided to build a large new store, Mr. Todd insisted on locating it in the heart of town rather than moving, as the company frequently has done elsewhere, to the outskirts. Thus he individually has been a notable contributor to the preservation of the business vitality of downtown Charleston.

We have many reasons to like and admire Jack Todd, but this alone is a monument worthy of memory. The best part of it is that the decision was also profitable for his company.

For Mr. and Mrs. Todd we wish many years of health and happiness, wherever they may go—so long as they keep coming back home to Charleston.

TABLES ARE TURNED—RETIRING STORE MANAGER GIVES EMPLOYEES A DINNER

Retiring manager of Charleston Sears, Roebuck store, H. D. Todd turned the tables on his employees last night by honoring them with an appreciation dinner.

Store supervisors who have been associated with the store for a total of 854 years were guests of Todd and his wife last night at the Francis Marion Hotel.

Employees at the dinner included persons who had served 30-, 25-, 20-, 15-, and 10-year tenures.

Mrs. Mary Todd Poore, Todd's daughter, and J. E. Williams of Greensboro, retail zone manager for 29 stores, were special guests.

Todd will have served Sears, Roebuck for 32 years when he retires January 31.

In civic affairs; he is a member of the city's planning and zoning commission and the board of adjustment. He is a member and former vestryman of St. Phillip's Protestant Episcopal Church. He joined Sears in Chicago in 1929 and managed stores in Indianapolis, Montgomery, Tampa, and Savannah.

Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my congratulations to President Johnson on his decision to refer the problem of Vietnam to the United Nations as a further step in his effort to explore and exhaust every possibility of bringing peace to that war-torn area of the world.

We Californians, in particular, support the President in this new peace initiative, because for both historic and geographic reasons we fully appreciate the President's desire that America play an important leadership role in promoting the cause of freedom and in building the foundations for peace among the nations of the world.

Located as we are on the eastern shore of the Pacific Ocean, and with many of our citizens having close family, ethnic, language and cultural ties with the people of other Pacific nations, we have always been an outward-looking society—a true melting pot of the strength and diversity of backgrounds that have made America great—with an immediate and personal interest in establishing good constructive relations with our neighbors in the Pacific community.

For these reasons, we can only applaud the President's action in seeking the assistance of the world organization in attempting to find the way to a peaceful and honorable settlement of the conflict in Vietnam.

Certainly every American endorses our Government's proposed resolution submitted to the United Nations Security Council calling for "immediate discussions without preconditions * * * to arrange a conference looking toward the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in southeast Asia."

In addition, we can all support the U.S. resolution's recommendation that "the first order of business of such a conference be arrangements for a cessation of hostilities under effective supervision."

Finally, we welcome the broad language included in our resolution suggesting that the U.N. offer "to assist in achieving the purpose of this resolution by all appropriate means, including the provision of arbitrators or mediators."

Mr. Speaker, I am personally very proud and happy that President Johnson has taken these affirmative steps to engage the best efforts of the international community of nations in our continued search for meaningful negotiations and a just settlement of the war in Vietnam.

I have this deep personal interest and pride because I was one of several Members of Congress who made similar suggestions to the President some time ago—and if my efforts in this matter have had even a small part in influencing or reinforcing the President's determination to enlist the help of the United Nations in calling a peace conference, in proposing unconditional discussions, in advocating an effective cease-fire, or in suggesting use of the techniques of arbitration and mediation—then, Mr. Speaker, my efforts have been amply rewarded and I am extremely happy to have played a constructive role in trying to move the tragic fighting in southeast Asia from the battlefield to the conference table.

I am confident that I share the hope of the overwhelming majority of Americans that the United Nations act promptly to take advantage of this opportunity to advance the cause of world peace and put an end to the war in Vietnam.

If the U.N. should fail to assume its responsibility in this vital matter, we will all be the losers. Then, the chances of a peaceful settlement of the present situation will have been reduced, and the future usefulness of the world body in settling international disputes will have been diminished.

Ukrainian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who live secure in a Nation where the Government is of our own creation, governed by institutions which are bound by the motto: "Of the people, by the people and for the people," it is difficult to understand the national frustration of peoples obliged to live under the rule of a foreign power.

Since the rule of Catherine the second in the 18th century, the Ukrainian people have lived under foreign rule. Occasionally their hopes have been rekindled by a relaxation of the grip or a military defeat suffered by their rulers, but in every instance, the Ukrainians have been cast back under foreign control.

The great hope of the Ukrainians came in 1917, when after two sudden revolutions, a new Russian Government assumed the reins of power and proclaimed the rights of all the nationalities of Russia to self-determination. The Ukrainians were one of the first to take advantage of the new policy and joyously proclaimed their independence. They were able to enjoy it just long enough to sign a separate peace treaty with Germany as Russia left World War I.

Unfortunately, the Bolsheviks had not been serious about the autonomy of the nationalities. They saw it as a means of weakening the unity of the imperial regime. Once safely in control, the Communist government of Russia clamped down on the nationalities, including the Ukraine.

To this day the Communist control over the Ukraine continues. This rule is imposed by the same group of men who claim themselves the champions of national independence movements. It is a tragic irony indeed. Yet, in all of this, one light of hope continues to glow; it is the unswerving national identity and dignity of the Ukrainian people. Despite the harsh attempts at Communist assimilation, the national character of the Ukrainian people stands triumphant.

Let us pause, Mr. Speaker, to take this moment to salute the proud people of the Ukraine.

Washington Airport No Place for Jets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the recent decision of the Federal Aviation Agency to permit jets to operate from Washington National Airport, particularly in view of the proposal to spend $150 million of the taxpayers' money to enable that airport to handle such planes.

Many years ago when we were considering legislation to authorize the construction of Dulles International Airport, I took the floor to warn my colleagues that the proposed airport could not be built for the $34 million the administration was requesting. History proved that I was right because we have already spent more than $110 million on Dulles. But we were told then that this new airport was to handle jet traffic and that Washington National Airport could never handle jets because it is already overcrowded and because of the noise factor. Now, the FAA has reversed its previous decision and has stated that with $150 million Washington National can be made to handle jets.

I am opposed to the use of Washington National by jets because I think it is unsafe and because of the noise and because I think it is a complete waste of the taxpayers' money to spend another $150 million on airport facilities when we already have Dulles and Friendship International Airports to handle jet traffic. Neither of these facilities is operating at anything near capacity and these two airports can handle all the jet traffic for the Washington area for many, many years to come because they both have plenty of room for expansion.

One of our great Baltimore newspapers, the News American, recently ran a series of articles by Mr. Ray Abrams, Jr., calling attention to the recent growth of airports in the Washington area and I recommend that all of my colleagues give serious consideration to the problems outlined therein. The articles are as follows:

[From the Baltimore News American, Jan. 23, 1966]

AIRPORT NIGHTMARE—JETS JOIN IN JAM AT D.C. NATIONAL

(By Ray Abrams, Jr.)

(Because of the obviously short memories of Federal aviation authority officials, Baltimore's Friendship Airport, once more faces an uncertain future. Following the FAA's decision to permit small jets to use federally owned Washington National Airport, News American Staffer Ray Abrams, Jr., conducted a study of the three airports servicing the Baltimore-Washington area, Friendship, National, and Dulles at Chantilly, Va. Abrams' first of a three-part series, "The Airport Nightmare," begins today.)

On a June morning in 1938, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt awoke shuddering from a nightmare.

That same day he called a number of congressional leaders into his office and, after telling them that he had dreamed about "a ghastly air collision" over the old Washington airport, urged the construction of a new, safe landing field.

"It must be the best airport in the world," he ordered and, upon its completion 3 years later, the Washington National Airport was just that, though not for long.

As the years went by, it soon became clear that the "child of a nightmare" was determined to remain true to its origin.

Alarming headlines began to appear on the front pages of the Nation's press. By 1947, 6 years after its opening, the new field was already too congested to handle the ever-rising traffic.

Built at the cost of $16 million (prewar dollars), the Washington National Airport is bounded on three sides by the Potomac River and on the fourth by Virginia suburbs. As early as 1947, the airport's potential for development was being seriously questioned on the Hill.

Then, 2 year later, the alarming headlines turned tragic. Within 6 weeks two fatal air crashes occurred, one claiming 55 lives.

The fatalities brought on the wrath of a safety-conscious public and the Federal agency then in charge of the field was forced to reevaluate the airport's safety precautions. The answer was simple: cut down on the traffic. An order went out to that effect.

But typical of Washington, once the dead were buried and remembered only by their relatives and close friends, the picture at National changed drastically. Early in 1951, the flight movements had jumped to 186,747—some 21,000 above the critical figure of 1949.

During the years which followed, things have grown progressively worse, the airport getting more and more crowded, so congested, in fact, that it is the fourth busiest airport in the Nation, though it is nowhere near the size of any of its top competitors.

Baltimore's Friendship Airport, within easy reach of Washington, though it handles but a fraction of the kind of traffic which is sweeping National, is more than four times larger, with its shortest runway only a few hundred feet shy of the longest one which Washington has to offer. Friendship's longest runway, on the other hand, is 9,450 feet compared to National's 6,870 feet.

But forget National's short runways. The FAA is absolutely certain that they are now adequate to handle the small jets like the Boeing 727, the Douglas DC–9, and the BAC–111.

The four-engine jets, of course, will not be permitted on the field, according to Arven Saunders, recently appointed head of the federally owned Dulles and National Airports.

"Small jets," however, is a misleading label. The Boeing 727, for example, has a seating capacity for 144 passengers. The Boeing 707, one of the so-called big jets, has seats for only 16 more.

But then, that's another story.

The question here is: How will the increased traffic affect the overcrowded field?

Well, in Washington, the answers are hard to come by, but the Federal officials involved in the matter, insist that National is capable of handling millions more passengers than are now using the facilities.

This begs a question: Will the passengers be able to take the conditions which Washington is determined to force on them?

The airlines are still fighting to convince the public that the psychological factors which inhibit air travel are unwarranted, that flying is the safest, fastest way to get from one place to another.

But the view from the ground at National, and that goes equally for the view from the control tower there, is frightening even to those who are convinced of the advantages of air travel.

Up in the tower, even during the offhours, it takes seven flight directors to handle the planes which come and go at the alarming rate of one each minute. During peak hours, between 5 and 7 p.m., the landing and take-off rate is even shorter.

In that tower, things are hectic, but orderly. There are no outward signs of worry, not yet at least. The jets, which will sharply increase the traffic flow, are not due for a couple of months.

But on the ground, in the corridor leading to the administrative offices of the airport, one Government secretary confided to another: "It always looks as if they're going to crash, but they don't." The two of them had spent part of their lunch period on the observation deck.

Last year close to 7 million persons used National and, whether the Federal authorities in charge admit it or not, the figure is a few millions above what could be comfortably routed in and out as far as the comfort of air travelers is concerned, not to mention the safety factor involved in overcrowding the airport's facilities.

But all this and more is like water on a duck's back. It just floats on down without effect.

Judging from recent Federal Aviation Agency announcements, different rules seem to apply to the fields it operates. The comfort of passengers is apparently of no concern to the FAA, not when it anticipates that by allowing short-haul jets into National the passenger figures will climb to more than 10 million within a decade.

But the lack of concern among those in charge of the FAA, is not reflected by the Representatives on the Hill.

Members of the Maryland delegation, especially Senator DANIEL BREWSTER and Congressman CLARENCE D. LONG, Democrat, Second District, have condemned the new FAA policy which will tax an airport which has already been taxed beyond the wildest predictions.

Though their criticism of the FAA plan was in part motivated by their concern for Friendship's financial future once the short-haul jets begin to operate, the legislators claim that they are also echoing widespread fears among Washingtonians and those who live in the nearby suburbs.

The safety factor is foremost in their minds, and the deafening noise made by incoming and outgoing jets has them deeply troubled.

But that is not the case with the FAA officials. They cite their "expertise" in such matters and declare that the noise factor is minimal and that there are now planes landing at National which "are just as noisy as jets."

So, too, claim the subordinates out at the field itself. The argument is that jets have a faster climb rate once off the ground and that by the time they pass over inhabited areas they are so far up as to cause no discomfort to "even sensitive ears."

Of course, they did not mention the noise made during the landing period and that is when jets are most annoying.

Though FAA officials are quick to brush aside the question of noise, they are even quicker to discredit anyone who mentions the lack of adequate safety measures at the field.

Mr. Saunders, for example, was adamant about the point "that there has been no compromise made with safety." He says this, in spite of the fact that he is talking about an airport designed to handle 2 million travelers and is at present coping with 5 million more.

Nor is he upset by the fact that the change of heart at National will raise the present figure by 1.5 million within this year.

There are plans he explained during a News-American interview in Washington this week, to modernize the field, but he was in no position to elaborate on them, beyond stating that no major changes are foreseeable.

But then, the FAA was faced with an awesome choice. The alternatives were (1) open the airport to jets or (2) close it down. Once the decision was made, there was no turning back.

And it is interesting to note, that once the Federal officials had made up their minds, their attitudes toward National quickly changed from black to rosy.

Suddenly, an airport which had been consistently condemned as too congested, had hidden space—space for millions more than had ever been believed possible.

But then, that's the way it is with a short memory, and men with short memories are common in Washington.

[From the Baltimore News-American, Jan. 24, 1966]

AIRPORT NIGHTMARE—LIKEN FRIENDSHIP WOES TO THOSE OF CINDERELLA

(By Ray Abrams Jr.)

The trouble which Friendship International Airport has been having with Washington brings to mind the abuse which Cinderella was forced to endure at the hands of her vindictive stepmother, who insisted on pampering her own unattractive daughters at the expense of her stepchild.

It never fails. Each time Friendship gets financially dolled up, someone in Washington tries to cancel her invitation to profits.

Does the analogy really fit?

Sure it does. The stepsisters are Washington National Airport and Dulles. Both are federally owned and operated, and are they ever overprivileged?

The first time Friendship secured some financial appeal, Washington gave Dulles the most lavish coming-out party imaginable. It cost a fantastic fortune but did little good. Friendship hung on to what she had and earned even more.

But Washington was not about to give up. This month, the Federal Aviation Agency announced a new policy. Starting April 24, jets will be invited to Washington National Airport.

The point must be: Perhaps National can succeed where Dulles failed. After all, something had to be done. Mistakes must be erased.

Dulles, expensive from the start, is languishing far from home, costing "Mother" a loss of $7 million per year.

But forget the $120 million spent to make Dulles attractive, or the millions it takes to keep her in the style she has become accustomed to. Even the FAA, which is charged with looking after her, is beginning to have second thoughts about the flashy girl, as expensive as those thoughts are.

They are not ready to admit they were wrong about Dulles. Not that. But they do agree that Dulles has not been coming "along on schedule."

These reluctant admissions—another example of how seldom rosy predictions turn realistic—were necessitated by the uncontradictable fact that, for all the gold that has gone into making Dulles attractive, she has yet to appeal to the jet traffic she was meant to entice to Chantilly, Va., more than 30 miles from Washington.

Then there is Washington National Airport, the older sister, conceived as a result of a nightmare which the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt had one night in June 1938.

The kindest thing which can be said for National is that she is old and shows her age. Small in stature, she was never meant to be stretched to the proportions which the FAA has permitted during the years.

As early as 1947, only 6 years after her birth, her growth potential was already being seriously questioned on the Hill.

Though her unique qualities defy attempts at facelifting, she is to be admired for being able to handle the load she does, though nobody can explain how it is possible.

After all, National is old and haggard and there is no way to hide her dilemma. And yet, she remains extremely popular. Last year close to 7 million people used her. No doubt, her claim to fame has something to do with her availability to those who fly in and out of Washington.

So there it is. One "daughter" is expensive, but hardly appealing. The other is old and tired beyond her years, but oh, so accessible.

And "mother" is always there to promote them, Friendship be hanged. Thus the invitation to the short-haul jets. The old girl is never too old for a new fling.

So much for the analogy. The facts are too grim for fairy tale material, though they lend themselves to such use.

Part of the difficulty which Friendship has had with Washington in general, and the FAA in particular, has to do with her inherent charms.

Located on Baltimore's doorstep, she is within easy reach of the heavily populated political Washington suburbs and equally available to many Washingtonians.

The planning which went into Friendship has much to do with her appeal. Her runways are long and capable of extension should jets become bigger than they are already. Her facilities are new and comfortable and her growth potential unimpeded.

National, on the other hand, has always been confined within its initial perimeter, bounded as it is on three sides by the Potomac River and on the fourth by the suburbs of Virginia.

Within seconds of the airport are all the important Federal buildings, including the Pentagon. The least error makes them all vulnerable. Their dangerous proximity to the landing field, however, has had no sobering influence on those in charge of the airport, even though the facilities at National have been taxed beyond anything imaginable.

The recent decision to permit "small jets" onto the crowded runways, a policy which will increase the passenger load at the airport by 1.5 million within the next 11 months, doesn't seem to bother the FAA, either.

Nor is the FAA worried about the alarming statistics which lie ahead. In a recent press release, the Agency announced that within a decade more than 10 million passengers will be using an airport that was designed to handle 2 million.

For years, any talk of having jets at National was quickly dismissed with statements that the airport was already dangerously congested, that runways could not be extended.

But then, in 1965, without any special study to determine the feasibility of changing the longstanding policy against jet traffic, the FAA, depending on its own "expertise" and the development of smaller jets (planes that can handle 114 passengers, by the way), suddenly changed its rules.

To an extent, the failure of Dulles is responsible. That airport, because it is too distant from Washington for convenient use, forced the FAA onto the horns of a serious dilemma.

Two possibilities presented themselves: One brings to mind the frying pan; the other, fire.

The FAA could do one of two things, it claims: (1) Close down National to commercial traffic or, (2) allow small jets. A third alternative, that of keeping things as they were, was not considered, nor was the impact which this change of affairs would have on Friendship really examined.

After all, the FAA, with Dulles hanging like an albatross around its neck, and with the stigma of a crowded National to live down, the things which demanded most attention were those which could relieve the Agency of the embarrassing problems which it had, to a great extent itself created.

An economic study was ordered before the change was announced, but that study has yet to be released to the public or to their Representatives on Capitol Hill.

It is a matter of dotting the "i's" and crossing a few "t's," the director of information for the FAA explained during a News-American interview in Washington last week.

But when Representative CLARENCE LONG, Democrat, Second District, asked for a rough draft, his request was turned down.

According to Arven Saunders, who recently took over the direction of the FAA-owned and operated National Capital Airports, the study shows that nearby fields, including Friendship, have nothing to worry about, not after 5 years or so. Then, Mr. Saunders claims, there will be enough traffic for all.

He also emphasized that no dangers would be created by the influx of traffic to National, that Dulles would not be hurt by having jets at the old field and that Washingtonians, though he could not be absolutely sure about this, would not experience any perceivable increase of annoying noises.

He further said that the decision was prompted by yet another consideration. The airlines, he explained, were rapidly converting to jet equipment. One major outfit, he added, would have no prop planes by the end of this year.

He intimated that it would be unconscionable to close the field down and was convinced that no compromise was being made with safety in allowing jet planes on the runways.

What's more, he said, it would mean a profit of $550,000 for National.

But on closer examination that profit is more paper than dollar. Under the agreement made with the airlines which will start bringing in jets by the end of April, Dulles profits (and here the word is used loosely) could be affected.

The way it looks, it is more than a mere likelihood. The agreement permits the airlines to cut down by 14 the jets now daily in use at Dulles. This would certainly mean a decline in landing fees, and fees charged for the use of the mobile lounges which are necessitated by the vastness of Dulles.

But that's another matter. People like to hear about profits. What do they know about accounting?

When the FAA discounts the danger factors of stacking planes, of having them whiz in and out at the rate of at least one every minute of the day; when the FAA claims that the noise will be any greater or more uncomfortable than it already is and that congestion will not be a serious handicap, it has answered just about all the objections to having jets at National.

Whether Friendship's future will be in jeopardy, is something for Baltimore to worry about. The FAA has its own troubles with Dulles and National.

The frightening thought, however, is that everything is so optimistic, so fairy talelike. Predictions from Washington agencies, though bright when made, have a way of getting tarnished with time. What, no doubt, safety-conscious air travelers are hoping is that the predictions merely tarnish and do not turn tragic.

[From the Baltimore News-American, Jan. 25, 1966]

THE AIRPORT NIGHTMARE—FRIENDSHIP CONSISTENTLY MOLESTED BY WASHINGTON

(By Ray Abrams, Jr.)

When the Federal Aviation Agency did a recent about-face on its longstanding policy of not permitting jets at the congested Washington National Airport, Charles P. Crane, the retired head of the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. and chairman of the Friendship Airport Board, saw the switch for what it was: "Just another declaration of war."

And he pegged it right.

For as long as anyone can remember, Friendship, through no fault of its own, has been consistently molested by Washington.

Each time it becomes financially secure, someone in the Federal Government seems to get envious.

In November of 1962, Washington launched Dulles with a shower of dollars which threatened to break through the financial dikes—$120 million worth.

Oh, there were elaborate plans for conserving the funds and, after 30 years, to drain the dollars back into the Treasury of the United States. But then, the best predictions have a way of springing leaks as time goes by.

The estimates for Dulles have already been modified by the FAA which operates it. Within 4 years of its opening, the field at Chantilly, Va., is lagging behind schedule, costing the Government $7 million per year, much of it unexpected.

Last week, during a News-American interview in Washington, Arven Saunders, recently appointed Director of FAA's Bureau of National Capital Airports, put it this way: "Dulles has not picked up the way we hoped."

An admission like that is welcome, especially from Washington where candid comments about past errors are rare. And Mr. Saunders' statement is welcome in spite of the fact that it gives but a glimpse of the true picture at Chantilly.

What he did not say, however, was that Dulles failed to relieve the overcrowded conditions at Washington National Airport, though that was part of its justification.

The congestion at National, by the way, has been repeatedly condemned as "dangerous" by a number of Congressmen and Senators as well as other observers of the crowded conditions there.

In 1949, within 6 weeks, two crashes occurred, one claiming 55 lives. The public anger generated by the fatalities caused a reconsideration of the traffic load.

An order went out cutting down the number of flights permitted each day. But by 1951, things were not only as bad as they had ever been, but worse.

During the years which followed, the number of flights at National has grown to the alarming rate of one per minute between 7 a.m. and midnight, 7 days a week.

And now, with the airport older and more jammed than ever, the FAA has extended an invitation to three-engine jets. Airlines serving National will begin jet flights April 24.

At first, only 25 percent of the planes will be jet propelled, but by the end of this year more than half of the current prop planes will be gone. What this will do to Friendship is not exactly clear. Estimates differ.

To a large extent, the impact will depend on what Baltimore and its suburbs, as well as the suburbs of Washington, do about the attack on Friendship.

"To us it is a second full-scale war," Mr. Crane declared at a recent interview.

Seated behind an immense partners' desk in his spacious office on the 19th floor of the Gas & Electric building, the veteran strategist of the Dulles campaign was getting set to fight yet another battle.

Though only a part-time "general," Mr. Crane has routed many a Washington career officer. His triumph over Dulles is still being studied at the FAA. One official at the National Aiport, when asked about the effect which the jets might have on Friendship dismissed the question with a laugh.

"I can't understand the worry," he said, "not with Charlie running things."

And Mr. Crane has a story of his own which he related the other day.

"You know," he said with a smile, "a few weeks before the FAA made the announcement, I was down in Washington talking with William McKee, the new Administrator of the Agency.

"He was facetious, but he did say that he would like to have me promote Dulles for him and get the place going."

Mr. McKee might have been less facetious than Mr. Crane imagined. Arven Saunders has also heard of Friendship's chairman, and he has no desire to meet him in a head-on fight either, not if Mr. Crane's rallying power is what it was during the dark Dulles days.

At that time, under his leadership, the airport was fighting for its dear life, with profits threatening to slip away and air service in danger of curtailment.

It was then that the chairman's creative leadership initiated a publicity campaign which is still the envy of Madison Avenue. Everything from press releases to nationwide ads were thrown into the fray and the people who had depended on the field in Anne Arundel County responded with overwhelming support.

Almost 130,000 Friendship stickers appeared on cars across the country and by the end of 1964, Friendship had not only met the challenge of Dulles and survived, it had flourished as well.

Even now, Friendship handles more passenger traffic than Dulles and has a higher consistent growth rate than both the Washington airports.

But whatever its vitality, Baltimore's airport cannot afford to treat lightly what occurred in Washington this month, and Mr. Crane is the first to emphasize that.

"Of course, it is pretty hard for us to say ahead of time what the jets at National will do," Mr. Crane noted.

"Suppose none of the current flights are withdrawn from Friendship," he continued. "The only loss that one can visualize is the loss of some of our Washington patronage."

He did not foresee losing any travellers from the Washington suburbs, which are close to Friendship being convinced they are satisfied with the service they have been receiving.

But taking no chances, he went on to add that the airport board is determined to do everything it can to keep Washington aware of Friendship's advantages.

"And those advantages are many," he asserted.

Friendship is a young airport, its runways more than ample to handle any known or conceivable jets. Its facilities are up-to-date, with a number of additions in the planning and development stage. It has yet to reach the limits of its possibilities and is, indeed, a field capable of always keeping up with the future.

The landing fees for jets are half what they are at the Washington airports and Friendship never experiences the dangerous congestion of National.

Parking rates for automobiles are half of what they are at the Washington fields, and that is an important factor, since many who use planes come in their own cars.

"And this may not sound important," Mr. Crane volunteered, "but at Friendship a man has his choice of beverages. That's not the case at the Washington airports which are covered by Virginia laws."

With the existence of valet-parking and at-the-curb baggage checking, Friendship's comforts cannot be equalled by National, jets or no jets. The spacious waiting facilities are yet another attraction.

It's an established psychological fact that people do not enjoy being crowded and those in charge of Friendship are banking on what is known as "creature comfort."

With National as tightly packed as a sardine can, and with the FAA determined to push a few million more into space which should have run out 17 years ago, "creature comfort" might not be a bad investment for Friendship.

As far as safety factors go, stacking planes at Friendship is a rare exception, whereas at National it is a never varied rule.

At present, five landing bridges are about to be installed at Friendship, with five more contracted for. Other additions to the facilities are also being planned.

Expanded cargo facilities are also in the works, according to Mr. Crane. When they are built, Friendship will experience a rise in freight traffic during the night hours.

The cargo jets, once unloaded, are easily converted into passenger planes and will leave the field for their destinations loaded with travelers.

"The position of the airport board is that our primary concern is with the adequacy and completeness of flights in and out of Friendship, regardless of what is true in Washington," Mr. Crane explained.

"But as taxpaying citizens" he added, "we feel that we are entitled to make our feelings known on matters which might to some people seem beyond our concern.

"As far as I am concerned, you cannot make a jet port out of National. The place is obviously not suited for it," he concluded.

Time might prove him wrong on that. But then, time was supposed to prove the FAA right about Dulles.

What's interesting about Mr. Crane, however, is that he is taking no chances and is ignoring no possibilities. That's why he has stopped talking and has started doing.

He is well aware of the fact that constructive criticism of FAA policies goes just so far—rarely far enough.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence was observed on January 22, 1966. Just 48 years ago in Kiev in 1918, the Ukrainian people—a freedom-loving people—seized the opportunity created by the Russian revolution of the year before to declare their independence, proclaim their freedom, and shake the yoke of centuries of Russian domination.

As we all know, the freedom of the Ukraine was a short-lived freedom. Russian domination after 3 short years of bitter fighting was replaced by the Communist domination of the Soviet Socialist Republic.

Mr. Speaker, the Ukraine has a population of some 40 million people. In our country, more than one and a half million American citizens trace their origin to the Ukraine. So we in the United States—a free land—share at least a twofold common interest with our brothers behind the Iron Curtain: Like them we love freedom and we look with them to the day when freedom will once again be restored to their beleaguered country; and with their brothers who, like us are American citizens in a free land, we join in commemorating a glorious though short-lived episode in Ukrainian history.

The observances that were held all across this country on January 22 will serve as a forceful reminder to all Americans that the flame of liberty still burns in the hearts and minds of the millions of Ukrainians who live under the domination of communism.

It is a privilege to pay tribute to this freedom-loving people.

Jack Justice New NAREB President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last night the National Association of Real Estate Boards installed a vigorous new president, Mr. Jack Justice, of Miami.

Mr. Justice's election to the presidency of one of this country's most important national organizations is a major recognition at the national level of the energy and talents of one of our outstanding business leaders. We in the south Florida area applaud his installation. We have had the privilege of knowing Jack Justice for more than 30 years. His activities as a real estate dealer and community leader have done much to promote the growth of our area from a small town to one of the world's great metropolitan areas.

Mr. Speaker, Jack Justice's career reflects many of those attributes of the American character which have done so much to build this great Nation of ours. We in Miami are proud that the National Association of Real Estate Boards has seen fit to give recognition to Mr. Justice's many accomplishments by selecting him as president.

The article follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Jan. 30, 1966]

JACK JUSTICE'S NEW POST TO TAKE HIM 100,000 MILES

(By Fred E. Fogarty)

Jack Justice, a Miami Beach realtor for almost 30 years, will take over as the Nation's No. 1 realtor on Tuesday night in Washington, D.C.

And as new president of the 82,000-member National Association of Real Estate Boards it would seem appropriate at the installation ceremonies to scrap the usual gavel exchange and hand him a passport and suitcase.

Justice, who traveled to his Miami real estate career by way of Buenos Aires, Argentina, is probably one of the travelingest realtors in the business. If he isn't he'll narrow the gap during the next 10 months in office.

The Miami Beach realtor will log at least 100,000 miles during the coming months and dine frequently on roast beef while on a speaking tour that reaches all the way from Auckland, New Zealand, to Anchorage, Alaska.

HOW HE CAME TO MIAMI

But traveling isn't anything new to the new NAREB president. Early in his non-real-estate career it brought him to Miami, then on to South America, and then back to Miami where he decided there were "some opportunities" in the real estate industry.

Justice, who is a native of Birmingham, Ala., first came to Florida in 1930 as a representative of the General Electric Co. His job was to make a feasibility study on Miami Beach apartment houses as to the possible conversion of ice boxes to electric refrigerators.

After completing the survey he was ordered to another State. But Justice already had a few "grains of sand" in his shoes. He resigned his job and went to work as a door-to-door salesman.

But a year or so later the Kelvinator Co. approached him with a sales manager's job. His territory was Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay.

After 3 years in South America Justice decided to return to Miami Beach and open a real estate sales office. "I guess the sand was really in my shoes," he said.

FIRST OFFICE IN SURFSIDE

Justice opened an office in Surfside and sold real estate until 1942. "Business was good but nothing great," he commented. In 1942 he joined the Army and spent the next 3 years in what could be considered a semi-real estate job. He managed five hotels in Chicago which served as training headquarters for several Army technical schools.

After the war, Justice returned to Miami and opened his office on Harding Avenue. "I started in an old shack which was located at the rear of the lot," he commented.

"I later built a building on the front of the property. But if I'd just had the foresight to purchase all of the property on Harding Avenue back in those days just think what it would be worth today," he said.

Today he has his offices in an attractive two-story building at 1143 Kane Concourse, Bay Harbor Island. Justice employs about 25 persons and "they're the best in the world. In fact most of them have been with me for years," he commented.

"When I take over as president of NAREB my office will be in capable hands," he said. Justice figures that the duties of NAREB president will keep him away from the office at least 6 months of the year.

The Miami Beach realtor specializes mostly in residential properties, but the firm also does some work in commercial and acreage transactions.

Justice is justly proud of his operation, and especially of his preferred listing program. He has contact with about 1,500 brokers around the world and regularly mails out brochures to them on choice properties that are available in the Florida area.

When he's installed as national president it won't be his first national presidency. In 1958 he was president of the National Real Estate Flyers Association and in 1963 was head of the National Institute of Farm and Land Brokers.

In addition he's served on dozens of national committees, is a former president of the Florida Association of Realtors and the Miami Beach Board of Realtors.

And his convention attendance record probably can't be equaled. "We hold three major meetings a year around the country," he said, "and I haven't missed a one in 17 years."

In addition to this, he makes frequent trips around the country to fill speaking engagements. In fact in 1963 he made a dozen major speeches.

This year the speaking tour will be by far his greatest. In early March Justice and his wife Kay will leave Miami for a tour of Down Under and the Far East. The first stop is Honolulu, Hawaii, and from there it's Auckland, New Zealand.

The rest of his itinerary includes: Sidney, Canberra, and Melbourne, Australia; Singapore, Bankok, Hong Kong, Manila, Formosa, and Tokyo.

After his stop in Japan he'll head to Anchorage, Alaska and then down to Chicago for the spring meeting of NAREB. But that isn't all. Justice figures to visit at least 40 States on the U.S. mainland in addition to his stops in Alaska and Hawaii.

The Justices, who live in Surfside, have a son, 30, who is a teacher in New York, and a daughter, 20, who is in Dade Junior College.

What's the outlook for the real estate industry in 1966? "This will be the greatest year the industry has ever known," Justice said. "The only thing is the Vietnam trouble which could naturally change the picture," he commented.

And what about Florida? "I'll tell you what. If I blindfold you and have you throw a dart at that map over there, anyplace it hits—providing it isn't in the Atlantic or Gulf—will be a good place," he said.

U.S. Merchant Marine Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the Congressional Record, House Concurrent Resolution 81, adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the Congress of the United States on U.S. merchant marine policy.

The resolution follows:

H. Con. Res. 81

(Offered by Representative Cater, on behalf of the Speaker and the entire membership of the house of representatives)

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States on U.S. Merchant Marine policy

Whereas Public Act 835, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, still the law of this land, implements a strong U.S. merchant marine and mandates its adequacy for national defense or emergency; its adequacy for all domestic waterborne commerce and for a substantial part of export and import (foreign) waterborne commerce; its mandates vessels constructed in the United States of the most modern and efficient models, operated and manned by citizens under the U.S. flag; and

Whereas experience prior and subsequent to this act indicates that each component factor cited in the act is vitally necessary to the Nation and to its political subdivisions immediate and extended economy and safety; and

Whereas enforcement of these mandates has become so lax that today U.S. ships carry less than 9 percent of the total U.S. waterborne foreign commerce—because of failure by the Federal Government to support and protect the U.S. merchant marine, providing less support, less protection than is the practice common to all other maritime nations; and

Whereas the active U.S. merchant marine now consists of approximately 900 vessels—less than pre-World War II strength, and shipbuilding capacity has dangerously dwindled since that period, although the national responsibilities undertaken in the world and the magnitude of dangers confronted are gravely increasing. In contrast, the Soviet Union's maritime strength is equal to, or may now surpass, this Nation's—auguring favorably for their avowed purpose to dominate world maritime power by 1970—and meanwhile the United States allows its maritime force to diminish: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Michigan Legislature respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to urge that the provisions of Public Act 835, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, be enforced, and immediately to pursue every channel of such enforcement rigorously; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Michigan delegation to the Congress of the United States.

Beryl I. Kenyon,
Secretary of the Senate.
Norman E. Phillio,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Speaker at Meeting of Alabama Industrialists Presents Views on Apportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record I would like to include a very able discussion of apportionment and Senate Joint Resolution 103 as presented to the Associated Industries of Alabama by Mr. Carl F. Bailey, assistant vice president of the Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Birmingham, Ala.

Statement in the Public Affairs Field Before the Alabama Congressional Delegation, January 24, 1966

(By Carl F. Bailey)

Subject: Senate Joint Resolution 103, constitutional amendment on apportionment.

At the outset I'd like to make it clear that we recognize that many States have been denying urban majorities their full voice in State legislative affairs. What we question is the legal right as well as the wisdom of the U.S. Supreme Court to move into the area of State legislative apportionment. This has been questioned not only by us but also by a large number of people in our country.

The late Mr. Justice Frankfurter stated in his strong dissenting opinion to the Court's 1962 decision, delving into State legislative affairs, that the majority of the Court mistakenly assumed that the Constitution provides a "judicial remedy for every political mischief, for every undesirable exercise of legislative power." It seemed obvious from our historical background that the U.S. Constitution was not designed to permit the Federal Government to solve all of the problems of all the people. It is a Constitution of checks, balances, and limitations, reserving in the 10th amendment "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, or reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Most of our States from the beginning have set up a bicameral legislature with one house apportioned on the basis of population and the other chiefly on the basis of geography. This system, one house on population and one on geography, reflects the continuing belief that there should be some check on the power of one house whose members are selected on the basis of population to thwart or crush the interest of minorities. History has recorded that the system was not designed to, nor does it, kill popular legislation, but permits a thorough and public examination of minority or sectional viewpoints. It seems to us that the Supreme Court has, in effect, thrown out the very institutions carefully designed by the States and by the U.S. Constitution for our own Federal legislative system.

It has abandoned the benefit of a time-tested tradition and experience and substituted an abstract theory that Mr. Justice Stewart calls the "uncritical, simplistic and heavy-handed application of sixth grade arithmetic."

Law Prof. Robert G. Dickson, Jr., of George Washington University has analyzed the assumption that equal districts will provide a legislature exactly mirroring voters opinions. "Take a hypothetical house of three districts with exactly equal population with 100 votes each. If, say, party 'A' won each district 51 to 49, its total of 153 votes would give it all 3 representatives, while party 'B's' 147 votes would rate none or, if party 'A' won 2 districts 51 to 49 and lost the other 90 to 10, it would have 2 members for 112 votes while party 'B' would have 1 or 188. Who is to say either outcome is the epitome of fairness?" It seems apparent that a mechanical one-man one-vote formula is by no means a final answer. The ultimate fairness of a legislative system is best determined by the States and the people concerned with this matter. We endorse the proposed constitutional amendment seeking to restore the rights of the States to have one house based on population and the other on a geographical or other basis reflecting common interests. The fair solution to this critical issue is the submission of the same to the States and the people for their determination.

We commend you, Senator Hill, and you, Senator Sparkman, for your support in the last session of Congress of Senator Dirksen's constitutional amendment and urge your active support for Senate Joint Resolution 103 in this session of Congress.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH
OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, as in years past, I once again pay tribute with my colleagues to the Ukrainian people on the anniversary of their independence, celebrated last week. This, of course, represents a hope rather than a fact. For in fact, the Ukrainian people, independent culturally and in spirit, are not the masters of their house. Their struggle over the years to live as a free nation has magnified their cause to freedom loving peoples of the world; their indomitable faith in a world torn by a lack of faith is a superb demonstration that tyranny, in whatever brutal form it manifests itself, cannot conquer the soul of a nation and its people.

The Ukraine, so rich in naural resources, is richer still in that intangible natural resource of human courage under the unobscured overtness of human oppression. This anniversary commemorating the Ukrainian declaration of independence 48 years ago, so valiantly fought for, so long awaited, and so short lived, represents a dream as old as man and one which we can honestly share. For them, as for us, it is an occasion to rededicate ourselves to the ancient proposition on the equality of man.

Wisconsin Students Support Government Action in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Government's action in Vietnam has spurred comment from all quarters, dissensions within all factions, and criticism from home and abroad.

We have seen young and old alike picket and protest against the war, and we have seen violence from pacifists. Our college campuses have erupted with debates and teach-ins, arguments and sit-ins.

Out of these massive demonstrations against the actions of the U.S. Government's actions have come overwhelming counterdemonstrations in support.

I have received such an indicator of support from the nine State universities in my State of Wisconsin.

I have a letter from Mr. Robert Shaw, who is the president of the United Council of Wisconsin State University Student Governments. In this letter, Mr. Shaw points out that the united council passed a resolution in their fall meeting that went as follows:

> Whereas there has been some question concerning the support of university and college students of our Government's policy in Vietnam, and
>
> Whereas this question of support has left doubt in the minds of concerned peoples throughout the world as to whether our Government is reflecting the will of the people in this matter: Therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That the nine State universities of the united council conduct a uniform referendum on the question of the U.S. policy in Vietnam, and that the statistical results of this referendum be submitted to the united council legislative committee chairman for the purpose of distribution to all the presidents of the nine State universities, to Gov. Warren P. Knowles, to the State Legislature of Wisconsin, to Wisconsin Members of the Congress of the United States, and those congressional committees dealing with such matters, and to Lyndon Baines Johnson, the President of the United States.

The referendum carried out shows the following results:

Percent for, not for, and no opinion

Eau Clair	74.5	19.4	6.1
Lacrosse	75	20	5
Oshkosh	80.6	12	7.4
Platteville	77	11	12
River Falls	70.3	29.7	----
Stevens Point	80	13	7
Stout	74.6	12.2	13.2
Superior	87	12	1
Whitewater	73.7	22.2	4.1
Total average	77	16	7

The results of this poll show clearly where the support of the students of the State of Wisconsin lies: 77 percent of the students of the nine Wisconsin universities were polled as being in favor of the Government's action in Vietnam.

Only 16 percent of the students polled were not in agreement with the Government's action, and 7 percent showed no opinion.

These students have done this Congress a favor. These students have done a service to their country. This country will not be swayed by a handful of vocal and violent protestors. This country, and indeed, this august body, is governed by the principle of majority rule.

These students have shown their opinion—they should be commended for their action.

Congressional Travel Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Douglas MacArthur II, wrote a splendid article for the November issue of the Department of State Newsletter.

Mr. Speaker, we greatly admire the Honorable Douglas MacArthur II, and appreciate his outstanding service to our country during these critical times. I commend his excellent article to the attention of my colleagues and to the people of our country:

MACARTHUR: ON CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL
(By Douglas MacArthur II)

I have long believed, and my present assignment has confirmed me in that belief, that there are few areas in which the Department and the Foreign Service have greater opportunities for constructive accomplishment than in dealing with the Congress.

During the postwar era, it has become increasingly apparent: that our foreign policy cannot be successfully executed without full Congressional support; that the Congressional role in foreign policy is growing in scope and complexity; that this is a legitimate and necessary development in the conduct of a leadership foreign policy by a democracy; and that the demands which this growth makes on the Department are matched only by the demands it places on the Members of Congress themselves.

Our function, of course, is not—and indeed never was—to resist congressional participation in the policymaking process, but rather to welcome it and to help make it an efficient and mutually profitable one—for the Department and the Service, the Congress, and above all, for the American people whose interests we all serve.

There are countless ways in which this is being done here in Washington, such as: increased briefings of Members and committee staffs; greater contact by Members of Congress with the Diplomatic Corps and foreign visitors; assigning junior and middle grade FSO's to brief tours of duty in congressional offices; and the heightened and encouraging departmental effectiveness in the handling of congressional correspondence.

A major area of immediate opportunity for increased understanding is the field of congressional travel. The misguided tendency to regard congressional travel duties as an annoying chore is, happily, a disappearing one. Those of us who have had repeated opportunities to deal with traveling Members of Congress and their principal staff assistants have learned that congressional travel, if handled properly and with imagination, can be a great source of benefit to the Department as well as to the Congress.

Perhaps even more important for our FSO's in the field, it presents a unique opportunity to acquaint Members in detail with the problems we are facing abroad and thus engage their understanding and support. At the same time it gives those in the field a new insight into the concerns and worries of the American people and their elected representatives in the field of foreign affairs.

It is difficult to imagine people who have heavier demands on their time and energies than Members of our Congress. They have their subcommittee work, their committee work, quorum calls, rollcalls, national problems, the problems of their constituencies, and a seemingly never-ending stream of visitors from their home district or State. Many of them simply do not have as much time as they would like when they are in Washington to devote to foreign affairs. When they travel abroad, on the other hand, they are free of many of these pressures and do have the time to focus on important foreign policy problems.

Contrary to the impression given in some irresponsible quarters, congressional travel abroad is neither frivolous nor insignificant, and I, for one, would recommend that every Member travel as much as his schedule will permit. It is a serious responsibility of their office enabling them to gather important material for further legislative work as well as deeper understanding of the great issues of war and peace in a troubled world. It is the occasion for them to observe at first hand how the Foreign Service functions and how, and why, our various programs overseas are working. My experience, and I am sure yours, has been that they are, almost without exception, eager to take advantage of this opportunity.

European Common Market Threat to U.S. Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a grave situation is developing within the European Common Market that may have a very serious impact upon commerce between the United States and those countries which are members of, or associated with, that economic community.

At the moment the threat is specifically against the importation into that community of American tobacco, in a program designed to expand tobacco production within the community. But if tobacco is restricted or excluded the same soon may happen to the movement of any U.S. commodity or goods, agricultural or industrial, into the Common Market countries.

Mr. Speaker, I, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, joined by the gentleman from Virginia, Hon. WATKINS M. ABBITT, chairman of the Tobacco Subcommittee, invited House and Senate Members from tobacco-producing areas to meet in the committee room this morning to hear representatives of tobacco interests and spokesmen for our Government discuss this Common Market development.

Tobacco exports to Common Market and associated countries amount to more than $100 million a year, and it is no exaggeration to report that the meeting this morning showed that the movement to restrict U.S. tobacco is causing alarm among American tobacco producers and in the industry generally. We were assurred by spokesmen for our Government that every appropriate action will be taken to persuade the European countries that it is to their best interest, as well as to ours, to abandon any such undertaking which would injure the friendly commerce between us. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this matter does not develop in a way that will call for retaliatory action by the United States.

I wish to inform the House that the proceedings of this morning's meeting will be printed, and will soon be available to each Member. Meanwhile, with the permission of the House, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter I wrote to the President, and a response I received this morning from Hon. Christian A. Herter, our Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. This correspondence follows:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because of the great burdens you bear, I would hesitate to presume or intrude into your time any new difficulty or problem, but I am persuaded that you will want your personal attention drawn to a developing situation that suggests a deterioration of trade relations between the United States and the nations which are associated in the European Common Market.

I am informed there is a movement within EEC that could seriously damage a major segment of the agriculture of the United States, and might lead to retaliatory action.

My information, gathered in numerous reports from the American tobacco industry, is that a draft proposal is now being prepared for presentation to the EEC Council, that would set up in the Common Market a Tobacco Authority with broad powers over the importation and usage of tobacco in the community; remove all restrictions on tobacco production in the community, with guaranteed high support prices encouraging greater production, extending to Greece and Turkey; control American and other tobacco by a licensing system on imports, and suspend all tobacco imports from the United States and other countries at times when surpluses occur from tobacco production within the European Community; and dispose of surplus tobacco produced in the community through sale on the world market under a subsidy arrangement.

Mr. President, if such may happen to tobacco, in the EEC, it could happen to any export commodity of the United States, agricultural or industrial.

As for tobacco, our exports to the Community amount to more than $100 million annually. This business, established over centuries of friendly trade relationships with the countries involved, is vitally important to the well being of many thousands of American families, on farms, in industry, and in trade. It is especially significant, moreover, to America's balance of payments.

That a proposition which could destroy an important portion of our export trade would be considered seriously by EEC is beyond comprehension, since it is so mutually profitable and important to the Common Market countries to maintain strong trade ties with the United States. I have visited often with leaders in the EEC movement, during the last several years, emphasizing such advantages to their countries and to ours. I heretofore have been confident that this was understood in the Community.

But now, Mr. President, if EEC persists in this new undertaking, which may spread to other of America's export commodities, heedless of all the good principles of friendly trade relationships, then it would seem logical and just, and to our best interests, that our Government prepare strong retaliatory measures, reaching all the export goods—industrial and agricultural—that the Community countries deliver into the United States in exchange for dollars.

Very respectfully yours,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1966.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HAROLD: The President has asked me to reply to your letter of January 27, 1966, in which you express concern that the proposed tobacco regulation of the European Economic Community could do serious harm to U.S. tobacco growers and to U.S.-EEC trade relations generally.

On the basis of reports that have appeared in the European press and information received from trade sources, we likewise had become apprehensive about the proposed tobacco regulation of the European Economic Community. As a result, our mission in Brussels was instructed to make representations to the EEC Commission at the highest levels, expressing our deep concern in the matter.

These representations have now been made. Commission officials have assured us that the reports concerning the draft regulation which have appeared in the European press are inaccurate. They indicate that the regulation is still in tentative form and that substantial additional work is required before it is ready for submission to the Commission and the Council of Ministers of the Community for approval.

You may be sure we will continue to give this matter our closest attention with the view to assuring that the final regulation in no way impairs the concessions the United States obtained from the Community on leaf tobacco in the Dillon round. A high guaranteed price support for unlimited tobacco production within the Community would undoubtedly lead to more severe restrictions on imports. We have made very clear to Commission officials that in our view implementation of a regulation having the effect of increasing import fees, introducing quotas or embargoing imports would constitute an impairment of concessions on tobacco the United States obtained in the Dillon round and do serious harm to U.S. tobacco interests.

We have also made clear that if a tobacco regulation were adopted that impaired our existing trade concessions, the United States would have no alternative but to take measures to restore the balance of trade concessions.

It will continue to be our objective not only to prevent any impairment of existing tobacco concessions which we have from the Community but in the Kennedy round to negotiate reductions in the relatively high fixed tariffs the community maintains on tobacco imports.

Best, as ever,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Special Representative.

The Year for Truth in Packaging—1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, like many Members of Congress, I hope 1966 will be the year Congress gives the consumers of America a better break by passing the truth-in-packaging legislation.

The merits of this proposal by the very distinguished and able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] have been thoroughly debated since the bill was first introduced in 1963. I think a majority of both the House and Senate will support the truth-in-packaging legislation if given the opportunity.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can proceed this year without further undue delay to approve this bill which will, in my opinion, mean a great deal to the American consumer.

In this connection, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent United Press International dispatch by Marguerite Davis summarizing the provisions of Senator HART's truth-in-packaging bill. The article, which appeared in the December 26, 1965, issue of the Detroit News. follows:

YOU TRY SHOPPING, TRUTH IN PACKAGING FORCES TELL SENATE

(By Marguerite Davis)

WASHINGTON, December 25.—A harassed California housewife thinks every Member of the U.S. Senate should be required to shop in a supermarket and try to figure out which toothpaste or which detergent is the best buy.

"If this doesn't cause the gentlemen to pass your truth-in-packaging bill," she wrote Senator PHILIP A. HART, Michigan Democrat, "then I think you should give up."

HART, who has been fighting for passage of his bill since 1963—believes 1966 may see its passage.

He told reporters he expects the measure to find a high place on the Senate's agenda in January "and I am very hopeful of passage."

His chief opponents will be the same as in years past—powerful food lobbyists who thus far have had their own way.

PIG IN A POKE

Truth in packaging is intended to answer protests such as one made by a New Orleans shopper. He wrote HART: "Some packages are so misleading, it's like buying a pig in a poke."

HART's bill would forbid:

Inconspicuous, hard-to-read statements of quantity. (A Chicago pensioner complained that he bought a 6-ounch jar of instant coffee for 85 cents and a 7-ounce jar of the same product "with a so-called free ounce," for $1.09. He said that when he got home he calculated the cost per ounce and decided he had been gyped.)

DOESN'T MAKE CENTS

Manufacturers' "cents off" promotions when there is no assurance the savings will be passed on to the shoppers. (An Otsego, Mich., housewife wrote that she paid 2 cents more for a container labeled "50 cents off" than for the same product with a "25 cents off" label.)

Such designations as "giant pint" and "king size." ("One man's 'king' is another man's medium," HART commented.)

Fractional ounces which make it hard for the shopper to compare. ("The housewives complain about not being able to compare the price of 7⅜-ounces of this with 5 7/16 ounces of that," a California manufacturers' representative wrote.)

ANGRY ABOUT TOYS

Boxes are larger than the food they contain. (An El Paso, Tex., correspondent thought this should be extended. "One of my pet peeves is having to pay for toys in cereal boxes," she wrote, "I for one could not care less whether parents of brats have to bribe their kids to eat.")

Designations of how many servings are contained in the packaged food. (A Lansing, Mich., man sent HART two packages of instant potatoes. The weight of the larger package, 6½ ounces, was exactly double that of the smaller, 3¼ ounces. But the larger was labled 12 servings and the smaller 5.

(The reverse side of the small box refers to 4-ounce servings, and that of the larger to 3-ounce servings. HART's correspondent believed this was "an attempt to deceive the housewife into believing she is receiving more for her money.")

Failure to list ingredients when this information may be important. ("On a jar of jelly, why isn't the packer required to state the ingredients?" A Springfield, Va., housewife asked, "On jelly it states, 'pure jelly, blackberry,' but I believe most of it is apple jelly.")

SMALL PRINT HIT

The small print on packages is a deceit that constitutes a "wasteful drain on the slender resources of the elderly," Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, recently told the National Council of Senior Citizens.

Even a person with normal vision has trouble reading the fine print on some packages, she said, but the elderly, with impaired vision, have even more difficulty.

BEGAN QUIZ IN 1961

Mrs. Peterson said another deceit that forces oldsters to pay more is the "bewildering array of different size packages, often expressed in odd weights and fractional ounces, that prevent price comparisons between brands."

HART began investigating packaging in 1961. He held hearings that year and the next. In 1963 he introduced his first "truth in packaging" bill. It was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee where it died.

President Johnson's support may help the bill's chances next year.

Responding to claims that consumers are satisfied with things as they are, HART pointed to an estimated 10,000 letters. Most support his bill, he said, and a random check appeared to support this claim.

But there also were dissenters.

A Flint, Mich., husband registered protest this way:

"With your stupid packaging bill you are inferring that my wife is too stupid to do her own picking and choosing in the grocery store."

Associated Industries of Alabama Analyzes Truth-in-Lending Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, so that all Members of Congress may have the benefit of the reports made to the Alabama delegation by representatives of Alabama industry, I am including a report made to the annual meeting of the Associated Industries on the truth-in-lending bill. This report was presented by Mr. G. H. Caffey, Jr., of the Birmingham Trust National Bank, Birmingham, Ala.:

TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL—S. 2275

(Statement in the public affairs field presented before the Alabama congressional delegation, January 24, 1966, by G. H. Caffey, Jr., Birmingham Trust National Bank, Birmingham, Ala.)

On July 12, 1965, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, reintroduced S. 2275, the Douglas truth-in-lending bill. Section 4 of this bill pertains to "disclosure of finance charges" and applies to any creditor.

Associated Industries of Alabama would like to go on record as opposing this bill due to its effect on various businesses in Alabama. Any retail business offering credit would be faced with a fantastic amount of bookkeeping and added expense. Some of the businesses affected for example, would be sales finance companies, savings and loan associations, retail stores, and commercial banks.

Associated Industries of Alabama wholeheartedly endorses the principle of full disclosure in installment credit transactions. While we endorse the principle of full disclosure we are of the firm opinion that the subject matter of the truth-in-lending bill is a matter for State legislative action. (Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of Committee on Banking and Currency, states in his letter of March 17, 1964, to Senator DOUGLAS "* * * the States can regulate the disclosure of credit terms as well as they can regulate other matters relating to credit—and all States have some legislation in this field.") It is desirable to inform the public of what they pay for credit in dollars and cents. This form of disclosure is best understood and in general is far less complicated than an explanation of interest rates.

We are primarily concerned about article 7, section 4, of the truth-in-lending bill. This opposition to the simple annual rate provision is due to a number of reasons, including:

1. It would be confusing to the public.
2. Dollar and cent disclosure is readily understood.
3. The high cost of computing the simple annual rate would, in time, be passed on to the borrower.

As a banker I would like to state that this bill is also strongly opposed by the Alabama Bankers Association, representing approximately 99 percent of all banks in Alabama. The American Bankers Association takes this same position.

Here are several illustrations where disclosure using the simple annual rate would create severe problems for the banking industry.

I am sure these examples will apply to many other types of business.

(a) Where the consumer now, generally speaking, selects the most convenient repayment plan and monthly payment date in relation to his paydays and budget, he would probably be forced to accept a plan that could be most easily adopted to simple interest computation.

(b) There would be an undue burden in the expense of computing simple interest on each loan transaction. The rate would vary if the first or final payments were larger or smaller than other payments. Making the first payment larger is not an uncommon practice. For example, if trading equity on an automobile purchase is insufficient, this may be somewhat offset by making the first payment relatively larger and further, by making this first payment due in less than 30 days—sometimes in 10 days to 2 weeks.

(c) On the other hand, if a borrower has an unusually large equity and for reasons of his own prefers small monthly payments with a relatively large final payment, perhaps in conjuction with a bonus arrangement, this would result in a complex situation for computing simple annual rate. Banks would be much more restricted in tailoring a loan to a particular customer's need due to the difficulty in complying with section 4 of this bill.

(d) In recent years there has been a definite trend on the part of banks to utilize forms of revolving credit. In this area of credit, section 4(b) of this bill raises the same difficult problems for banks as it creates for the retail merchant who strongly opposes this section of the bill. Check credit is one popular form of revolving credit used by banks. This consists of a line of credit to be drawn upon by the customer as needed and repaid in monthly installments.

In effect, the borrower creates his own loans by writing checks against a prearranged amount of credit. If several checks are drawn during the course of a month it would be very difficult and costly to compute the simple annual rate of interest. To further complicate matters the charge to a customer is usually based on two elements: (1) a per check handling charge of so many cents, possibly 25 cents per check, and (2) a percentage per month charge on the daily average outstanding loan balance.

(e) Another form of revolving credit now popular with banks is "charge account credit," or "charge plan." This is another approach to the financing of accounts receivable. In charge account financing the bank consolidates all of the customer's charge purchases from member merchants into a single revolving charge account with the minimum monthly payment being a percentage of the outstanding balance.

In this type credit simple interest computation would again be very difficult and expensive as charges are usually made by a customer throughout the month, and ordinarily if the customer pays within 30 days of his billing no interest charge is made. If a portion of the balance is paid within 30 days no interest charge is made on the amount paid.

Both types of revolving credit—check credit and charge plan—provide a monthly statement to the customer listing old balance, checks drawn or charges made during the month, new balance, and interest charged on dollars and cents where applicable.

Where the simple interest computation requirement would be a burden to the larger credit businesses of Alabama who either have, or soon will have, installment loan and revolving credit accounting on some type computer arrangement, it would be an impossible burden to the smaller businesses of the State who do not have this advantage. And, of course, these smaller businesses make up the vast majority of Alabama business.

To restate the Associated Industries of Alabama's position:

Associated Industries of Alabama favors full disclosure of al installment credit charges; they are vigorously opposed to disclosure in the form of a simple annual rate, in addition to a disclosure of costs in dollars and cents.

Mackay Yanagisawa Builds Hawaii's Hula Bowl Into a Sports Classic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of America's most popular leisure time activities is the sport of watching athletic events. To meet this demand sports minded promoters have tried the staging of annual post-session games, especially in football. Some have failed from the very outset, others have enjoyed continuous success from the very beginning, while still others have gone through extreme difficulties at the beginning and now enjoy noticeable success. The annual Hula Bowl classic, featuring all-Americans from colleges throughout the United States and played in Honolulu, falls within the third category.

Because of the unpredictability of the ingredients that make up a truly great sports event, it is not often that one is able to witness a completely satisfying game. This year's Hula Bowl game played on January 7, was just such an event, and the spectators at Honolulu Stadium all left convinced that they had witnessed the greatest game ever played. The event was a success in all aspects.

The Hula Bowl did not just happen. The person who did the most to promote it is Mackay Yanagisawa, a personal friend of mine.

Mackay started sponsoring it 20 years ago. There were lean years when Mackay nearly lost his shirt, so to speak, and was about ready to throw in the towel. But with hard work, perseverance, and undying faith in the sports fans of Hawaii, he made it what it is today—one of the greatest postseason classics in the Nation. Having been a star ball player in his youth, Mackay has been giving Hawaii some of its most memorable sports events, but the Hula Bowl has been his specialty.

And so I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story of how Hawaii's Hula Bowl has become the recognized annual sports classic and the game to see. The article, written by sports editor, Andrew Mitsukado, appeared in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of January 16, 1966:

THEY ARE STILL TALKING ABOUT IT

(By Andrew Mitsukado)

Fans who took in the Hula Bowl classic on January 7 are still raving about it.

"It's the greatest game I have ever seen," one spectator said. "It was a thriller."

Hundreds of others echoed the assertion.

It seems that Mackay Yanagisawa, sponsor of the game, hit the jackpot.

Not only was the game one of the most thrilling ever played here, but it also sent the spectators home fully satisfied and happy.

It was a perfect game and a perfect evening. No rain or Manoa mist. The air was crisp and nippy. Perfect football weather.

The highly publicized All-Americans lived up to their reputation as they went all out to give the fans a spectacular game.

And a capacity crowd was there, too. Quite a number of fans had to be turned away.

It will be many, many years before the fans who were fortunate enough to see the game will forget the spectacle they witnessed.

"I went to the game to watch the All-Americans," a fan said yesterday. "I wanted to see them execute plays and see how they react to various situations. In other words, my interest was in the individual stars.

"But it wasn't long before I forgot all about them. I became engrossed in the game itself. I never enjoyed myself more. There were brilliant plays and spectacular touchdown drives. The scored ended 27 to 26, with the North winning. You couldn't ask for a more thrilling finish. I thoroughly enjoyed the game and I went home fully satisfied. I couldn't ask for a better evening."

IT WAS A JOB WELL DONE

Yanagisawa has been hearing similar comments every day since the game was played over a week ago.

It makes him happy.

He is delighted because his promotion was a success in every way—financially as well as artistically.

And as a promoter he feels the satisfaction of having presented a good attraction.

Yanagisawa began sponsoring the Hula Bowl 20 years ago.

Shortly after the Rose Bowl game of 1947, Yanagisawa received a letter from the late Paul Stupin asking him if he would be interested in sponsoring a football game, featuring the UCLA seniors of that year. The Bruins were headed by All-American End Burr Baldwin and Quarterback Ernie Case.

Yanagisawa took up Stupin. He matched the Uclans, augmented by several UCLA graduates, against the Leilehua alumni 11. Two games were played that year.

That was the start of the annual postseason Honolulu football classic.

The following year, Stupin brought a Pacific Coast All-Star collegiate 11 here and again a Hawaiian 11 furnished the opposition.

In 1949, Stupin and Yanagisawa began inviting collegiate seniors from various sections of the country.

Naturally, the collegiate 11 began proving too powerful for the local all-star aggregation.

Yanagisawa then decided in 1951 to invite the outsanding National Football League stars here to play with the Hawaii Stars against the College All-Stars.

OUTSTANDING PROS INVITED

Johnny Lujack, former Notre Dame All-American and a star quarterback of the Chicago Bears, and Herman Wedemeyer, a Honolulu gridder who won All-American halfback honors at St. Mary's College and who was then playing pro football, were the first pros brought here for the classic.

In the following years, Sammy Baugh, Frankie Albert, Leon Hart, Doak Walker, Kyle Rote, Ollie Matson, Bobby Layne, Lou Groza, Y. A. Tittle, Frank Gifford, Hugh McElhenny, Otto Graham, and Crazy Legs Hirsch among many others were invited. That they thrilled the fans no end goes without saying.

It got so that the pro stars preferred to come here for the Hula Bowl than show in the Pro Bowl at Los Angeles. So much so, the National Football League had to forbid playing postseason games outside of the Pro Bowl.

As a result, Yanagisawa changed the format of the Hula Bowl game, inviting only collegiate stars to the classic.

It's hard work but Yanagisawa has been successful in getting the greatest stars here—fortunately for the football fans of Hawaii.

"The last game was a brilliant success, but we are not going to stop there," Yanagisawa said. "We will continue to bring in the outstanding college gridders of each season and we hope the games in the future will be just as thrilling as the 1966 classic."

Back to Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, let me add my voice to those who have advocated the reconvening of the Geneva Conference as a constructive suggestion toward achieving our common goal of freedom and peace in southeast Asia.

Of course, along with all Americans, I hope and pray that President Johnson will be successful in his effort to bring the situation in Vietnam before the United Nations as an integral part of his worldwide diplomatic peace offensive—and as an additional step in his attempt to explore and exhaust every possibility of promoting the cause of lasting peace in that war-torn section of the globe.

But, should this worthwhile effort fail, or should the U.N. fail to assume its responsibility in this vital matter, I believe we ought to try to reopen the Geneva Conference of 1954, which first attempted to negotiate a Vietnam settlement, as a means of initiating full-scale discussions of the entire range of problems involved in the present Vietnam conflict.

Although the United States was not an actual party to the 1954 Geneva accords, we have repeatedly expressed our acceptance of their terms and our willingness to conduct unconditional negotiations on the fighting in southeast Asia on the basis of those agreements.

In fact, in the recent debate at the United Nations, when the possibility of reconvening the Geneva Conference was brought up, our distinguished U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Arthur Goldberg, is quoted as saying:

> Let the joint chairmen issue a call today to reconvene the Geneva Conference, and we will be in Genva tomorrow.

This is in line with President Johnson's oft-repeated pledge to go anywhere and talk to anyone if it would promote the cause of peace.

Added encouragement for the idea of going back to Geneva with the Vietnam question can be found in late news reports that quote a spokesman for the North Vietnamese Foreign Ministry as declaring:

> The Government of North Vietnam reaffirms once again that, on the international plane, consideration of the * * * war * * * in Vietnam falls within the competence of the 1954 Geneva Agreement on Indochina.

If this statement in fact reflects the position of the North Vietnamese Government, and if our efforts at the United Nations prove unavailing, I would support the President in again taking the peace initiative and formally requesting Britain and Russia, the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, to reconvene that group for the express purpose of reopening the Vietnam question and of negotiating a fair and equitable settlement of that thorny issue on the basis of the freedom and peace of the people of that unfortunate land.

World War on Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 19 I introduced in the House H.R. 12152, a bill to open the way for a world war on hunger, through extension and expansion of America's food-for-peace program.

There has been a broad and positive public response to this proposal. This interest affirms the humanitarian instincts and the great heart of the American people. I see in this response a feeling that this is a war in which we all may join, in the interest of suffering humanity and of world peace.

The legislation I have introduced embraces thoughts advanced on December 9 in Washington at the organization meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis. It was my privilege to speak at this meeting. I am gratified and encouraged by the interest in my remarks at that time. In response to this interest, Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I am inserting these remarks in the Appendix of the Record:

Remarks of Hon. Harold D. Cooley, Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, Before the Organizational Meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis, in Washington, December 9, 1965

Mr. Chairman, there are two magic words in all the languages of this world, food and raiment.

The absolute necessity, the ultimate prerequisite, to peace in the world is food for the hungry and clothing for the naked.

I am dogmatic in this conviction. I am certain that each of you gathered here shares this persuasion. Our position is axiomatic. Then let us proceed from where we are. Let us here explore the opportunity, the challenge, before these United States—through its ingenious farmers, its fertile fields, and its God-loving millions of people—to bring peace to this troubled world.

You people, as I understand you, are gathered here today in a dedication to a greater deployment of our food and fiber abundance to do battle against the agonies of mankind.

You have come here, and I am here, drawn by a conviction that bread and not bullets will be the last in the train of human progression and consequences, as peoples finally make up their minds to live together in peace.

You are here and I am here to reexamine the philosophy and the policies that now guide us. We are here together to offer and to employ whatever talents we may possess to explore and to find the way to unleash the abundance of our agriculture, as a means to a peaceful world.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is the destiny of this country to attack starvation around the world. I feel that this mission is so urgent, its rewards to all mankind so promising, that nobody can head it off.

Anyone who looks closely at the food and population situation today must recognize that the trend of world hunger rises on the horizon like a vast, engulfing storm. Already the winds are howling. Already the misery is felt by over 1 billion people. On this very day 10,000 men, women and children around the world will die of starvation.

In the last 12 years, under Public Law 480—the Food for Peace Act—we have fed millions of people in many nations. This has been a demonstration of the great heart of America. Thousands, perhaps millions, of people are alive today because we have had food to share.

We have done this while restricting the production of our farms. It was necessary to do this, to maintain restraints upon the output of our agriculture, because we have not yet developed another means to prevent our farmers from producing themselves into abject bankruptcy and chaos.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today asking if there isn't a different and a better way. I will say that this Nation faces a decision on one of two courses:

1. Shall we further restrict the production of our farms in programs of controlled abundance in America, sharing only what we cannot use?

2. Shall we loosen the cords that now bind our agriculture, and then set upon a vastly expanded attack on starvation around the world—in programs aimed ultimately at developing the potentials for food sufficiency in those areas where hunger now is rampant?

Of course the great heart of America votes for a worldwide war on hunger.

But we who are gathered here know that the answer is not simple. We know that there must be limits upon the costs of such an undertaking. We know the great difficulty in delivering food to starving people in remote areas of the world where there are virtually no docking facilities, no storage accommodations, no refrigeration, virtually no transportation, and no system of distribution.

While I am here in a posture of advocacy, where hungry people are concerned, I must very carefully stress that it would not be possible to alleviate hunger in the world at one fell swoop. Moreover, as vast as is our potential to produce food and fiber, we could not with all our resources reach all who hunger.

Therefore, we can only promise to attack starvation, to the limits of our ingenuity—in a community of generosity among free peoples.

It would be folly here even to suggest that we immediately or summarily remove the restraints upon our outpourings of food and fiber abundance. Whatever course we follow must be orderly, else we might wreck our own farm economy, and fail in any new mission we may commend and command.

And, of course, the ultimate decisions must come from the Executive and the Congress of the United States.

There are momentous aspects to be considered.

The Communist world can offer the people of the world only starvation and slavery.

We here are talking in terms of food and freedom. How then will the masses of the world respond?

I think I can venture this observation: If Russia and China had been able to match the ingenuity of our agriculture, and they, and not us, had controlled the sources of abundance of food and fiber, the larger part of the world long since may have swung into the Communist fold, for starving people may often exchange their liberty for food in their stomachs.

In any enlargement of our assault upon starvation, there is the consideration of the effect upon our own farmers and, moreover, upon the total economy of the Nation.

I will say that I fear further restraints upon our agriculture.

It is well known that I did not lend any enthusiasm—to put it mildly—to the new cropland adjustment program in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. The Government is authorized in this new program to retire 40 million acres of cropland over the next 10 years, further constricting our agricultural plant at great expense.

On November 5, I wrote the President:

"In my view, Mr. President, this whole concept of buying millions of acres of farmland out of production is wrong. This same program was tried by the Eisenhower administration, through the old Soil Bank of the 1950's, and it caused such turmoil in rural America it was abandoned by the administration then in power and by the Congress.

"It is wrong because it will drive thousands upon thousands of people off the farms, and out of our rural communities, into our overcrowded cities.

"It is wrong because it concedes and admits defeat in the purpose of using our great food and fiber productive potential to aid free world people in their immediate needs and in the development of their own self-sufficient economy.

"The great opportunity now confronting us is to reverse the direction of all prior farm programs, which have repressed production to avoid surpluses, and to set upon a new coruse of vast exportation of food and fiber as the best instrument of our own security, the well-being of rural America, and for banishing hunger from the free world.

"The world cries out for food and fiber.

"Our farmers want to produce. They want to plant more acres, not fewer and fewer acres. Their business is to produce food to feed people and fiber to clothe people.

"There are now underway studies bp private groups and persons which may show and prove that the billions now used to reduce the production of our fields may be better spent in an imaginative program freeing up our agricultural productive resources, buying off the abundance and using, as an instrument of foreign policy, the food and fiber we produce beyond our needs at home and for dollar sales in our normal export markets.

"But such studies and the work of the new Commission on Food and Fiber may be worthless if the cropland adjustment program is employed now to take millions of acres of land out of production on long-contract arrangements, and our rural areas thus are further depopulated."

I then respectfully urged the President to cause a suspension of the operation of the new cropland adjustment program until the Congress, with the Department of Agriculture cooperating, can explore new ways that our abundance can be delivered to ill-fed and ill-clothed free world nations, so that we may loosen the reins upon our agriculture instead of drawing them tighter.

I was disappointed that the President, in his response to me, did not see fit to accept my suggestion regarding the suspension of the cropland adjustment program.

However, I have informed the President that it is my intention, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to call public hearings early in 1966 to explore the possibilities of developing a new program dedicated to expanding the use of our agricultural abundance in needy nations of the free world.

While we must caution again and again that this meeting, nor no one of us gathered here, can commit this country to any course or to any policy, in advance of determinations by the Congress, still it is exciting and thrilling to me, as I am sure it is to each of you, to imagine what would happen in this world around us if, indeed, we can find the practical means to bring to bear the full force of our agriculture, and our agricultural know-how, in mankind's struggle against hunger and for freedom.

It would bring a new revolution to our agriculture and in world agriculture.

I can see in our own country a dead halt to the flight of our people from the land. I can see a new era of security for our farm families. I can see prosperity in rural America. I can see Main Street America flourishing again.

Mr. Chairman, there will be happy and peaceful days, years and centuries ahead, if we now can find the way. I commend each of those gathered here for his interest in and devotion to the aspirations, perhaps the dreams, that have brought us togther.

And I leave you with this final word, as a summary of my own feeling:

Food and fiber are weapons of peace. These weapons in our hands must be unsheathed.

Guns and Butter Preferred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, in the opening weeks of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, we have heard much about whether this Nation can support its commitment in Vietnam and its other commitments abroad, while maintaining essential programs on the homefront.

On January 10, the opening day of the second session, I made a statement which sets forth my views on the situation in Vietnam in which I urged that we should not sacrifice our domestic program in order to carry out our commitment.

The question most often raised in this Chamber and in our newspapers has been whether or not we will be required to cut back on Great Society programs, in order to carry out and meet our commitment in Vietnam.

I have taken the position that our President has chosen the correct course—that of continuing to meet our commitments abroad while going forward with those programs in the fields of education, health, housing, and urban development and others which are designed to help the general welfare of 195 million Americans. America is strong enough economically to do both. This should be done while we continue in pursuit of peace.

I have stated in the past that I have serious reservations about our military foreign aid program and that I favor a reevaluation of our policy with respect thereto. In particular, I favor a cutback in military aid—and where necessary economic aid—to nations which threaten their neighbors—such as the nations in the Middle East and in South Africa, and to those nations which are aiding the aggressor in Vietnam. By so doing, we can reduce our expenditures for military aid and insure that we will not threaten our domestic programs.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing proposal has for its purpose the reduction of our military foreign aid program to certain nations so as not to prejudice our programs at home. At this time I would like to make a proposal which has for its purpose the raising of additional revenue.

The present Internal Revenue Code provides for an oil depletion allowance of 27½ percent, which I am informed involves a revenue loss to the Treasury of $2 billion. This amount is greater than our projected budget deficit and exceeds our budgetary appropriations for the war against poverty.

I fully realize the risks involved in the oil industry and that the purpose of the depletion allowance is to stimulate and encourage investment in this field. However, I question the amount of the allowance and suggest we consider its impact on the Nation's economy. If "guns and butter" is to be the order of the day, then I suggest that we look at both sides of the ledger and seek out ways to increase our revenues while cutting expenditures for such purposes as do not serve the best interests of our Nation and the general welfare of its 195 million citizens.

I strongly recommend that we take a serious look at the oil depletion allowance provisions of the internal revenue law as a source of increasing our revenues to meet our commitments abroad and at home and to help balance our budget.

American Council of Learned Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the American Council of Learned Societies at its annual dinner January 20 honored those who played a leading role in winning enactment last year of legislation establishing the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, in the principal address at that dinner correctly emphasized that the arts and humanities do not have to be justified on the grounds of any immediate and practical results, that fundamentally they are good in themselves because they are the "bearers and preservers of what we call civilization."

Under leave to extend my remarks I ask that the Vice President's remarks be included in the RECORD at this point:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, American Council of Learned Societies, Washington, D.C., January 20, 1966

It is good to be with you tonight and to join with you in celebrating the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

I have long valued and admired the work of your council and of its constituent organizations. To one of them, I owe a special obligation.

Some years ago, I received a thorough inservice training in the art of being a vice president—vice president of the American Political Science Association, that is.

My good friend Evron Kirkpatrick and his associates took me in charge, and shepherded me through my tenure in office. In fact, they even pronounced me fit for further service. How could I say no when the next offer of a Vice Presidency came my way?

For many years, men in public life have professed their love of the arts and humanities—and their profound regret that they could do nothing tangible to help them.

But, thanks in large part to your stanch friends in the Congress, things have changed.

I know that Senator Pell, Senator Javits, Senator Clark, Senator Gruening, Congressmen Thompson, Fogarty, Moorhead and Widnall and many others share my pride tonight that the Congres has provided financial support for the arts and humanities.

In 1964 we did achieve a significant first step; the creation of the National Council on the Arts. But the establishment of a foundation, endowed with real money, still seemed remote then.

We had enthusiasim. But we didn't have the votes.

Then came the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Thanks to determined leadership by President Johnson and skilled floor work by your friends in Congress, we did break through.

As you undoubtedly recall, the debates in Congress focused largely on the arts rather than the humanities.

There were a variety of reasons for this. Nearly everyone considers himself a qualified critic of the arts—in the sense that, like Mr. Khrushchev, he knows what he likes and doesn't hesitate to say so.

Moreover, by their very nature, the performing arts are public in character and presuppose the existence of an audience. Their practitioners are public figures, and possess that quality we call glamour.

But the practitioners of the humanities are, for the most part, free of the more dubious blessings of public attention.

Few laymen profess with confidence to know what they like in philosophy or linguistics—and fewer still to say so. Editorial writers, columnists, and commentators of all sorts are not constantly looking over your shoulders and advising you what to do and what not to do, what to say and what to leave unsaid—unless, of course, you write history about the living as well as the dead.

But even privacy can be pushed too far. As men and women who have dedicated your lives to the service of knowledge, you have every right to expect a reasonable degree of public understanding and recognition.

And, to look for a moment at the other side of the coin, now that the humanities have formally entered the competition for public funds, you have a certain responsibility to make clear to the public, and to your representatives here in Washington, some appreciation of what you do and why it is important.

The eloquent report of your Commission on the Humanities was a welcome step in this direction. And it is no exaggeration to say that this report won for the humanities an equal place in the new National Foundation. But the process of communication with the public and the Congress must be a continuing one. You can never assume that the case has been made once and for all.

Perhaps I, as an amateur humanist and a professional public servant, can be of some help here by telling you what I consider the vital contribution of the humanities to our national life.

First of all, a thorough grounding in the humanities sharpens, in the individual, the quality of choice.

Choice is a vital part of all our lives, and nowhere is it more important than in government; indeed, a wise Frenchman has observed that "to govern is to choose." Each choice taken, indeed, even each choice deferred or avoided, has consequences reaching far into the future.

There is an abundance of specialists who can provide us with the facts relevant to decisions—the "what," the "where," the "when," and the "how."

But when they have laid their facts upon the table, an essential factor is still missing: the "why."

No narrow specialty or expertise can provide the full and essential grasp of the continuity of past, present, and future that the humanities do.

Let me make it clear: I do not believe that the humanities must be justified on the grounds of any immediate and practical consequences. In the most fundamental sense, they are good in themselves simply because they are the bearers and preservers of what we call civilization.

The historian who brings order out of the tangled record of the past, the critic who casts new light on a work of literature or painting or music, the philosopher who questions and clarifies our most basic assumptions—all of these serve to enrich our lives and to expand our vision. Together they constitute one of our most precious national resources.

One of the most important facts about the establishment of the new Humanities Endowment is that it does at last constitute a recognition of the humanities for their own sake. Humanist scholars, as you are well aware, have long received support from the Federal Government. But in the past this support was always justified in terms of something else: international cooperation, the improvement of the school curriculum, national defense, and so forth.

Now the President and Congress have gone on record as believing that the strengthening of the humanities as such is in the public interest. The National Government has, in effect, endorsed the words of your Commission on the Humanilites: "Through the humanities we may seek intellectual humility, sensitivity to beauty, and emotional discipline. By them we may come to know the excitement of ideas, the power of imagination, and the unsuspected energies of the creative spirit."

Ultimately, the fate of the humanities must rest in the hands of devoted individuals: scholars who pursue their researches wherever they may lead—guided by their own intelligence and by the canons of scholarship itself.

These individuals, in their single-minded dedication to their calling, may often be deaf to the cries of the marketplace and the forum—to the seductive voices of fashion and of expediency.

Certainly the American Council of Learned Societies may be proud of its long record of supporting worthy scholars despite the apparent lack of popular interest in what those scholars proposed to do. By maintaining and applying the most rigorous intellectual standards, often in definance of fashion and of popular trends, the American Council of Learned Societies has served the humanities and the Nation as well.

But the history of the American Council of Learned Societies illustrates another principle I think is well worth mentioning on this occasion.

In every field of intellectual endeavor, in the sciences as well as the humanities, what today appears to be the most esoteric and impractical research may tomorrow prove to be of the utmost practical usefulness and importance. I stress "may" because I do not think that the case for basic research and scholarship in the humanities should be made to rest on claims of practical utility.

In this connection I think, for example, of your council's continuing interest in the study and understanding of languages. For many years, yours was the only organization in this country to offer encouragement and support for scholarly work in what were then rather patronizingly termed "exotic" languages.

Suddenly, with our involvement in World War II, we found ourselves in urgent need of communication with peoples who spoke some of these languages.

Besides linguists, we also needed scholars whose knowledge of the basic structure of language enabled them to develop new and more effective techniques of language instruction for the Armed Forces.

The same story can be told of the development in this country of area studies, in which your council has also played a leading role.

Our possession of substantial numbers of highly trained and skilled experts on the peoples and cultures of Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Latin America, and Africa has turned out to be an invaluable national asset. The United States would simply not be able to discharge its worldwide responsibility adequately without them.

In both these cases, and others I could cite, the so-called impractical scholars turned out to be more farsighted than many of our public officials.

But this is neither surprising nor distressing. It is, in fact, as it should be.

The scholar—by disposition, by training, and by situation—is peculiarly fitted to take the long, detached view of men and of societies. To do so is both his privilege and his responsibility. Whatever the pleasures of public life may be—and I assure you there are many—the opportunity for contemplation is seldom among them.

I am a man in public life and a man of affairs. As such, I envy your opportunity to ponder in depth and at length all the ramifications of human knowledge and experience.

And I do hope that the program of the humanities endowment will include some opportunity for scholars to impart more directly and regularly their unique perspective and insights to those of us engaged in the business of governing and decisionmaking.

The establishment of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities marks the beginning of a new era for the humanities in America. If I might presume to give you a few words of advice as you enter it, I would simply say: "Be true to yourselves." I hope you will continue to do what seems important to you—guided by the internal logic of your work and your own high standards of scholarship.

I hope you will never succumb to the temptation to sacrifice that work and those standards to any transitory notions of expediency or popularity. And, in your corporate capacity as the representatives and the servants of our Nation's tens of thousands of humanist scholars, I hope you will always remember your responsibility to speak and to act for your constituency.

If your voice has been heard in the councils of government—and it has—it is because it has been the authentic voice of dedicated scholars. This must continue to be the case.

By being true to themselves, scholars best serve not only their nations and their times, but all mankind as well.

Alabama Industrialist Expresses Concern About Rent Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to present the views of one of Alabama's outstanding industrialists concerning rent subsidies. The following report was presented to the Alabama congressional delegation at the recent Washington meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama, by Mr. Joe H. Goldman, public relations manager, Alabama Operations Aluminum Co. of America, Mobile, Ala.:

Rent Subsidies: Part of the Urban Development Act of 1965

(By Joe H. Goldman)

Senator Sparkman, we are well aware of your personal interest and many accomplishments in the field of private and public housing throughout the years.

We are sympathetic with your views that the rent subsidies portion of the Urban Development Act of 1965 would provide 8 million American families, now living in slums, with decent homes, if properly administered.

After studying the act as passed and the Federal Housing Administration's Multifamily Housing Letter No. 63, we are convinced that the rent subsidies program does not reflect the thinking and ideals of the people of Alabama.

As an association, we are deeply concerned with the ultimate results of this program for the following reasons:

1. Mr. Robert Weaver, head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in repeated testimonies before the House and Senate committees, has declared the purpose of the bill is to experiment with offering underprivileged families greater opportunities to live in better neighborhoods.

2. The Housing Administration in their MF Letter No. 63 stated that: "Important criteria with regard to approval of a rent supplement project will include full consideration of its contribution to assisting in integrating income groups and furthering the legal requirements and objectives of equal opportunity in housing."

3. Under the provision of the bill, eligible projects can be owned by private nonprofit, limited distribution or cooperative mortgagors. It is difficult to visualize the NAACP, CORE, SNICK, and church organizations being the first to get into the housing rental field. By the same token, AIA, as well as similar organizations could qualify as private, nonprofit mortgagors.

4. Units authorized under this bill may consist of five or more single family detached, row, walk-up, or other type multifamily units.

5. Authorized project owners can select occupants—subject to qualifications established by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or a private agency designated by the HHFA concerning the criteria for eligibility.

6. While the Urban Development Act of 1965 is effective for 4 years, the Housing Administration is authorized to enter into 40-year rent-supplement contracts with owner of such housing.

7. Last but most important, President Johnson has announced he will ask Congress for an additional $13 billion to pay for the Vietnam war. We feel that $5.8 billion—$8 billion—or whatever the figure—over the next 40 years is too much for a program completely foreign to our American concepts.

We commend all our representatives for voting to delete the rent subsidy section of the bill when it was before the House. We also commend your voting to eliminate the funds for this program. In our opinion there must be major revisions in the act for the protection of every citizen of Alabama before it is implemented.

Tomorrow, Which World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William J. Coughlin, editor of the Missiles and Rockets magazine discusses in his editorial of January 24, 1966, the future course of space exploration. He develops the analogy of our current ventures into space with that of the initial exploration of the north polar region less than 40 years ago. Mr. Coughlin brings home the spirit of our space exploration efforts in this well-written article and identifies one of the several important reasons why we must continue this effort.

The editorial follows:

Tomorrow, Which World?

This Nation, and this administration, face within the next year some major decisions about the future course of space exploration.

A committee of eminent scientists has issued a thoughtful report on the directions such exploration should take. Others have made their recommendations. Now, decisions must be made.

Should we concentrate on earth-orbiting space stations? Should extensive exploration of the moon follow the initial lunar landings? Should we initiate the long leadtime projects looking toward manned landings on Mars? Should we instead step up unmanned exploration of the Martian surface? Or should Venus be the focus of our efforts past the moon?

At short range, all of these seem to offer themselves as alternatives.

History teaches, us, however, that such exploration is more likely to come in waves, one overlapping the other, than in single units, each with a distinct beginning and distinct end.

Man strives for the most distant objective within reach of his technology. And as the first explorers try and try again on that far reach, others—at first, other explorers and scientists, then those scouts of commerce, miners and trappers, then businessmen, settlers and shopkeepers—follow in their wake to probe and develop what courage has proven attainable.

Perhaps the most easily understandable comparison to space exploration in our history is the exploration and development of the polar regions. Today's commercial benefits such as firs, oil from Point Barrow and the casual use of airlines across the top of the world throw into shadow the gallant, dramatic and extremely hazardous efforts initially made to reach unknown areas of the earth's surface.

It is worthwhile in attempting to look ahead at space exploration to look backward at polar exploration, particularly at the first efforts to reach the North Pole by air, for there lies the heritage of Apollo and the projects to follow. It is easy to forget, as we aim for the moon, that the North Pole was first reached by air less than 40 years ago.

Each advance in technology, as it occurred, was pressed into the battle with the elements, for this was indeed a battle, not just against the unknown but against the undone.

The earliest recorded proposal for reaching the Pole by air seems to have come from a Frenchman who suggested to his government in 1845 that it could be accomplished by balloon.

Theory did not become reality until 1897 when the Swedish explorer Salomon August Andrée attempted to reach the North Pole with two companions in a hydrogen-filled balloon.

Why did he go? His answer, as quoted by Kurt Stehling and William Beller, now a senior editor of Missiles and Rockets, in their fascinating book "Skyhooks," rings down through the years as an answer to those who ask today why we go into space:

"I'll be giving the world something it's never had before, a knowledge of the Arctic. Is there land in the Arctic, or is it merely a mass of floating snow and ice? Will we find life there? If we do, how is it able to adapt itself to the cold? If we learn this, perhaps some day we will be able to populate that region. Oh, there are so many answers locked in that frozen area that I hope I'll have the knowledge and strength to learn even a few of them."

Andrée and his companions perished in their attempt. Their balloon went to ground 3 days and 300 miles from their takeoff from Danes Island on July 14, 1897. The world learned 33 years later, when their bodies and diaries were discovered, that they had died in October of 1897 while attempting to return to civilization on foot.

According to Basil Clarke in his book "Polar Flight," the first to fly an aircraft north of the Arctic Circle was a Russian aviator, Lieutenant Nagurski, during World War I. But an attempt to reach the Pole was not made until Roald Amundsen and Lincoln Ellsworth tried it in 1925 in the N.24 and N.25 Dornier Wal twin-engined flying boats. That effort ended in forced landings 136 miles from the Pole and only by extreme effort did the party manage to return to Spitzbergen, having fallen short of their goal but having flown farther north than anyone before them.

The effort to reach the Pole by air finally came down to a race between Richard E. Byrd and Floyd Bennett in a three-engined Fokker powered by 220 horsepower Wright Whirlwinds and the Italian airship Norge under the command of Amundsen, Ellsworth, and Umberto Nobile.

This was truly an international effort, with Italians, Norwegians, and an American in the airship crew, and with the British and Russians providing aid enroute. It reached the Pole on May 12, 1926.

It is perhaps worth noting that it ended on a bitter note when Amundsen felt that Nobile, donning the uniform of a full Italian general on arrival in Seattle, attempted to claim all the credit. Ironically, Amundsen later was killed while on an Arctic search for Nobile, who crashed but was rescued.

Biggest disappointment of the voyage of the Norge, however, was the news that Byrd and Bennett reached the Pole in their Fokker May 9, 3 days earlier, to become the first airman to accomplish the feat.

With exploration and development of the Arctic and Antarctic regions still underway, how is it possible then to say where space exploration will lead us? But polar history teaches us what courage and determination can achieve and points to the decisions we must make this year. The answer to those who ask, "Why should man go into space?" is that we have always gone.

Appendix

Be Still and Know That I Am God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, gave the *sermon at St. John's Church—Episcopal*—in Georgetown at the Annual Church and Government Sunday. He spoke with eloquence and deep feeling of need for people in today's world to better understand their God. So that more people will have an opportunity to read these important remarks I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR HUGH SCOTT, ANNUAL CHURCH AND GOVERNMENT SUNDAY, JANUARY 9, 1966, AT THE ST. JOHN'S CHURCH (EPISCOPAL), GEORGETOWN, WASHINGTON, D.C.

"What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?" Psalms 8, verse 4. "Thou makest him to have dominion of the works of Thy hands." *Verse 6.*

Confronted by the incredible advances of the modern world, has the inner nature of man been affected, and if so, in what way? The discoveries within a single century have surely altered the course of man's progress more than the sum total of all the term of man's prior existence on this earth.

What of man against the machine? How has he fared? The machine drastically alters the course of man, speeds up his timetable a hundredfold, even a thousandfold and, in space opens a new dimension to be conquered. What of the effect upon man's relationship to God?

Automation may be defined as the substitution by machines for the physical strength of man. Cybernetics may be described as the substitution by machines for the mental operations of man.

Some of you may have read recently the somewhat irreverent story told by technicians, about computers. The story goes that a huge computer was fed this question: "Is there a God?" The computer whirred, buzzed and finally read out: "Now there is."

Well, the most deeply thoughtful explorers of the nature of the universe find, of course, that the more they learn, the more there is to learn. The deeper they probe, the more likely they are to find that the acceptance of God, the Creator, is essential to the verity of their theorizing.

Einstein caused the world to know the meaning of E equals MC^2, but behind this equation of destruction, beyond the discovery of a key to unleash the powers of the earth and the air, lies the creative, all-knowing force which is God.

Men have believed (as the ancients thought) that Heaven is upon some mountain top, or beyond the sky or at the farthest reaches of the stars. Though men have dispatched their minds to search in the far places, the longest journey cannot but bring one back to the simplest truth: that God is surely to be found within each human heart.

Let us return to man and the machine: servant or master? It is true that automation and cybernetics bring with them deprivations and dislocations. They may, and do, reduce employment, especially in the areas of their original impact. In time, more employment is created, more leisure is made possible for the employee. Leisure, wisely used, can open new worlds, heretofore unsavored.

Automation, the machine, is not superior to man. It does not supplant man in the scheme of nature any more than the secular church can, in this aspect, supplant the spiritual church. The good works of automation may serve to free the individual to provide more time to adjust more agreeably to a widened vista, perhaps even to give more thought to his meaning as man. The good works of the secular church bring religion into involvement with the problems of modern living. As we have just read in Psalm 72: "He shall defend the children of the poor." The spiritual commitment of the church impels it still to minister to the souls of men.

A more automated community need never be a less spiritual community, as is well exemplified in the computerized atomic energy communities in New Mexico and Tennessee. For it is eternally true that there is no machine to replace those inner fires of inspiration, to create the indispensable ideas which only men can feed to the machines.

No cybernetic formulas to simplify with computers the intricate problems of men in space can ever put men in orbit until after other human beings have conceived within themselves, and then pursued, the challenges offered by the unexplored.

However much the Sunday supplement writers may dwell on the so-called illimitable potential of the machine, that power is always limited, always finite. For the machine is, and must ever be, the servant of man, for good or ill. The power for good is illimitable if "the spirit of man that is in him, to the light of the vision wakes." Not all of the computers in the world, nor all of the mathematical equations of cybernetics can create that vision, nor can any manmade thing, without the guidance of man, bring an idea to life.

From whence, then, comes "the light of the vision"? This is no vision fabricated of metals, plastics or electricity. Nor is man alone, within himself, capable of the wonders which man has wrought. Many of you are familiar with the glorious ceiling in the Sistine Chapel, painted by Michaelangelo, so surely illumined with his own inner vision. There one sees—and feels—the hand of man reaching, straining to its uttermost, to touch the hand of God, to receive from the Almighty the gift of life.

"The light of the vision" is a gift from the hand of God.

Men today through prayer, communion, dedication, zeal or devout determination, summon up inner resources when they touch the hand of God. Inner fires are set aflame, to conquer the mysteries of the unknown, to light the way of the future. In harmony with God's purpose, he may give life, as the poet Goethe did. Consider the power potential, to use modern terms, of these two thoughts which Goethe has left with us:

"Nothing is more terrible than ignorance in action," and

"That which we have inherited from our forefathers, we must earn again, in order to deserve."

So, imperishable ideas are flung, like torches, to be retrieved and carried aloft by others, from day to uncountable day.

How wise are they who know that these things they have done are not of their own human doing. There is the cry of one who made possible our now commonplace telephone, when he viewed its success: "What hath God wrought."

No one will claim that any electronic device has ever been sparked by the touch of God's hand. But every single thing which goes into that complicated engineering marvel has been conceived by men who, without inspiration, which is the heritage of God's challenge to man, would have been as powerless to start themselves as are the machines.

In all of our "still achieving, still pursuing," amidst the tumult of this modern busy world, let us never forget that there is a voice to be heard, a voice which is not our voice, yet mindful of us, informing us all, commanding us all:

"Be still—and know that I am God."

IUE To Raise Dollars To Construct *Vietnam Refugee Resettlement Village*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of pride that I call attention to a project of my union, the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Works, AFL–CIO, to help the innocent victims of the Vietnam conflict rebuild their lives. Under a resolution adopted by the IUE Executive Board on December 8, 1965, a campaign has been launched to obtain a dollar from each member to construct a refugee resettlement village in South Vietnam to assist displaced families and orphans in shaping a better, more productive future. Recognizing that peace with freedom is impossible while people are hungry, homeless, and jobless, the IUE has, in characteristic fashion, taken constructive, positive action to help win the peace and the people. Knowing my fellow IUE members' spirit of brotherhood and compassion, I am confident of the success of this laudable people-to-people, union-to-union program.

The underlying hope of these good Americans who are contributing their dollars and good will to the victims of war was summarized in an editorial in the IUE News of December 23, 1965:

> And yet, if IUE succeeds in the village, and others can find their way of helping, and governments can tackle the big picture in time, perhaps we can prevent another Vietnam from plaguing the earth.

The details of the project are contained in the following articles that appeared in the December 23 and January 6 issues of the IUE News:

[From the IUE News, Dec. 23, 1965]

IUE TO RAISE DOLLARS TO CONSTRUCT VIETNAM REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT VILLAGE

To aid the innocent victims of the war in Vietnam, the IUE Executive Board, by unanimous vote, has initiated a subscription campaign of $1 per member. The action stems from a resolution, adopted at the December 11 meeting in San Francisco, expressing support of President Johnson's policy on Vietnam.

Moving quickly to implement the resolutiion—which was adopted after a long and thorough discussion—IUE National and International Affairs Director Al Loewenthal, acting under the direction of President Jennings, met with representatives of the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development to ascertain needs in order to develop a meaningful program.

Among those consulted were three Government officials who also carry IUE membership cards: Howard Robinson, State Department labor adviser for Far Eastern affairs; John Dillon, chief of program coordination of AID's office of labor affairs; Emil Lindahl, AID labor technical officer, now working in Vietnam.

Others who were consulted by Loewenthal were George Goss, AID Vietnam Relief Coordinator, and Paul Schuler, acting Far East labor adviser for AID.

As a result of these consultations, IUE has undertaken to raise a dollar from each member to establish a refugee resettlement village in South Vietnam working together with the Vietnamese labor movement (CVT) and AID.

The IEB originally contemplated a children's village for orphans, but Vietnamese labor leaders and AID officials in Vietnam informed the union that a refugee resettlement village would fill a greater need by bringing orphans together with families and by helping all displaced civilians help themselves to build new lives.

According to surveys made for President Johnson by a seven-man team of voluntary agency representatives last month. "The number of refugees in Vietnam will in all probability increase by the end of 1965 to something in the magnitude of 1 million persons."

In an article, prepared for the New York Times, Dr. Howard A. Rusk declared, "President Johnson has asked for greater public support of our voluntary agencies in Vietnam and increased participation by free world nations. What is being done is being done well but the needs are so great they cannot be met by our present effort. That effort must be tremendously increased if we are to win the peace and win the people."

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY recently said, "The opportunity is to transform the refugees from a national liability to a national asset—to seize this opportunity to help the displaced people of Vietnam help themselves to a more secure and productive life through Government-sponsored programs of resettlement, vocational training, agricultural training, and technical assistance in the fields of health, education, public works, and public safety.

"The United States is supporting these refugee relief and rehabilitation programs of the Government of Vietnam with all the applicable resources at its disposal—AID, U.S. voluntary agencies, and U.S. military materials and personnel."

A call for more voluntary agencies to join in "a great international effort to help the people of South Vietnam" in civic action programs was issued earlier this month by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees. He emphasized the great need for "refugee aid programs."

The resolution of the IUE executive board expressed the union's support "of the U.S. commitment in Vietnam to establish peace with freedom."

It cited President Johnson's April 7, 1965 speech at Johns Hopkins University in which he offered to enter into "unconditional negotiations" and pledged to meet the basic problems of human suffering and impoverishment by asking Congress for a $1 billion investment to aid the economic development of southeast Asia.

"The President has clearly extended the offer of peace and though rebuffed many times his offer remains the core of American policy," the board resolution declared.

"Until Hanoi agrees to come to a conference and negotiate a settlement, there is no alternative other than that American diplomacy and military involvement be carried on vigorously and continuously to bring them to the bargaining table.

"We must convince the Communists that their error is both military and political and that their stubborn refusal to recognize reality by the prolongation of hostilities is inflicting misery beyond toleration upon the people of Vietnam. We must make clear that their resistance to unconditional negotiations strengthens each day our determination to achieve a just and lasting peace."

The IUE Board pledged "full backing to our fellow countrymen who are charged with the delicate and dangerous military tasks of carrying out American policy in Vietnam" as well as to "the innocent victims of that conflict."

In addition to the $1 a member subscription campaign for the refugee resettlement village, the board endorsed campaigns for CARE and USO "to express our regard for the military personnel on active duty there."

[From the IUE News, Jan. 6, 1966]

TO WIN THE PEACE AND THE PEOPLE IN VIETNAM—THE IUE HELPS

Fleeing from the terrorism of the Vietcong and the increasing scale of military action, some 1 million persons have left their homes and sources of livelihood to seek refuge in areas controlled by United States and South Vietnamese forces. They are mostly women and children and old folks. After 25 years of war, they are a tired, disillusioned and skeptical people. According to a team of U.S. voluntary agency representatives who went to South Vietnam to look at the problem last October, the refugees "will have to be convinced over a period of time before they genuinely resettle in reasonably normal pursuits on their own."

Last month the IUE International Executive Board also took a look at the Vietnam situation and voted unanimously to support President Johnson's policy. At the same time, in recognition "of the suffering inflicted upon the people of Vietnam, most particularly upon the innocent victims of that conflict," the IUE Board decided to help. After consulting with the Vietnamese Confederation of Labor (CVT) and the United States Agency for International Development (AID), President Jennings announced IUE's help would be the raising of voluntary dollars to build a refugee resettlement village in South Vietnam.

Vietnamese labor leaders suggested the village based on knowledge of the needs of the refugees, and the CVT will be a full partner in the program, according to IUE International Affairs Director Al Loewenthal.

Why should an IUE member give a dollar to help build a village of homes and farms and jobs for Vietnamese refugees they have never seen? For some it is because we must win the people as well as the peace in South Vietnam to prevent the Communists from controlling all of southeast Asia. For others, it is because children and women and old folks are crying out for help so that they can help themselves.

Whatever your reason, the need exists and your dollar can help. Won't you be one of those who care enough to give? Checks should be made payable to: IUE Refugee Resettlement Village in South Vietnam, and sent to IUE National and International Affairs Department, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Custer County's Pioneer Dr. McArthur Foresaw Future Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, 60 years ago this week, the Custer County Chief, published in Broken Bow, Nebr., conducted a contest for the best article written on Custer County.

The prize was a leather-bound edition of the collected works of Alexander Pope. It was won by a young physician named Dr. A. J. McArthur who, in a real sense, was a pioneer doctor on the Nebraska prairie.

The volume was inscribed to Dr. McArthur by the "Purcell Bros., Publishers, the Chief." It is of interest, Mr. President, that the Purcell family, represented now by Mr. Harry C. Purcell, is still editing and publishing the Custer County Chief.

Dr. McArthur died in 1942, but on this 60th anniversary of his prize-winning essay, it is appropriate to think back to that time and to consider his predictions, hopes, and aspirations for the area he loved so well.

Dr. McArthur graduated in 1891 from the St. Louis School of Medicine, now the medical school of the Washington University in St. Louis, Mo. As a young man, he came to Custer County and settled on a farm outside the city of Broken Bow. There he raised 12 children and established his medical practice, a practice that took him great distances in this county with its 2,600 square miles of area.

He was one of two country physicians who traveled the wide expanse of this sprawling county in a horse and buggy. As he traveled through Custer County, he grew familiar with the general topography of the area which at that time was not completely cultivated or settled. Dr. McArthur envisioned bountiful harvests and a long and productive future for the rolling grasslands, fine winter ranges for cattle, and plenty of water.

It is interesting to note that the predictions of this leading citizen came to be realized. In 1906, Dr. McArthur called Custer County an "empire" of "stupendous possibilities." And it was.

The "little patches of alfalfa" of which Dr. McArthur wrote now place Custer County first in the State alfalfa acreage. Cattle, by far the most important type of livestock, have thrived on the grazing lands so that the county now ranks second in the total number of cattle. This number has helped considerably to assure Nebraska's leading place in the cattle industry. Corn, rye, wild hay, and wheat production also contribute substantially to the economic stability of this county.

Dr. A. J. McArthur, a man of vision, would be proud of Custer County and its people who build up the county's resources. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the winning essay of Dr. A. J. McArthur be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Custer County and Its Future Prospects

(By Dr. A. J. McArthur)

J. Protor Knott once humorously stated that the city of Duluth is exactly in the center of the universe, and for proof adduced the fact that the horizon came down to meet the earth at exactly the same distance, in all directions. This is is equally true of Custer County, but it is further true that Custer County is the center of the most central State in the Union, which, in its turn, is the most central country in the first continent on the globe. To the unsophisticated eastern tenderfoot, who, in a lifetime, never ventures beyond the purlieus of his township, central Nebraska is only a barren windy waste, scorned by the flocks of cranes and geese as they hasten over, and peopled only by rattlesnakes and skulking coyotes.

"Happy is the country that has no history," for it means peace and prosperity. What a sight it would be to one of these men, who every morning of his life has taken his little basket and gone out to feed his dozen shoats, if he could visit an average Custer County farm, to see the farmer hitch a stout team to a big wagon, scoop in 50 bushels of corn and drive to the feed yard with the morning rations of a quarter acre of hogs. Then to realize that this is only the commencement of the morning chores, that there are more hogs and perhaps hundreds of cattle still to be fed. When he looks at the alfalfa meadow, dotted with scores of stacks, looking in the distance like the tented bivouac of an army, he will remember how, for years, he has carefully fed old Dobbin a little timothy sprinkled with water to guard against the heaves, and pitied "those who dwell in desert places."

The name of Custer County and the name of her metropolis, Broken Bow, conjure visions of clashing interest and border strife, but the strife has long since ceased. The Indian, in token of defeat, has cast down his broken bow and passed on to the west, and where once roamed the majestic herds of buffalo are now found the matchless herds of fine cattle.

We have often wondered if the residents of Custer County ever think upon her stupendous possibilities or speculate upon her future.

We have an empire within our borders. Custer County contains more than 1½ million acres of land. Larger than some of the States, larger than some of the monarchies of antiquity, the history of whose people and their deeds of valor is now taught in our public schools. Infinitely larger, if measured by the lavish ensemblage of natural resources of this, "The Great American Desert."

How many farmers can remember with what misgivings they first ventured into Custer County, 25 years ago. Timidly, tentatively, looking back, but dreading the derision that awaited them there, they found the Eldorado of their dreams:

A soil which, "tickled with a hoe, laughed with a bounteous harvest," and which, after a quarter of a century of cultivation, is the same soil still.

Expecting to find man wandering, insane from thirst, they found a water course every 10 miles, a climate that gave new life and strength, cool nights, that snatched the languor from the most wearied limbs, and—and fleas.

Some turned back, of course. Nature would furnish the grist, but nature would not grind it, so they went back to their wives folks to gather hickory nuts and persimmons.

And now Custer County is about to realize her hopes, to stand free from the calumny of her traducers. When it takes half a train to haul a man's stock to market, he is past the place where you can argue with him about his prosperity or raise the ghost of his long forgotten doubts as to his country. Long misunderstood and reviled, farmers are coming to understand that Custer County is mighty, but benign, if her moods and peculiarities are respected.

She has shown her contempt for long-haired prophets and rainmakers, and has settled down to certain crops equal to any produced in the Mississippi Valley.

The great activity in real estate and the rapid advance in value of land shows that farmers are beginning to appreciate the country. Land is still ridiculously cheap.

Eastern men who come here are made suspicious by the mean prices that farmers put on their land. We simply have not the nerve or the sense to ask for it what it is worth. Real estate men are growing rich buying from the unwary and in a few days selling again, often for nearly double the purchase price. Think how rapidly the country is developing, all because of a better understanding of the climate and soil. Only a few years ago it was commonly believed that winter wheat could not be grown here. Now it is a staple crop and the yield equal to that of the northern wheat belt. How long since every farmer believed that the native grass was the only forage or pasture that would grow here. Now there are numbers of grasses that only need a start to thrive here and outyield the native grass 5 to 1.

In annual grasses we have never in any other country seen such profusion of varieties or such rank growth.

A few years ago farmers were raising little patches of alfalfa in their gardens, indifferent, without confidence, saving a little seed to sow the next year. Now it is the staff of the country, ranking right with corn in all around utility. The yield of alfalfa is almost past belief. One acre will feed 20 hogs through the entire summer and it defies the frost until late in the fall. If mowed and carefully saved, an acre of alfalfa will make from 8 to 12 tons of hay.

Brome grass is proving itself to be a close second, with the added advantage that it may be pastured at any time with impunity.

With the coming of these things is come the honey bee. With ordinary care bees increase very rapidly and produce honey in plenty and of fine guality. They care nothing for wire fences and will garner from your neighbor's field as well as from your own, and will go a long way to do it. In a short time this country will outclass all others in bee culture and the production of honey.

Nearly all kinds of fruit are now grown here, not only successfully, but with profit.

A "lick and a promise" will not grow corn, nor will it grow fruit trees. Neither do fruit trees, especially when young, make good pasture for cows. But the right varieties, properly planned and properly cared for, will produce fruit of any kind.

Who thought of strawberries, some years ago? Now farmers raise them by the bushel.

The whole secret, in Custer County, is in knowing the climate and soil, and a reasonable care of the crop. It would not be fair to omit the most important crop of all—the babies. For no other crop is the soil so productive. Families of 10 or a dozen are found on every section, and upon no other crop does the future greatness of this county so much depend.

Nothing else so completes a man's satisfaction with Custer County, as a visit to the home of his boyhood.

There will come the homesickness—the longing to go back: "* * * back to Grigsby's Station. Back where we used to be so happy and so pore."

He will go and come again entirely disillusioned of the sylvan and elysian memories that he has cherished, and wondering how people there manage to make a living. They don't. The New England States are dotted with hundreds of deserted farms, so worthless and so numerous that they are becoming a huge problem to be solved by the people of these States.

Great as Custer County has already come to be, she is still in the early morning of her life, a toddling infant just quitting the threshold of her nursery for a life of strenuous endeavor and great achievement. With the accumulated wealth of ages in the soil, a matchless climate, skies as blue as Italy's, stars as bright as any that ever looked down on ancient Egypt, peopled by men and women whose restless energy would not brook the sterile parsimony of other lands, she is like the block of fine marble that only awaits the hand of the sculptor to release the angel imprisoned within.

Alcoa President John D. Harper Addresses Pittsburgh Traffic Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the president of Aluminum Co. of America, Mr. John D. Harper, is one of my dear friends. He is also a great American, an outstanding business leader and an astute observer of the contemporary scene.

This company is one of my valued constituents, having four manufacturing facilities in Indiana, among them the largest smelter and rolling mill complex in the world.

Recently, Mr. Harper spoke to the annual dinner of the Pittsburgh Traffic Club. This address reflects the thinking of modern business enlightenment as well as a total understanding of the problems of government and the continuing need for the people in private enterprise and those in government to work together in their mutual best interest.

I ask unanimous consent to include the remarks of Mr. Harper in the Record:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FULL THROTTLE FOR CHANGE

(Remarks of John D. Harper, president, Aluminum Company of America, at the annual dinner, Pittsburgh Traffic Club, January 27, 1966)

Thank you for inviting me to dinner. I am honored by your invitation to speak. Having sat several times on your side of this rostrum, I know the warm, contented feeling that this wonderful outpouring of food and beverage can produce. My task is clear: respond to the tenor of the evening. I trust I will succeed.

Tonight I would like to share with you a few observations about change. I will propose that we give full throttle to the challenge of confronting change creatively; and also, that we give maximum attention to the need for change in areas often overlooked as we give a green light to technological change.

There is a story that might amplify one of these points. It's about a Tennessee mountaineer who fetched the doctor to take care of his son-in-law. The doctor arrived to find the young man looking like he'd been kicked by a mule. "What happened to him?" said the doctor. "I beat him with a shotgun," said the mountaineer. "That's a terrible thing to do to your son-in-law," said the doctor. "Waal," the mountaineer said, "He wasn't my son-in-law when I beat him up."

Which goes to prove that you have to keep up to date; and this is one idea about change I would like to leave with you.

Everyone in this room is vitally concerned with the transportation industry—as a carrier, shipper or supplier. Many of us play a dual role, as both shipper and supplier. But whatever concern brings us here this evening, surely it is with a recognition that change is the middle name of the transportation industry.

A look around the room is all the convincing we should need. Here amid this preponderantly railroad audience are scattered representatives of motor, water and air carriers. The vigor of the competition between your various forms of transport is exceeded only by the imaginative way in which you have introduced innovations in your services. The most revolutionary changes of all are those recent ones that combine your competing services to the benefit of shippers. Containerization, surely the most dramatic broad-scale development now underway in transportation, is a truly classic example. Here is a great step forward in service to shippers, adapting to interrelated use of every mode of transport.

People, the ads told us, once took second place to hogs crossing the continent. They now will take second place to a journey anywhere in the world for anything that can be carried in a container module. The move to standardized container sizes is another creative change that will surely benefit all carriers, as well as shippers.

A symbol of change and an outstanding project for the transportation industry and for Pittsburgh is the first International Conference on Urban Transportation that will take place here next week. The prospects for this program to serve the transportation industry are indeed most exciting.

Change, of course, is at the heart of every businessman's daily life. In fact, one yardstick by which we measure management is its ability to meet change successfully. Another is its ability to nurture young men who can take the helm and cope with tomorrow's changes. Change is so much a way of life for my company that our advertising slogan is, "Change for the Better With Alcoa Aluminum." (We naturally urge its adoption by all of you.)

We have evidence that ancient man was as much fascinated by change as is modern man. In 500 B.C., a philosopher named Heraclitus told his students, "All things seem to flow and change; in the stillest matter there is unseen flux and movement."

It appears that one of the earliest significant prehistoric changes was in transportation. Evidence suggests that woman was the beast of burden until language had developed sufficiently for her to convince man that certain animals were more effective as the primary means of transport. Gives one pause, doesn't it? The only thing that hasn't changed is woman's persuasiveness, it seems.

Think of the truly pivotal role in world history played by changes in transportation. It took sea and land transport improvements to change the world from a feudal society to one organized on a national basis. Large sailing vessels made possible the discovery and settlement of new continents. Extensive canal and road systems led to the ascendancy of France and England in the 17th and 18th centuries. The great railroad systems permitted the United States to change from a chain of cities along the seacoast into the great nation it is today. Our rapidly building Federal Interstate Highway System, and the motor carriers that travel it, are bringing the goods of America and the world to the most remote corners of the continent.

Here today and on the horizon are equally dramatic and far more fantastic symbols of change in transportation. I have mentioned containerization. The papers are full of exciting explorations of urban and interurban mass transit, low-flying trains to whisk along the northeastern corridor, gigantic cargo aircraft that could accommodate a basketball court, and hydrofoils that rise above the waves. The trade journals reveal giant new railroad cars for economical bulk cargo service, unit trains, and computer-controlled classifying yards. Straight out of the science fiction books are ground effects machines, electronic roadways, and vehicles that travel on a cushion of air—yet all are feasible. If James Bond can rise above Paris with a backpack one-man flying machine, surely we can look to similar prospects ourselves.

I mentioned fast trains: you all have heard of the new 125-mile-an-hour express from Tokyo to Osaka. During my recent visit to Japan, I had a chance to take a ride. Let me assure you it's every bit as fast and as exciting as you have heard. It should please you railroaders that it is really giving the airlines a run for their money. That's certainly a change.

Just as change has characterized the development of the transportation industry, so it has marked my own industry. And much of the change and the growth for aluminum has been spurred by its use in transportation. I risk a commercial and say that the material commonly called the light metal surely has a pre-eminent role to play for an industry to whom deadweight is lost dollars. Events of the past eight decades have proven this. Civilian and military transportation has long been No. 1 or No. 2 among the markets for our products.

Unfortunately, the inherent fascination of changes such as I have cited can divert our attention from other changes necessary to our society. For instance, think of the many social changes we must bring about. To take the most obvious example, we must find the answer to the problem of the world's growing population, which seems to be accelerating as fast as change itself. (There's a special challenge to the transportation industry in moving the growing mass of people and the goods they need, of course.)

Dr. Vannevar Bush has noted that one of the most challenging changes of contemporary society is in the direction of man's technical efforts. From the beginning of the industrial revolution, man was engaged in inventing machines to supplement the work of his muscles and senses. But today, man has embarked on a bold new adventure: the building of machines to supplement the work of man's mind.

As American businessmen, we must learn to meet such challenge and a host of other new problems: among them, how to help the worker who is displaced by automation but lacks the skills and abilities to be employed in other work; and how to meet the accelerating competitiveness of world trade. And like all men in all periods of history, we still have war, and we still have not found the final answers to the problems of citizen-government relationships. I will have more to say on this latter challenge.

Our magazines, newspapers, radio, and television remind us constantly of changes made and needed in our world. To such an extent, in fact, that it might be said change has become a cliche. The danger of a contempt bred by familiarity with change seems to me a clear and present one. The difficulty lies in change becoming so much a way of life that we lose our perspective. It brings a dangerous readiness to accept change for change's sake. It causes a myopia, in which all change is viewed in the same plane. It dulls our sensitivity to the truth that not all changes are right changes. It distracts the very men who best understand the dynamics of free enterprise from the unalterable fact that unless we profit by change—socially or economically, or both—it is no change for the better.

It seems to me we now often fail to plumb the full potential of today's change, because we are so preoccupied with deciding what we will change tomorrow. We don't even pause to benefit by what is around us already, so swift is our race toward what we can accomplish tomorrow. This is leading to an awesome waste of human effort and capital. I have in mind, for example, expensive research projects duplicated because we haven't solved the information retrieval problem. An equally significant example is the loss of morale and good will by employees and communities when business makes rapid changes that seem to threaten jobs or community resources, without pausing to interpret to those it might affect the positive potential of such moves. Transportation provides an early example of the results of undigested change: the builder of the vessel *Great Eastern* hedged all his bets, and sent her to sea with a screw propeller, paddlewheels, and six sailing masts.

To me, it is far more disturbing to contemplate the gap between social science and technology than the disparities between various areas of technological advance. Our confirmed ability to place man in orbit surely suggests that we can devise solutions to any major technical problem, if we choose to direct our knowledge and energy to this end. But, I find no such source of encouragement in what we might call human technology. This seems to be the tortoise in a race where the hare keeps on going. As businessmen, we can all enumerate an impressive list of things we haven't been able to—or perhaps haven't even tried to—change.

Where is the ingenious new device that places us significantly closer to being able to manage people with sensitivity and understanding? Have we found any new formulas to catalyze the relationship between people on the job? Have we made any breakthroughs in finding patterns to offer job satisfaction in an increasingly impersonal manufacturing situation? Has there been any technical fallout to help us over the Everest of finding workable ways to communicate the ideas we must sustain if our way of life is to be advanced?

I must regretfully observe that there has been no amazing new alloy of ingredients that would sustain even significant, let alone revolutionary, progress in such areas.

How are we to find the E equals MC^2 of human relations if we haven't even perfected the simple arithmetic? Distressing as this may be, it is even more overwhelming when we realize there are changes in technology now set in motion that will widen the gap still further, while simultaneously making the need for human relations progress even more crying. I cite as today's most vivid indication of this the growing computerization of our world. Can we fail to see the awesome and widening gulf this digs between man and technology? Surely not.

For those of us whose decisions will be of profound import in shaping tomorrow, there must be a commitment to confronting change with an awareness of such circumstances. We must spend equally as much imagination and energy—and, where indicated, capital—in fostering change in the area of human concerns as we do in bringing about technological change. In particular, we must bring ourselves to realize that the acceleration of change will continue, and that the answers to today's problems will not work tomorrow. In short, we must look ahead, not back.

An interesting list of some of the changes with which you and I must cope in 1966 was presented in a recent issue of the Iron Age magazine. The list was described as, "1966's New Realities." It just as easily could have been called Changes We Must Confront in 1966. It included the lengthening business boom, stimulated by a war economy; labor, with increased power and political influence, working through avenues never before explored; the ever-dynamic world market; the technical revolution; the shortage of skilled technicians and managers, and tightening money.

There was another item at the head of this list. I quote:

"First, and most important, is the basic reality that Government is an uncontrollable business partner. If not exactly a partner, the Government, guided by the almost irresistible hand of President Lyndon Johnson, will have a vote in almost every company decision."

I agree with the Iron Age. I am convinced that the role of Government in business is less and less subject to any quantitative discussions, except to observe that the impact of government at all levels—but overwhelmingly, and especially, at the national level—continues to increase, with little change of pace in prospect. As the businessman looks at this change, I feel he must turn from the quantitative problem—that is, from discussing "Should government influence business?" which today is an irrelevant question. At the risk of being called a defeatist, I question whether this situation is likely to reverse itself in the forseeable future, regardless of the political party in power. In fact, Government influence is likely to accelerate. As a result, the businessman must direct his attention to qualitative questions. Here I feel the businessman can responed to the increasing, changing role of government in his own business and in the free enterprise economy of which it is a part.

I realize that for transportation people—and, I would say, railroads in particular—Government influence of your business is old hat. You have more agencies than there are letters in the alphabet to identify them. However, I am convinced that the role now being played by Government is of vastly broader scope than anything hitherto experienced by even highly regulated industries.

There are several ways in which a businessman can ask qualitative questions about the role of government in his operations. He can, for instance, ask which is the most effective level—Federal, State, or local—at which a given problem can be handled.

Another of the qualitative questions a businessman might ask is, "Why is the caliber of many public officials not higher?" A frequent answer would be, "Because few of us take an active interest in politics, devoting time and concern to a political party and to our public officials."

Another possible question is, "Why don't people in Government understand me and my company?" The answer—or the lack of one—goes back to the problems in human relations and communications I mentioned earlier, of course.

One question I think we surely must ask is, "How can I contribute to a business-Government relationship that will yield the greatest possible benefits to all elements of our society, with particular concern for those whose welfare is affected directly by my decisions?"

I do not suggest that we blindly and meekly accept Government's growing involvement in the day-to-day conduct of business. Rather, I propose that we be realistic about Government's role; that by aggressive action we make our views known, and make sure these views influence the action of the Government. We must become participants rather than opponents.

Reality cannot be avoided. We are faced with a requirement to work with local, State, and National Government. And there is no likelihood that this situation will change.

In conclusion, let me suggest that we share a common responsibility as we give full throttle to change. We must give primary attention to change itself, since it is the most important fact of our lives today. And at the same time, we must seek a balance of change, giving attention to areas such as human relations, where we must have progress if we are to reap the full rewards of the technological changes we must also continue to make. And certainly we must contend first, last, and evermore, with the changing role of Government as an informal, but vocal and compelling party to our business decisions.

Thank you.

The 1965 Sports Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest the speech of our colleague, CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1, 1966, on page 1637 entitled "Milwaukee: Candidate for the Baseball Hall of Fame?". I sympathize with our colleague and the people of Milwaukee but to me it seems unfair that the people of Milwaukee must be compelled to resort to the courts for relief which is both expensive and delaying.

The injustices and discriminations which our colleague complains of have existed for years in our major sports. Our Supreme Court in 1922 in the case of *Federal Baseball Club of Baltimore* v. *National League of Professional Baseball Clubs* (259 U.S. 200) held that "business" of baseball was not "trade or commerce in the commonly accepted use of those words" and therefore not under our antitrust laws, which decision to this day has not been overruled. On the other hand, the other major sports have been denied that protection by our courts and as late as 1957 the Supreme Court in the case of *Radovich* v. *National Football League* (352 U.S. 445) had this to say:

> If this ruling is unrealistic, inconsistent, or illogical, it is sufficient to answer, aside from the distinctions between the businesses, that were we considering the question of baseball for the first time upon a clean slate we would have no doubts. But Federal Baseball held the business of baseball outside the scope of the act. No other business claiming the coverage of those cases has such an adjudication. We, therefore, conclude that the orderly way to eliminate error or discrimination, if any there be, is by legislation and not by court decisions. Congressional processes are more accommodative, affording the whole industry hearings and an opportunity to assist in the formulation of new legislation. The resulting product is therefore more likely to protect the industry and the public alike. The whole scope of congressional action would be known long in advance and effective dates for the legislation could be set in the future without the injustices of retroactivity and surprise which might follow court action. Of course, the doctrine of Toolson and Federal Baseball must yield to any congressional action and continues only at its sufferance.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it has been seen that the court has already made it clear that:

> The orderly way to eliminate error or discrimination, if any there be, is by legislation and not by court decisions.

This being true, Mr. Speaker, is it not up to the Congress to act rather than subjecting the good people of Milwaukee to expensive, unnecessary and delaying litigation?

It is my understanding that S. 950 sponsored by Senators HART, DODD, DIRKSEN, and HRUSKA, and which is known as the 1965 sports bill, passed the Senate last August and is now before our body for action and places baseball under our antitrust laws. It is also my understanding that our colleague, BYRON ROGERS of Colorado, has introduced H.R. 9981 relating to the same subject.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from Milwaukee [Mr. ZABLOCKI] asking our esteemed colleague, the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to take the lead in conducting full dress hearings covering all the inequities and discriminations that may exist in the major sports today and as suggested by our Supreme Court in the Radovich case and thereafter draft such legislation as may be necessary. The Congress of the United States owes this not only to the sport fans but to sports themselves.

The 159th Birthday Anniversary of Gen. Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Fredric Shriver Klein, professor of history, Franklin & Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

The remarks made by Dr. Klein were on the occasion of a commemorative program of the 159th birthday anniversary of Gen. Robert E. Lee, sponsored by the District of Columbia Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, held in Statutary Hall, U.S. Capitol, Washington, January 22, 1966.

There being no obection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS ON THE OCCASION OF THE COMMEMORATION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTHDAY OF ROBERT E. LEE, BY FREDRIC SHRIVER KLEIN, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, FRANKLIN & MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

On the 1st of June 1862, on a battlefield only a few miles from Richmond, while the battle of Fair Oaks was still in progress, President Jefferson Davis turned to his companion and military adviser, and said, without warning, "General Lee, I shall assign you to the command of this army."

Two events that could have been called chance or might have been destiny, had unexpectedly brought a new figure to the stage of American history. A stray bullet and a piece of shell had wounded Gen. Joseph T. Johnston, commander of the Confederate forces defending Richmond; and his next in command, Gen. G. W. Smith, suffered an attack of what is now called battle fatigue.

Davis' statement at that moment meant that a man who otherwise might have played only a minor role in our Nation's military history was to take a position of responsibility which was to win for him a permanent place of honor and respect in the hearts of all Americans, as well as to make him a symbol of a way of life for all time. Robert E. Lee's military activities as commander of the Army of Northern Virginia lasted less than 3 years, and yet in that brief span of time he become a legend, not only for his army or for Virginia or for the South, but for all Americans for generations to come.

How did this man capture the imagination and win the devotion of soldiers and civilians alike, who knew little about him except that somehow he inspired their faith and confidence in his leadership? When he took command, he was not widely known for his military ability, although Gen. Winfield Scott, who had seen Lee's action in the Mexican War, had stated that Lee was the very best soldier he had ever seen in the field, and urged that Lee should be his successor in command of the Union Army at the outbreak of the war.

But Lee came to his command with some public criticism for his failure to drive the Federal forces out of western Virginia, and had even been referred to as "Old Granny Lee," because he had been overcautions. He had been in charge of the seacoast defenses of South Carolina and Georgia, without much success, and his routine insistence on the digging of defensive earthworks did not help his popularity with his troops. There were no enthusiastic cheers from the ranks when the news of his command was announced, but Jefferson Davis had the same confidence in Lee which had been expressed by General Scott. The new commander's ability as a great military strategist was yet to be demonstrated, but it did not take long to become apparent.

The Lee legend did not develop from inspiring statements or immortal phrases by Lee which crystallized the objectives of the southern cause into memorable slogans for a great crusade. He was not in the habit of making them. It seems strange that there are few, if any, statements from Lee which have remained in the memory of Americans to typify his character or his ideals. His letters to his family are informal, warm, and wholesome, his military orders are simple and direct, and his few formal statements are adequate but not immortal. Even the impressive General Order No. 9, his farewell address to his troops, was drafted by his aide, Charles Marshall, as normal staff procedure. His deeds were to be much more significant than his words.

Nor did the Lee legend develop because of any dramatic emotional appeal, for he was not an exciting personality who captured popular imagination with an image of a gallant, reckless cavalier. There was none of the swashbucking, sword-waving comaraderie so often associated with the popular idea of the typical Civil War officer, galloping along the ranks or stirring his troops with fiery words. Lee was quiet, outwardly, but those who knew him best recognized the constant activity of his alert mind.

Lee's career in the 50 years before the Civil War throws some light on the development of the qualities which were to earn universal esteem in the war years. It is not strange that he has been held in somewhat of the same reverence which has been given to Washington, for there was much of the Washington tradition in Lee's life. There had been an intimate relationship between his father, Light Horse Harry Lee, and General Washington and the legend of Washington must have played a prominent part in Lee's boyhood days, even though Robert's father left the country as an invalid when Lee was only 6 years old. But the shadow of Washington was constantly near Lee, through his life in Alexandria and at Arlington, where he lived with his wife, Mary Ann Custis, a descendant of Martha Washington. It was particularly appropriate that the words which his father had used in describing Washington, "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," would be used with reference to Lee when he was formally appointed a commander of the Virginia military forces.

Like his father, Robert E. Lee was primarily a soldier, and within the relatively small circle of army personnel, he was recognized as an excellent officer. He was second in his class at West Point, efficient as an engineer, and skillful in military tactics during the Mexican War. His only position of administrative importance was his appointment as Superintendent of West Point Military Academy, but he had acquired some public recognition as the result of his suppression of the John Brown raid at Harpers Ferry in 1859, when he was called upon to command the troops sent to the scene of the insurrection.

So, in the fateful early months of 1861, Robert E. Lee was a colonel of the 1st Regiment of Cavalry, U.S. Army, highly regarded by his superior officers, but not well known to the rank and file or to the general public. He had not commanded large bodies of troops. He had no political experience and little political interest. He disapproved of slavery and of the idea of secession, but had made no impressive public statements. He loved his family, his Virginia home, and his chosen career in the Army. In these respects, there were many others like him. The responsibility of maintaining the Arlington estate occupied much of his time, and he seriously considered resigning from the Army to devote the rest of his life to the problems of managing a Virginia plantation. He could not have foreseen that when he left Arlington in April 1861 it would be lost to him forever.

What, then, was there about this man that was to mark him for a place in our Nation's history among the great Americans of all time? The 3 brief years of his Civil War career as an Army commander demonstrated almost immediately that he possessed two outstanding qualities that impressed friend and foe alike. His personal character represented the very best in the American tradition, and his military genius surpassed anything in American military history up to that time, and for many years to come.

The significant aspects of his personal character began to become apparent as soon as destiny selected him to lead the Army of Northern Virginia on June 1, 1862. Lee had a quality of quiet dignity which was as natural and normal to him as though he had been trained for a position of leadership during every previous moment of his life. It was a characteristic which became immediately apparent even to those who might have known him for only a short time, and which rarely failed to impress his associates. One of his aquaintances called him "the noblest looking man he ever saw," and the concept of nobility seemed to be associated with him constantly. It was recognized by contestants on both sides, and a northern newspaper, at the time of his death, only 5 years after the end of the bitter war, called him one of the few men who throughout the contest most nearly represented the idea of the true knightly soldier. Even at the height of the conflict, when both sides were hurling bitter and often exaggerated accounts of barbarities and atrocities, there was no chink in Lee's armor which could be attacked. "No man has so few enemies," wrote a British observer. Almost any officer could be, and usually was criticized for small personal vices, but Lee abhorred profanity, abstained from tobacco, and shunned alcohol. He was a large, handsome man, commanding in appearance, careful about personal details, and fond of neatness and order. He had a quiet humility which led him to take entire personal responsibility when failures occurred, and to refrain from criticism of others even when the faults were obvious. The New York Times commented, at the time of his death, "By his unobtrusive modesty and purity of life he has won the respect even of those who most bitterly deplore his course in the rebellion." It is significant that his former foes could deplore his stand, but they could not be angry or resentful toward him.

This knightly quality, so often romantically associated with the chivalry of the Old World, was a natural characteristic and not an assumed pose, as was so often the case with some of the military. He seemed to personify the aristocratic tradition—confident and assured on horseback on the battlefield, friendly and sympathetic to his troops, courteous and polite to his associates, gracious and gallant with the fair sex, and sincerely religious with simple and confident faith.

But it was not only the recognized nobility of character that raised the name of Robert E. Lee to a proud place in our history. Knightliness demands not only goodness and gallantry, but a knight must be able to fight and to fight well, and the work of a soldier was Lee's real love and life work. As a soldier, he had a sense of duty and responsibility which made the war a series of professional problems for which he had trained most of his life, and which it was his obligation to solve as efficiently as possible.

Strangely enough, although he became and will always remain the symbol of the Confederacy, Lee concerned himself not at all with the political or ideological aspects of the war. He was sincerely opposed to secession and it cannot be said that he was passionately interested in the permanence of the Confederacy. He had written, before the outbreak of the war, "There is no sacrifice I am not ready to make for the preservation of the Union, save that of honor * * * I wish for no other flag but the Star Spangled Banner."

But the web of fast-moving events in April of 1861 trapped Lee as it trapped many others. Lee's resignation from the U.S. Army took place not to join the Confederate Army, but because he could not accept the offer to command the newly raised Union Army which threatened the invasion of Virginia. There is reason to believe he might even have preferred to close his Army career and remain neutral, if that were possible, but he could not refuse services for the defense of his beloved Virginia, and when Virginia joined the Confederacy, her cause had become his. It had been a terrible and soul-searching decision for him to make, but when he had determined upon his duty, there was no thought of turning back, and his goal was clear to him—the dedication of his military ability to the cause of Virginia and the Confederacy.

While there was little opportunity during the first year of the war for demonstration of any exceptional military genius, he did become one of the few persons who enjoyed the complete confidence of Jefferson Davis, because Lee was tactful and diplomatic enough to understand the peculiar combination of military authority and political statesmanship which Davis embodied.

But his real ability became apparent within a few days after his appointment to full responsibility for the defense of Richmond. His special qualities of military skill had an immediate opportunity, and the characteristics which were to give him the reputation of a military genius became apparent at once.

The audacity of his first major campaign on the peninsula in 1862 was a dramatic prophecy of what might be expected from him in the future, for it was a daringly bold adventure that might have been disastrous. His army was outnumbered and faced by powerful forces within a few miles from Richmond. He divided his army, leaving only a token force in defense of the Capitol, and prepared to strike the Union Army on the northern flank, cutting off their base of supplies.

Ordering Jackson to threaten the Shenandoah Valley, and Stuart to threaten Union communication and supply lines, his brilliantly conceived and coordinated campaign resulted in 7 days of battle which turned almost certain defeat into decisive repulse of the Union Army. Never again were there to be charges that Lee was overcautious, for the success of this first major campaign won him the respect and confidence of the entire army.

In rapid succession, the actions of his army at 2d Manassas, Antietam, Fredericksburg, and Chancellorsville demonstrated that here was a new master of military strategy, and it was not long before Lee became the symbol of the hopeful invincibility of the Confederate Army. And yet Lee was not invincible, and there were defeats as well as victories, although the defeats were never followed by the bitter recriminations or criticisms which so often occurred when military plans went awry.

While today Round Table members and Civil War historians spend endless hours in pointing out the mistakes of Civil War generals, Lee would have wasted no time or argument on such matters.

He had always understood that command means responsibility, and never was this conviction more dramatically demonstrated than on the third day of the Battle of Gettysburg when Pickett's charge had been repulsed, and the long campaign had ended in failure. Many things had gone wrong on that third day, but Lee's only summary of the situation was contained in his simple statement, "It was all my fault." It must have been one of the most difficult moments of his career. The story is told that when he overheard some criticisms of the way in which the battle had progressed, he turned to the critic and commented, "Young man, why did you not tell me that before the battle? Even as stupid a man as I am I can see it all now."

Lee's reputation as a great military commander came from a number of qualities—his quick grasp of the military situation, the simplicity of his plans, his prompt decisions about major objectives, and the confidence he placed in his subordinates to carry out his orders, which was not always justified. He concerned himself about details, reconnaissance and the abilities of his opponent.

He had learned an important lesson from his early military training—that the duty of a commander is to make the final decision and to stick to it. His military orders were simple and uncomplicated, and their eventual success depended on the amount of initiative and responsibility assumed by others. It was a way of permitting the men under him to exercise some of their own judgment, and to have them experience some of the problems involved in making significant decisions. He had learned to analyze a military problem with an unusual capacity to anticipate his opponent's probable actions, and no small part of his reputation came from the speed with which he determined upon his policies.

The admiration which Lee's troops gave their commander was inspired in large part by his air of quiet confidence and in part by the fact that he usually kept his army on the offensive, which is always more inspiring than the uncertain situation of waiting for an enemy attack. While the South itself was on the defensive Lee usually managed to turn a defensive situation into an offensive attack. The man who inspired the affectionate title of "Marne Roberts" had the important quality which soldiers need—confidence in their commander, and this confidence did not come from grand reviews or inspirational speeches, but simply from the fact that Lee almost seemed to be a man of mystery who never by word or deed let the slightest impression grow that he had anything on his mind but the serious business of winning the next battle. He became the ideal father image to both officers and men, and the graying hair and beard which had now replaced the youthful black mustache of his earlier days added to the appearance of a patriarch.

It is interesting to compare and contrast the two men who became symbols of the two causes which came into conflict during the Civil War. There is a Lincoln legend, too, but it is doubtful whether any two men could be found in positions of leadership at the same time with more different characteristics.

Many of Lincoln's simple phrases have become a permanent part of the American philosophy, but there is little from Lee to quote. Lee was a soldier, concerned entirely and solely with his military responsibility, while Lincoln found himself deeply involved in military affairs, with very little experience or qualification. Lincoln was awkward, rough, often crude, and sometimes held in contempt even by his associates, while Lee seemed to enjoy universal respect.

Both Lincoln and Jefferson Davis were the subject of bitter cartoons and lampoons, but Lee could not be caricatured or ridiculed. And yet these two men whom chance had thrown into conflict had one great human characteristic in common—the quality of infinite patience in the face of towering problems.

There is sadness in both of them and with the sadness, humility. Both seemed constantly conscious of their inability to completely solve the task which Providence had given them, and yet both had unconquerable faith that they must do their best, as they saw it, and take the final awful responsibility for their actions.

They are a strange contrast, outwardly representing two entirely different personalities, but inwardly having much similarity in the common knowledge that they must bear the weight of their respective problems by themselves, must conceal the temptation to despair in times of darkness, and bear their misfortunes with silent patience.

We must be realistic with Robert E. Lee's place in history, as we must be with everyone. There is a constant temptation to deal in unqualified superlatives with national figures whose lives have earned them a significant place forever in our history, and perhaps to cloud some of the real truth with imaginary achievements. We should remember that Lee was not faced with the overall responsibilities which confronted Jefferson Davis, who had the problem of reconciling the unity of the new Confederacy with the sovereign rights of the separate States, in addition to his almost overzealous concern with military affairs.

Lee led only one army, and never had the opportunity to exercise the larger command which was awarded to him as commander in chief only in the last weeks of the war. Lee never found himself in the position of a political general, as so often happened in both the northern and southern armies.

It is all the more significant that this man, who stood in the spotlight of American history for only a few years, whose activities involved only one geographical area of a vast conflict, and who said rarely a word about the causes or objectives of the contest in which he was involved, should have emerged as a symbol of everything that could be admired in the human personality.

We honor and revere his memory for his purity of character, and for the influence it has left with later generations. There have ben many other leaders who, in their words and their actions, presented only an image of violent and bitter rebellion, but Lee could only appear as the champion of a noble crusade, even though the war had some of both aspects. As a military leader, those who have chosen this as their profession will always study and hope to emulate his cool and daring initiative, which, enabled an army to outmaneuver and often to defeat forces superior in numbers and training. We honor him for his sense of duty, his single-minded devotion to the task which faced him, and his refusal to be diverted by problems which were not his responsibility.

In paying tribute to Robert E. Lee on the anniversary of his birthday, we are faced with a mixture of emotions. The Nation can well be thankful that such a man emerged in a time of crisis to give us a model which we might well attempt to follow, but we are also reminded of a tragic war between brothers which we cannot help but deplore, as we place it on the pages of our history. Shortly after the close of the war, it was written, "The glories achieved in a civil war are unenviable at best. The Romans never erected monuments on the battlefields of their civil wars, nor permitted orations to the returning conqueror in an internecine strife."

We cannot erase this century-old conflict from the pages of our history, but history gives us the lessons of both the best and the worst from our past. Lee can now be honored and respected by all Americans just as the tragic fury of civil war can be universally deplored. This man personified forever the ideal concept of that simple but expressive phrase, "an officer and a gentleman." It has been truly said, "He did his best, and left the rest to Heaven."

Congressman Horton Offers an African Commentary on the Rhodesian Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I had the pleasure of meeting with three young men from Rhodesia who are students in the United States in my home community of Rochester, N.Y. A personal friend and distinguished educator in my home community, Mr. Norman N. Gross, arranged the gathering.

While the three students, Essiah Zhuwarara, Aaron Karimakwenda, and Timon Nyandoro, and I covered many subjects in our discussion, one of our principal topics was the Rhodesian crisis. In this matter, I found their comments so illuminating and helpful that I requested them, as officers of the Zimbabwe African Peoples' Union, Student Branch in the United States of America, to commit these comments to the form of a memorandum for my study.

I now have received this report, Mr. Speaker, and because of its value to all of us interested in helping to provide for an equitable and just solution of the problem in Rhodesia, I am honored to include it with my remarks for publication in the Congressional Record. I also would ask that my colleagues and those in the executive branch be particularly attention to the four-point plan of action which this report recommends.

Zimbabwe African Peoples' Union, Student Branch in the United States of America, Memorandum to Congressman Frank Horton

(Submitted by Essiah Zhuwarara, vice chairman; Aaron Karimakwenda, treasurer; and Timon Nyandoro, vice chairman, Rochester chapter)

PURPOSE

This memorandum is aimed at informing the American Nation, through their Congressmen, of the crisis in Rhodesia and it is hoped that the U.S. Government and its citizens will do everything possible to assist and bring about the downfall of the illegitimate, racist Smith regime, and then help in the establishment of a true democratic government based on one man, one vote.

THE HISTORY OF THE SITUATION

Since the arrival of the British settlers in Rhodesia (1890), the rule of law has never existed to date. The establishment of the infamous 1930 Land Apportionment Act divided the land into black and white areas. It gave all the best land to the whites: 70 percent of the total land to 220,000 whites; and 30 percent to the Africans, 4,500,000 people. The African people have no representation in Parliament, and their political parties have been banned and their leaders thrown into concentration camps and prisons, together with their 30,000 followers.

In order to clamp down African political opposition, the Smith regime has:

1. Banned several newspapers that expressed majority opinion, leaving government controlled press.

2. Restricted movement of the people by constraining their movements within certain areas.

3. Whittled freedom of speech by prohibiting political speeches both in public and private. It is unlawful for Rhodesian African citizens to tune radios listening to foreign news, including "The Voice of America," for which a 6-month term of imprisonment is the penalty.

Recent reports from British members of Parliament, and Bishop Pike, of California, who have recently been in Rhodesia, confirm that the dignity of the individual has been and is being subjected beyond human bearance by the use of gestapo methods of Nazi and Fascist Germany. Obsolete mines have been turned into "black holes of Calcutta" where the hard core of the African leadership is brutally grilled by the police. Police brutality has resulted in several deaths, and the inhuman laws of the country, designed for the Africans, have caused many otherwise innocent people to be executed, and there are many awaiting execution now. The inhumaneness of Rhodesian law was proved by Chief Justice Tredgold's resignation in protest.

U.S. VOTE AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Britain hoodwinks the world at the United Nations. Britain's claim that it is responsible for Rhodesia without physical presence in that country is a contradiction in terms. Britain admits that Smith's regime is rebellious and that Rhodesians are British citizens, but the scot-free rebellious Smith arrests, shoots, and imprisons British citizens at Britain's stare.

We are dismayed by American citizens in Rhodesia owing allegiance to the Smith regime. American industry and investments in Rhodesia are very unfriendly gestures to the African people, because they strengthen the rebellious Smith regime. According to Rhodesian law, any white male person between the ages of 18 and 55 is either in the army, police, or in the reserve unit. American citizens in Rhodesia (1,800) are part of this distasteful act.

This is the evil the U.S. vote in the United Nations supports by voting with Britain on the Rhodesian issue. The U.S. vote at the United Nations contradicts the U.S. foreign policy, that of self-determination, support of the declaration of human rights and the establishment of justice by direct involvement. We have yet to see the U.S. Government supporting its policies on Rhodesia realistically.

PROPOSALS

We propose—

1. That the U.S. Government support the creation of a truly independent Rhodesia with a constitution providing universal suffrage with the principle of one man, one vote.

2. That the United States urge Britain to release the nationalist leader, Mr. Joshua Nkomo, and all the masses in the concentration, detention camps, and prisons.

3. That the United States should demonstrate effective leadership independent of Britain.

4. That the United States should think in terms of establishing law and order in Rhodesia using a United Nations force.

We hope that this will be the beginning of the dialog between us and the Congressman and we hope that the Congressman will influence other Congressmen and members of the Government.

Records Broken on Coal Shipments on Norfolk & Western Railway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginia coal is being shipped to many foreign ports in addition to serving domestic markets.

Overseas shipments of coal, much of which came from West Virginia, increased an estimated 7.5 percent in 1965, to reach a record total of 22.5 million tons.

New records were set by the Norfolk & Western Railway in coal loading and dumping operations. Numerous mines are being opened or reactivated, providing more jobs.

In December, a $25.6 million project to deepen and widen the Hampton Roads, Va., channels of the James River was initiated. This vast improvement program will facilitate the exporting of Appalachian coal. West Virginia now produces 80 percent of the Nation's export coal, and most of this coal passes through the ports of Hampton Roads.

An article on the Norfolk & Western Railway's coal exportation appeared recently in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Coal Export—N. & W. Sets Shipping Record; State Field Supplies Bulk

Roanoke, Va.—Coal loading and dumping records were broken and rebroken along the Norfolk & Western Railway in 1965, and officials believe tonnages will continue to increase.

During the year, 78.3 million tons originated at mines along the N. & W., the largest amount in the road's history. This represented more than 15 percent of all coal mined in the United States. The road dumped 26.8 million tons over its piers at Lamberts Point, Norfolk, the highest total since N. & W. moved its first carload to tidewater in 1883.

"Our coal figures are gratifying," N. & W. president Herman H. Pevler said. "But even more impressive to me are the number of mines being opened or reactivated. There were eight such developments along the N. & W. this year with a total annual production rate of 1.9 million tons. And in 1966–67 we expect seven to nine more with total production potential of between 6.6 and 7.1 million tons. We are extending trackage to new mine sites, expanding the capacity of our coal-carrying fleet which now numbers some 65,000 hopper cars and preparing generally for future expansion."

Pevler added that mine openings already projected in 1968–69 would add still another 2 to 7 million tons to annual production.

N. & W.'s weekly all-time coal loading record was broken six times during 1965 and now stands at 33,698 equivalent 50-ton cars. The daily mark, also raised several times, now is 6,981 cars. Numerous other records at the Norfolk piers were smashed.

The world high for coal loaded into a single ship now stands at 71,855 net tons taken by the supercollier *Sigtina* at new coal pier 6. The coal came from 1,024 N. & W. cars. Only 4 years ago a record 31,050 tons, also set at Norfolk, was a proud figure. Among pier records established was the 134,582 tons dumped over N. & W. piers in a 24-hour period.

Overseas shipments increased an estimated 7.5 percent over 1964 to 22.5 million tons, with movements to Japan, Italy, and Spain showing the largest gains. Biggest foreign customers were Japan, Italy, Holland, West Germany, Belgium, Spain, and Brazil in that order.

Steel mills and other coke producers continued to be the largest consumers of N. & W. coal. They used 26.2 million tons in 1965, a 6.7 percent increase over the previous year. Electric utilities consumed 18 million tons, up 1.3 percent.

TV in Nonpresidential Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROCK ADAMS
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, last fall a most informative conference on the uses of television was held here in Washington, D.C. Stimson Bullitt, president of the KING Broadcasting Co. of Seattle, Wash., and a former candidate for Congress gave a very important presentation of the relationship between political campaigning and the television media.

His remarks at that time should be of great value to all who view television, who work in the television industry, and particularly to men and women who seek elective public office.

Therefore, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix to the RECORD the text of that fine speech. The text of the speech will require approximately 2½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of approximately $260, and, under unanimous consent, this expense is allowed and the remarks are included in the RECORD for today:

TV IN NONPRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

(Talk given by Stimson Bullitt at National Conference on Broadcasting and Election Campaigns)

I. ACCESS TO THE MEDIUM

A. Introduction

This subject contains three problems: access to the medium, attracting an audience, and providing instruction. That is, how to get the candidates before the camera, the voters before the screen and the former to enlighten the latter. First, let us consider access to the medium.

B. Exclusion by cost barrier

Several feedback effects of TV on the campaign process have become evident. Photogenic quality is more important. The comprehensiveness of the audience tends to inhibit the use of sharp, strong language and manners of a kind which would offend some ears and eyes which would not have been found at a political rally in the past. Speaking to a cross-section of opinion, not to a group comprising a single viewpoint, is another moderating factor. Also, the universality of coverage—augmented by the press—makes it no longer possible to take extreme contradictory public positions—to say you are for something out in the country and against it when you are in town. One result is to make campaign language and manners more bland, more polite and more internally consistent—if no more logical.

To date, there does not seem to have been much use of the "pseudo event" in TV campaigning. Much more of this continues to be done in the newspapers.

But of all the feedback effects, by far the most important has been the large increase in campaign cost.

TV's impact makes TV almost essential for a campaign, while its cost makes it prohibitive for many, yet, not only is there a high overall cost—getting into the game—but the unit cost is high compared to that paid by many other users of the medium.

In most mass medium solicitations, not all of the audience is composed of prospective takers of what the speaker is offering. But in a nonpresidential campaign, the proportion of the audience which the speaker tries to reach is small. Many of the audience are nonvoters or live outside the electoral district which is the candidate's target. Furthermore, in primary races, many of the remainder are excluded by the fact of their registration with another party—or attachment to it in other ways. The result imposes a cost per thousand on him which is higher than that sustained by most commercial sponsors. In general, the smaller the district, the higher the unit cost.

Yet where television is used skillfully it is so efficient a means of campaigning that a comparatively small amount of television time should be enough to provide for most of the efforts of an informative campaign. By the savings enabled on other means, it should permit a campaign to be conducted comparatively cheaply. By the speed of its process, it could enable shorter campaigns as well.

This cost factor's most harmful consequence is its tendency to exclude candidates of merit—as well as candidates who lack both merit and money. Access to this powerful instrument now is largely limited to those who are either rich or show enough probability of winning to attract campaign contributions. By definition, the latter status can be attained by only a few, and attainment without entering Faustian bargains is as hard as it was for the Biblical rich man to pass through the needle's eye in order to enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

This harm tends to be greater in the cases of primaries and small offices. Few channels of communication are available. A candidate has a commensurately greater problem of access to and dependence on a TV station.

By its own effectiveness in directly reaching the voter, television tends not only to outshine other election methods, but actually to disintegrate some of them, such as the party organization, which tends to become superfluous in the television age. TV's effect on campaign processes compares to that which it seems to be having on professional baseball, that of withering the minor leagues—but we cannot resort to developing our political leaders in the Caribbean, Mexico, and Japan.

The general result is greatly to favor those who are in or up—the incumbent, the rich candidate, the well-established one who arrived long ago—and to bar the upstart, the dissenter, the man outside the consensus. This campaign problem is accentuated by the news broadcasts' focus on the consensus every day of the year. About the only men outside the consensus who can get their notions broadcast are H. L. Hunt and Billy James Hargis. Television gives an enormous advantage to those enabled to use it and a commensurate disadvantage to those who are kept in the outer darkness. It leaves them ciphers and their ideas unknown, making even greater the contrast between haves and have nots of access to the medium.

This increased emphasis on cost does not mean that as a ticket for admission to public office the gifts of political leadership have been superseded by the ownership of riches—that Pericles is replaced by Croesus. Nor does it mean that campaigning skills have given away to the skills of making money—the replacement of Cicero by Crassus. It does mean a narrowing of the dialogue, a stagnation of public ideas, a concentration on the proven, the widely ppoular and the previously successful.

C. Subsidies

1. General

The path toward mitigating this harm seems to lie in a combination of subsidies, rules of application and other policies which tend to enable greater diversity, a freer market of ideas.

Subsidies can be provided by the stations, by the public treasury or both. If by the government, should the subsidy go to the candidate or to the station? The former would seem to permit greater freedom, flexibility, and competition: enabling the candidate to place his money where he thinks it would be most effective, choosing between media and between organs within a given medium. However, the public interest would not be well served if the money were used for measures which provide heat rather than light. Such public money would simply shift funds from the public treasury to the mass media without public value. On the other hand, to require candidates to spend their money on forms of solicitation which enlighten rather than simply get votes might be impossible. The only apparent alternative is a direct subsidy to stations, putting strings on the money to require that the programs which it buys are used for public enlightenment.

It would seem wise to confine the subsidy program to TV, not to extend it to AM. The latter medium seems inadequate for attaining the desired combination of appeal and instructiveness in a campaign program. The AM audience, regardless of programing skill applied, tends to be negligible in size for an enlightening campaign presentation and small for an informative one. The Commission study of last year's campaign showed that candidates seemed to agree with this as they concentrated their AM spending on spots. (It may, of course, be an effective compaign medium—for bits of information, name familiarity, and other sales techniques, and for reaching special groups such as ethnic minorities.)

In either the grant of subsidies or their application, they should not be flat. The races to which they are applied vary widely in their needs and significance. The stations, whether contributing or receiving a subsidy, vary greatly in their profitability, primarily according to the size of the market (and secondarily on the number of competitors with which a station shares it). Because the revenue curve in relation to market size rises more steeply than the cost curve, the net profit curve rises even more steeply than the revenue curve. As a result, a small town station may have an extremely small profit margin and a big city one, a large margin. This variation in profitability creates an equivalent variation in capacity to do useful and expensive things in the public interest. Therefore, without a graduated subsidy scale, regardless of the difficulties which this would entail, it would be both unfair and ineffectual to impose an equal duty of such programing on big city stations and the small.

2. By Whom

Here is a rough approach to the problem. The networks and the network affiliates in the top 50 markets should contribute their own time—and money—on the ground that they can afford to by reason of a privileged position. (If this is required, maybe no one will want to buy into the top 50.) And a graduated scale of subsidies should be granted by the United States to other commercial TV stations.

3. Application to Candidates

In applying the subsidized time to campaign programing, stations perhaps should give free time to certain of the small races (and perhaps run them in a low-priced period) and offer to participants in the bigger races to sell them time at a heavily discounted rate, say 10 percent of card rate (the 90 percent discount, the subsidy element, being contributed by the Government or borne by the station, as the case may be).

The programing time which should be provided should be of two kinds. Where a candidate cannot afford to buy himself other exposure, he should be allowed to speak his piece as he sees fit, unrestricted except in the use of some kinds of procedural or technical dishonesty (the lack of restriction being to protect him from unfairness—intentional or otherwise—at the station's hands).

But for the rest of his time and for the time provided others, the station should keep tight format control toward the end of producing Crowmwellian portraits. The basis of the policy is to give citizens a rational basis for decision, not to give a candidate, free of charge, a chance to misrepresent himself or to assert not his nature but his trademark slogan and his name.

D. Gain

The basic gain of the subsidy program would be to reduce the cost burden on candidates—with resultant decline in thralldom to contributors—and reduce the contrast between haves and have-nots in access to the medium. The combination or subsidy and regulatory pressure would tend to induce a station to provide free or cheap time to a candidate who otherwise would be excluded.

In the large races, where big money is available to be spent (such as general statewide elections in the bigger States or the New York mayoralty), the low rate plus the exposure would tend to induce the significant candidates to present themselves in a program enlightening to the audience, while the comparatively small but substantial charge would still tend to exclude those insignificant candidates who could not afford to pay it.

E. Limitations

However, the subsidy program alone is insufficient. In some cases, the offer of free time gives an airing to certain candidates who are a waste of everybody's time. In other cases, even a heavily discounted rate may bar from the air some impecunious minority voice which has something to say and which ought to be heard. Possible examples are the candidacies of LaFollette for President in 1924 and of Stuart Hughes for Senator 3 years ago in Massachusetts. But the best examples are people so obscure we never see them on the screen, some of whom are even deterred from running at all.

In the smaller races (including almost all primaries), the device of the heavy discount is too unsound in its discrimination to justify use. The reasons are two: The narrower spread in financial capacity among the candidates—so the charge excludes many significant candidates and fails to keep out many insignificant ones—and the lower correlation between significance and capacity to pay.

The subsidy system can substantially help the candidate with a middle-sized campaign fund but not the man with a small one. He often cannot get enough exposure to make a significant impact. Like middle-income public housing, it is useful but does not solve all problems in the field. The practice of giving exposure to a candidate who does not have a chance merely conceals the injustice.

A candidate with a big campaign fund can tend to swamp his opponents. The proportionate disparity between him and some of them is narrowed only slightly by the subsidy, since he adds his share to his bounty. An incumbent is not only likely to attract an adequate campaign fund—a real self-fulfilling prophecy—but his free news event appearances between elections may be enough to take care of him.

The subsidy may strengthen the dialog by putting the parties on a more even basis—in some places by revising the two-party system—but fails to reach beyond the zone of consensus. Yet it seems reasonable to ask and to help the medium to do more than support the consensus, even though the government itself does not. Even though a subsidy overcame a station's reluctance to give away what it otherwise could sell, it would continue to be disinclined—for reasons both pecuniary and constructively civic—to provide even subsidized time to insignificant candidates. So a subsidy may enliven the dialog within the consensus but tend to freeze out those persons and ideas outside.

The subsidy program's primary limitation is its failure to provide for sound discrimination. The problem remains of fair treatment in a subsidy's use. One aspect of this is how to formulate a policy, enforcible either by a subsidy carrot or a penalty stick, which can assure exclusion of the man from the Free Will Greenback Party or the Total Immersion Trotskyites, yet not bar some worthy young unknown in a primary or a new minority voice of significant novelty or dissent.

F. Supplemental measures

Since the subsidy system is not enough, supplemental measures are needed. A greater diversity of licensees to serve each community would help more than any other thing.

Another, until it can be improved on, is the law (sec. 315) prescribing equality of treatment. Although such treatment does not insure fairness, and although it is odious to the stations by its resemblance to block-booking or tie-in sales, it still protects against a worse injustice of allowing some stations to discriminate against a candidate, either for being poor box office or for taking a position the owners oppose.

Repeal of section 315, or its confinement to the major parties, would still further concentrate the attention on the consensus—which is a proper means for executing policy but not for formulating it. Such a change would tend to put many candidates at the stations' mercy.

The tendency, in our political system, of third-party movements to become absorbed into the big two, does not deny the significance of their effects, even after absorption. And if a novel movement is stifled before it can make its mark, the big two are not enabled to derive new directions from it. If the equal time rule were amended (as has been proposed) to apply only to representatives of parties which had received at least 4 percent of the vote in the last election, it is hard to see how a new movement ever could qualify for TV coverage without first employing TV.

It has been noted that news media report a famous man's death but not his birth. To determine whether a newly born child will be famous is even more difficult than to determine whether a newly declared candidate will be someone, or say something, worth considering on the screen (if he is allowed to appear). But the casting director for a campaign program, if left to himself, must exercise a combination of perception, judgment, and honesty seldom found in broadcast management. Yet if stations are to be allowed to discriminate only according to guidelines prescribed for them, how can such guidelines be formulated to handle such subjective decisions?

In trying to answer some old questions I've raised almost as many new ones. These must be left unconsidered. Some lie outside the scope of this discussion, and the rest are barred by limitations on my time or knowledge.

II. ATTRACTING AUDIENCE

A. Difficulty

Now it avails little to give the candidates access to the medium if they cannot use it to gain access to the audience. Their difficulty in winning and holding an audience derives from several factors: One is competition from programs which most people prefer. Another is less interest in the nonpresidential races. Third, neither candidate nor broadcaster can match the skill used in the national races in making the most appealing use of the medium. A large cause is the fact, previously mentioned, that most members of the audience are not in a position to act in any way on the solicitations made.

The painfully low resulting audience rating tends to make many broadcasters despair of making any effort to devise means to improve the appeal of such programs. Any political program long enough to provide enlightenment rather than simple name familiarity or a smack of personality, and run in the evening when voters are watching, is likely to cut the audience and the station's revenues.

Can anything be done about this problem? With a large audience, the cost per thousand would drop and less money would need to be spent.

B. Solutions

1. Simultaneous Broadcasts

Here are two suggested partial solutions which are supplementary rather than exclusive.

First is an agreement between stations in a given market to run their political programs simultaneously. The programs would not duplicate each other, so there would not be a waste of time and effort, but they would be run at the same time in order to escape loss of audience to other TV shows. Such an agreement would be difficult to reach, but not impossible, and its execution would be easy.

2. Stage and Dramatize

(a) Production help: Second is to stage and dramatize the programs to give them more popular appeal. The effort should be to make the subject matter more lively and real, not simply orderly and tame, like the conventions. One way is by providing production advice and help. Many candidates lack the staff support which can provide this independently. Since this lack is often due to lack of campaign funds, the station thus tends to serve as an equalizer as well as dramatizer.

(b) Homework by candidates: Another measure is to induce the candidates to do their homework, both in the subject matter and in their use of language. This factor makes a big difference in appeal as well as persuasion. Many candidates, unless urgently guided otherwise, persist in spending 8 hours at shaking 300 or 400 hands—with most of the time spent tearing around in a car going to occasions where hands may be shaken—rather than preparing for a TV appearance at which 30,000 or 40,000 people may make their decision on how to vote in his race. When Kefauver spoke in Seattle in 1950, much of the audience was prime for ignition by a show of leadership, and he was on the only TV station in the Northwest. Yet he merely read a speech by two local flacks; the audience could see little but the top of his head and the upper rims of his glasses (although this limited view can be attributed in part to the cameramen's lack of developed skill).

(c) Special programs: Also, a station can produce special programs on a race. One kind is a documentary consisting of a series of biographical sketches of the contestants in a given race. Another is a telethon, but run by the station, not by the candidate, who may be inclined to have batting practice pitches put to him.

III. INSTRUCTION

A. Support of light, not heat

For a TV campaign program to be in the public interest, it not only should enable the worthwhile candidates to appear and to win and hold the audience, but it should enlighten the audience as well. It should illuminate the candidates and what they are talking about. It should provide light rather than heat. The latter can be provided by provocative slogans, catchy jingles, projection of an apparently appealing personality, incessant repetition of a name, and other measures with which we in the media must make our living. The use of these may give one candidate a competitive advantage over the other, but the only public issue is the matter of the cost and its consequences. This is one which Mr. Schroth dealt with at lunch today. Our problem now is what methods can give to the public information and understanding on which to base their civic decisions. Here is a suggested general framework on which many variations can and should be made, both to improve the scheme and to provide the variety necessary for preserving public appeal.

B. Comparison

So that the candidates can be accurately compared with each other—the essential element of the voter's decision—they should be presented together and engaged in addressing themselves to the same matters.

If there are no more than three candidates and if they can and will join the issues, the debate format provides both enlightenment and drama. It should not be forgotten that understanding and amusement are not mutually exclusive, that light is not necessarily dull.

Another format, and one of more general application, is to have the candidates answer the same questions. No rehearsal, no advance notice. Camera work should make the person's appearance as realistic as possible—to show the "real them." No teleprompter, no reading of speeches prepared by someone else. No cosmetics, except perhaps as a corrective measure where a person looks worse on TV than on the street.

Further, candidates should be examined by a single interrogator so that consecutive thinking can be followed, and responsive answers can be pressed for, while with several questioners a question more easily can be evaded.

To undertake this, a station must take the initiative in providing a skilled and fair interrogator and seeing that he is properly prepared. The problem of fairness is a difficult one because a questioner can conceal a bias far more easily than the witness, the candidate, who must take positions, even if they are blurred. The interrogator's responsibility is a large one because although he cannot misquote a candidate as a writing reporter can, he can misrepresent him by guiding the subject and influencing the tone of the discussion.

The questions should emphasize the important issues. In this way the general neglect of them can be compensated, while the responses cannot but help to disclose the personality of the candidates.

This format should be made an adversary proceeding for the joint purposes of bringing out the truth and dramatizing the spectacle. Wigmore claimed that the practice of cross-examination constituted the most powerful engine for eliciting the truth. Cross-examination combined with television tends to make a penetrating engine for the electoral process.

IV. CONCLUSION

Our medium's nature, so aggressive in comparison to the passive book on the bookshelf, makes it a fitting instrument to provide members of the public with some of the things which they ought to have in addition to those for which they ask.

Water Project Rules Could Be Guide for All Federal Spending Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the editorial from the Huron, S. Dak., Plainsman, under date of January 26, 1966, pointing out the intensified trend to Federal intervention in the life of Americans through the $112.8 billion budgetary program of the President.

This editorial might have been even stronger had the Watson report been available at the time it was written, the report which proposes to guarantee to everyone in America a certain income, regardless of their desire or ability to work.

The editorial follows:

WATER PROJECT RULES COULD BE GUIDE FOR ALL FEDERAL SPENDING PROPOSALS

Intensification of the trend to Federal intervention and control of many aspects of American life is apparent in the $112.8 billion budget sent to Congress Monday by President Johnson.

The budget, which advances the causes of the Great Society, aid to education, slum eradication, and direct aid to the impoverished, is woven of the threads of Government control and massive Federal programs in which administrators, not the local people involved, will have the final determination.

In education, for instance, the President proposes Government subsidy of bank loans to college students from low-income families and Government guarantee of all other loans. This would take the place of the present plan where colleges lend Government funds to qualified students and would eliminate the local determination of a college administrator that an education loan is warranted.

And in spite of the protests over the application of Federal guidelines for spending of Federal school aids approved in the last session, the President is seeking more money to be spent on the children in the impoverished areas according to Federal rules, not as determined by the local administrators who know better, perhaps, the needs of their own schools.

Big cities, long the beneficiaries of Government aid in urban renewal and related projects, now will be eligible for Federal purchase of park land and open spaces and service centers for the dense population areas. This is an open political grab for masses of votes.

Despite the allegation of politics and inefficiency in the poverty war and the questionable need for these programs with dropping unemployment, the President asks for another $390 million for an effort which has accomplished very little.

Tucked away in the total request is a small amount—$2 million—for the Garrison irrigation project construction. This project was approved by Congress when the people themselves in the area involved showed they wanted irrigation and were willing to repay the Federal investment. This is one Federal expenditure which was sought by the people involved and which will be financed in the long run by the people benefited.

If other Federal programs had this prerequisite of local support and repayment contracts, the budget might be lower and the danger of Federal intervention and bypassing of local governmental units certainly would be greatly reduced.

Budget Cuts for REA Would Be Ruinous to Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in studying the administration's proposed budget for fiscal 1967, I was appalled to note that the loan level for the REA electric program has been slashed to $270 million. In addition, I understand that the administration has impounded $132 million of the $402 million authorized by Congress for use in the electric loan program during fiscal 1966.

The catastrophic effect which these proposals would have on our rural electrification program is apparent when you consider the fact that over $675 million in electric loan applications are either on hand at REA now or will be submitted by the close of the current fiscal year. If the fiscal 1966 program is cut back to $270 million, loan applications totaling better than $400 million cannot be considered because of a lack of funds.

This staggering backlog of loan applications will then have to be carried over to fiscal 1967, where it will be added to the $413 million in new applications which the rural electric cooperatives have indicated they will be submitting to REA in fiscal 1967. Obviously, the $270 million electric loan program proposed in the administration's fiscal 1967 budget cannot begin to take care of the fiscal 1966 backlog, let alone the new applications.

Mr. Speaker, I am vitally concerned with the economic and social well-being of the rural area which I have been privileged to represent in Congress for the past 24 years. Because of this, I have a deep and longstanding interest in the operations of the numerous Federal programs which have been designed to combat poverty and aid in the development of rural America.

Unfortunately, many of these programs appear to be missing their goal. This criticism cannot be made of the REA electric and telephone program. Like the Farmers Home Administration and the Small Business Administration programs, the REA program operates at the grassroots level. Its accomplishments are of direct, immediate, and lasting benefit to the rural areas served by REA's electric and telephone borrowers.

The 10 rural electric cooperatives in my home district in Wisconsin have done much more than simply providing lights to their 43,073 consumer-members and their families. The power furnished by these co-ops is making possible the recreational and industrial developments which are so essential to the revitalization of our depressed rural economy.

Some of the Federal lending programs are of the type which can be deferred temporarily without lasting damage. However, this is not true of REA. Adequate financing is the lifeblood of the rural electric systems. It is not enough to string some electric lines in rural America and then consider that the job of rural electrification has been completed. Our rural electric cooperatives must have access to adequate amounts of growth capital if they are to be able to furnish the increasing amounts of electricity required by a growing rural economy. If a budgetary tourniquet is applied to REA loan funds, the productive capacity of our rural areas will be the real victim of the resulting anemia.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress recognized this basic truth when it provided for an REA electric loan program of $402 million for the current fiscal year. This included a direct appropriation of $305 million, a contingency reserve of $60 million to be used if needed, plus the $37 million carryover from the contingency reserve authorized by the Congress in fiscal 1965 and released at the 11th hour by the Budget Bureau following repeated requests for such action from Members of the House and Senate. By impounding $132 million of this money, the administration is flouting the expressed will of the Congress in regard to adequate funding of the REA electric program.

In view of these facts, I have urged the President to issue a directive to the Budget Bureau and to REA to utilize the entire $402 million authorized by the Congress for fiscal 1966 to meet the loan needs of the rural electric cooperatives. In addition, I feel it is imperative that an REA deficiency loan fund be authorized for the current fiscal year in order to reduce the loan application backlog to a manageable size.

Since the $270 million budget request for the REA electric program is patently inadequate to fill an expected $413 million loan need in fiscal 1967, I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to join me in supporting an increase in the REA appropriation or the establishment of an adequate contingency reserve. Use of such a contingency reserve should be based on the need for funds by the Nation's 1,000 rural electric systems.

The Congress did not provide the fiscal 1965 and 1966 contingency reserves for the purpose of window dressing. The Congress intended this money to be used if and as needed. The need existed in fiscal 1965 and continues to exist in fiscal 1966, but the Budget Bureau has chosen to regard the contingency reserve as untouchable.

Mr. Speaker, the rural electric cooperatives of the Nation are developing a plan designed to bring outside supplemental capital into the program and thus to minimize the need for direct appropriations. In truly cooperative fashion, they are working on a proposal which would establish a cooperative bank for rural electric systems, a credit institution which the rural electrics would ultimately own and operate.

It is commendable that our rural electric co-ops are taking steps to implement such a forward-looking proposal. Congressional action will be necessary to put this plan into effect, and it will have my active support when it comes before the Congress. Meanwhile, we must assure that adequate funds are provided to meet the current needs of the rural electrics.

Legislation To Close American Ports to Ships Trading With North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to close American ports to ships trading with North Vietnam.

My purpose in introducing this legislation is to serve notice on some of our allies that while we tolerate dissent from our war aims, we do not tolerate trade with our enemies in war material that menaces our own American troops.

The British are the worst offenders. The British Government will trade with anybody for a brass farthing. The British Government is hypocritical talking about the British Commonwealth while shipping goods to North Vietnam that support war against American and British Commonwealth troops from New Zealand and Australia.

The British have a history of maritime opportunism and self-serving. Britain may no longer rule the waves, but Britain still waives the rules. The British can be made to comply with honor only through hard words and actions.

My bill will not affect many ships. The ships that trade in southeast Asian waters do not often call in American ports. The real intent of my legislation is to serve notice on our opportunistic allies that we had had enough of their trade with North Vietnam in war goods. I believe that adoption of my bill might be just what we need to make our point without harsher measures.

The War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Appendix today for the benefit of my colleagues a letter which I have received from a constituent of mine, Mr. Volney F. Morin, concerning the war in Vietnam. Mr. Morin is a veteran of World War II and the Korean war, and his letter is as follows:

Representative H. ALLEN SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Permit me to introduce myself as a voter in your district. Further, to introduce myself as one who volunteered for World War II on December 8, 1941, was honorably discharged on December 9, 1945 after 3 years of overseas duty, 3,000 flying hours, combat service in three theaters of war, and a commission as a lieutenant senior grade in the U.S. Navy. Further, as one who served in the Korean hostilities for a full 18 months in the theater, as a judge advocate with the rank of major in the U.S. Air Force. From this background, you will understand I am not a pacifist.

I find myself increasingly alarmed at the impossible war situation in Vietnam.

This letter is written as the strongest possible form of missive request that you and the recipients thereof do everything within your power to withdraw U.S. troops, or take the responsibility of declaring war under article I, section 8, of the Constitution and thereafter obliterating North Vietnam. The administration appears to be confused about the nature of war. The aim of war is to kill and destroy the enemy in sufficient number so that the survivors may be told what to do. It is not to force someone to a bargaining table. This view is nonsense.

We must stop the useless sacrifice of our men in an alien jungle to satisfy a useless escalation to nowhere. War is the most serious business in which men can engage. It must either be conducted with the sole aim of victory, or it must be abandoned.

Please follow either course—abandonment or victory—but do everything you can to end our own Government's useless position of fighting on the mainland of Asia with weapons of the enemies' choosing.

The courtesy of a response is not requested.

Sincerely,

VOLNEY F. MORIN.

Speaking in Unison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there has been some talk about "consensus" in recent months.

For most of the latter half of 1965 we on our side of the aisle were talking of the rising signs of inflation. But a consensus was lacking, since the White House insisted there was no problem of inflation.

Now that has all changed. The change is described well in the following editorial from the Evening Star of Washington for February 2:

SPEAKING IN UNISON

William McChesney Martin, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, found himself a rather lonely man as 1965 ended.

He had served notice back in August that he was worried about the possibility of inflation. By November, when word got around that the Federal Reserve was thinking of tightening up money by increasing the discount rate, the reaction from the administration was not long in coming.

Treasury Secretary Fowler, following the easy-money, expansionist philosophy of the White House, declared that such an increase to dampen inflation would be "premature and unwise." Within the next few days a startling example of the Johnson treatment ensued. Commerce Secretary Connor and Laobr Secretary Wirtz in separate speeches suggested there was still plenty of room in the economy for expansion without inflation. Then Joseph Laitin, a White House press aid, told reporters the administration didn't "consider inflation a major threat at this time."

The climax to all this came December 2 when the President himself told the Business Council in Washington that economic growth in 1966 would not be accompanied by inflation. "We can produce the goods and services we require," he declared, "without overheating our economy."

The rest, of course, is history. Martin & Co. ignored the drumfire of pronouncements and announced a raise in the discount rate December 5. The President, obviously displeased, deplored the action and said it should have been postponed until the Federal Reserve had the "full facts."

Well, a funny thing has happened at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. In his economic message the other day, the President conceded that avoiding inflation is "perhaps our most serious economic challenge in 1966." He spoke of a possible further tax increase and even hinted that price controls may lie ahead to cope with the problem.

It's nice to know that he and Mr. Martin are now in accord on the inflation hazard. But it does seem odd that the Federal Reserve arrived at this conclusion nearly 2 months ago. It suggests that Congress showed extraordinary wisdom back in 1913 when it created the Federal Reserve as a body independent of the Chief Executive and political pressures.

Address of Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN REIFEL
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have included in the Appendix of the Record the address of Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, at the 81st annual meeting of the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce, Aberdeen, S. Dak., on Thursday, January 20, 1966, in which he discussed the Vietnam situation.

General and Mrs. Johnson share a warm place in the hearts of many South Dakotans and, particularly, in Aberdeen. Mrs. Johnson was born and reared in Aberdeen and lived there while her husband was serving in the Pacific during World War II and during his ordeal as a Japanese prisoner of war after Bataan.

General Johnson joined his wife in Aberdeen at the end of the war. They became well-known and respected citizens in the community. The Johnsons still cherish the many friendships founded during the time they lived there.

General Johnson was the subject of the cover story of the December 10, 1965, issue of Time magazine.

The speech follows:

I am sure that you have heard many times why we are in Vietnam, but it bears repeating. I have found it difficult to find a better expression of our obligation than one written in a letter by a young Army captain to his wife shortly before he was killed in action. This letter was not written for publication although his wife subsequently permitted it to be published. It was a private communication between husband and wife, where the husband was expressing better than most of us can some of his innermost thoughts and feelings. I quote:

"I feel that there is too much talk of despair. * * * Above all, this is a war of mind and spirit. And it is a war which can be won no matter what present circumstances are. For us to despair would be a great victory for the enemy. We must stand strong and unafraid and give heart to an embattled and confused people. This cannot be done if America loses heart. * * * Please don't let them back where you are sell me down the river with talk of despair and defeat. Talk instead of steadfastness, loyalty and of victory—for we must and we can win here. There is no backing out of Vietnam, for it will follow us everywhere we go. We have drawn the line here and the America we all know and love best is not one to back away."

It is important for people to understand that while someone must spring to the immediate defense of the freedoms that we enjoy today, all of us have a stake in the outcome. Thus, it becomes important for us to be knowledgeable, and to keep a perspective as well as a sense of proportion about today's events and activities in Vietnam.

TACTICAL CHANGES

During the past 2 years I have made four trips to South Vietnam and returned from my most recent one just 3 weeks ago today. Two changes of major significance have occurred during this 2-year period. Two years ago, the Vietnamese Army, bolstered by a limited American advisory effort plus significant American materiel and hardware, was battling small Vietcong units that would concentrate periodically in battalion size of about 400 to 500 men for a specific engagement and then disperse.

These enemy formations were receiving directions on a weekly or sometimes more frequent basis from Hanoi, and the South Vietnamese Army was just barely holding its own. Today, those same gallant Vietnamese soldiers are battling battalions and regiments of Vietcong who have now been reinforced by major elements of at least three divisions of North Vietnamese troops. They continue to receive direction from Hanoi, but on a daily and sometimes an hourly basis.

However, significant friendly support has now come to the assistance of the Vietnamese. Korea, with her intimate knowledge of the terror, the humiliation, and the devastation associated with Communist aggression, has provided a combat division. Australia, an ultimate objective of Communist expansion in the Pacific, is providing an infantry battalion, some airlift forces, advisers, and medical teams. This Australian battalion has just completed an operation in the Iron Triangle area north of Saigon, with elements of our 1st Infantry Division. New Zealand has sent both combat forces and civil assistance teams. Altogether, 38 nations are providing assistance either of a military or of an economic or civil support nature and, of course, we have committed our blood and our treasure.

COMMUNISTS INFILTRATE

How did all this come about?

Let's go out west to Bowdle. You are familiar with Bowdle and the way the people live in that community. Now in your imagination pick up Bowdle and set it down in the delta area of South Vietnam, about 40 miles south of Saigon. Picture a Vietnamese who unobtrusively returns to his community after a lapse of some years.

Unknown to his neighbors, he was Communist oriented. In a very cunning way, he soon ingratiated himself with one of the members of the town council and brought that council member under his influence. Perhaps he loaned him money; perhaps there was something in this council member's past of which he was ashamed and wanted to keep hidden.

The two of them then went to work on other members of the town council so that the Communist, after a period of time, could grasp a position of minor authority in order to increase his influence. In 2 years, 3 years, or 5 years that town council became deeply influenced by the Communists, if it were not an outright Communist organization.

At about the same period of time, unusual things began happening in that community. Strangers passed through who stayed only a day or two. Levies were placed on the villagers for a few pounds of food. Occasionally, a special, forced collection of money was taken up. Now strangers moved in and stayed. Occasionally, a man who appeared to be seriously injured was carried in on a stretcher and cared for by one of the villagers. Structural materials were brought in, but there was no evidence of any construction. It had gone into caves, tunnels, and fortifications beneath the houses of some of the villagers.

The once friendly and happy air of the village turned into one of suspicion and fear. The district or county chief appeared in the village less frequently. The province or state chief never visited the village. Village officials, schoolteachers, and religious leaders who remained loyal to the government suddenly disappeared or were murdered. Government tax collectors were driven out and over a period of years, that village became a Vietcong village.

This course of events has been followed in many villages in South Vietnam. The number is not known, but there are about 10,000 hamlets in Vietnam, and these hamlets are grouped together into about 2,560 villages. In addition, there are major metropolitan areas such as Saigon, Da Nang, and Hue. Cells of Communists exist in the larger cities but the extent of their control is not the same as in the rural areas.

OTHER WEAPONS USED

To accelerate this process of infiltration and takeover, the Vietcong use the weapon of intimidation and terror, going to any extreme of brutality which they believe necessary to destroy the fabric of society. As a typical illustration, during the week of January 2–8, the Vietcong murdered 24 civilians, wounded 73, and kidnaped 328. Many of the civilians were province or hamlet officials, schoolteachers, or Buddhist monks. To portray the magnitude of these atrocities in relation to U.S. population, which is more than 12 times larger than the population of South Vietnam, the figure would be over 5,000 U.S. civilians killed, wounded, and kidnaped by the enemy during the week.

The takeover by infiltration of the political structure and by intimidation and terror apparently was too slow for the Communists, for, in 1959, they greatly intensified their efforts, and boosted them again in 1961. It was at this stage that additional American advisory effort and materiel were provided.

U.S. EFFORT BOOSTED

Today, you are aware of the growth of our effort. Our commitment of combat troops began in March 1965 with the landing of elements of the 3d Marine Division. This was necessary because increasing acts of terror and sabotage against installations where U.S. forces were located were endangering our assistance effort. In May, the Army's 173d Airborne Brigade was landed to provide protection for other installations.

Concurrently, we began to build a logistic base to support the combat troops we had committed. The adequacy of the logistic base is one of the items that tends to be somewhat puzzling to the general public and, from what I gather in my discussions with civilians, tends to be a cause of concern. Vietnam really had only one major port—the port of Saigon, which is located up a river that twists and turns and requires time to navigate. Tht port is required to receive the supplies for the population, supplies for an economic aid program and military supplies.

With the growth of the military effort, it is obvious that there is an equivalent growth in supplies required to sustain that effort. To meet the need, we are developing additional ports, one of the largest being Cam Ranh Bay. On December 26, I stood on a pier at Cam Ranh Bay that had been fabricated in Illinois, towed down the Mississippi River, across the Atlantic Ocean, through the Suez Canal and emplaced at Cam Ranh Bay. A ship was unloading on each side of that pier. We also have offloading points up the coast from Cam Ranh Bay. While there is still a backlog of shipping waiting discharge, this backlog is dissipating rapidly and I believe that we will catch up soon.

When you consider that Saigon is at the end of a supply line nearly 10,000 miles long and that it takes 19 days for a fast ship to make the trip, it takes time to build up stockpiles to sustain the military effort.

As an added complication, supplies that were ordered a month ago may have a lower priority for use by the time that they arrive. A combat action in Vietnam may have resulted in a heavier than planned consumption of some other items of supply that are on other ships. Moreover, many supplies that necessarily are shipped to Saigon have to be reloaded on other ships and carried up the coast. The Vietcong have cut a number of roads throughout South Vietnam; hence, it is safer and less costly to move supplies by sea to coastal ports and then inland. Of course, we have an extensive in-country air logistic system that also helps the supply problem.

As to the impact of this logistic buildup, many commanders volunteered the information to me while I was in Vietnam that there had been no combat action undertaken that was inhibited in any way by a lack of supplies. However, it is natural that in the early stages of a rapid buildup such as has occurred in Vietnam, that our support will be thin in places for varying periods of time. Normally, we try to have supplies on hand to support the troops for a considerable period. It should be evident that these supplies must be built up and at the present time our stockpiles are growing at a rapid rate. When I was there in December, we had then built up to well over one-half of what they ultimately will be. Thus, the fact that a ship is not unloaded does not mean that our soldiers are suffering for the supplies that are aboard that ship. We have a very solid foundation for a logistic system that will support whatever level of effort our President decides is necessary.

TROOPS ARE CONFIDENT

How and what are our troops doing? I spent about 8 days visiting just as many units as I could cover in that period of time, starting out early in the morning and finishing up late at night. Everywhere that I went our commanders and our soldiers were simply filled with confidence. They have demonstrated an ability to lick this treacherous, cunning enemy in direct combat. They have demonstrated an ability to dig him out of his tunnels and caves. They have demonstrated an ability to avoid his booby traps, his bear traps, his punji stakes, and his mines. We are still taking casualties every day from these devices, but our troops have learned to cope with them and are doing a simply magnificent job.

Our forces are confronted by two kinds of military action. First, because our helicopters enable us to range far and wide, we are searching out enemy formations so that they can be taken under attack.

This is a reassuring capability because we should be able to avoid being surprised by enemy mass formations and defeat the parts of the mass before they can assemble into an overwhelming force. This was done by the 1st Cavalry Division in the Ia Drang Valley Battle in mid-November. Second, we must continue to search out long established enemy hideout or safe haven areas. The battles that have occurred last week and going on into this week in places with strange names like Cu Chi, Lai Khe, and the Michelin Plantation are examples of this kind of action. Our forces have uncovered large quantities of supplies.

Last week, for example, one unit discovered enough rice to feed three Vietcong regiments for about a year. Those regiments must now find another source of supply. Some of this they will attempt to take from the farmers and thus create an animosity that serves to dry up the sea in which the guerrilla fish swim, using Mao Tse-tung's expression.

At the same time, our forces are engaged in other kinds of constructive, country-building endeavors. They do not fight all the time. When they are not fighting, small teams are out helping the villagers rebuild schoolrooms, or building new ones, improvings sanitation, providing fresh water, perhaps helping a widow repair her house. A most important activity is the valuable service performed by our medical personnel. Wherever our troops are located, our doctors and corpsmen are not only treating the sick, but are teaching the benefits of basic hygiene. They are giving of themselves and are giving heart, as Captain Spruill said, to an embattled people.

VIETNAMESE FIGHT WELL

In reporting the events in South Vietnam today, our papers very naturally tend to highlight the activities of the U.S. forces and to a lesser degree the activities of the Australians and the Koreans. U.S. activities are described quite fully, although the actions in which casualties occur usually receive a special recognition. On the other hand, the thousands of actions that are conducted by the Vietnamese forces each day are largely overlooked.

I want to assure you that the Vietnamese are fighting and fighting well. They have demonstrated a very remarkable resilience and an amazing ability to absorb punishment, when one thinks back upon the number of years that they have been fighting. Do not discount the Vietnamese effort and do not get the impression or the idea that the United States is taking over the war. This is still a Vietnamese war, and while they are pulling all that their capabilities enable them to pull, they continue to need the help of the United States and other allies.

From my visits to Vietnam, I see a country in deep trouble. I see a country in need of unwavering help. I see a people ravaged by war because Hanoi and Peiping continue to export the tools of violence and to seek absolute political domination over the helpless. I see a succession of brutalities, of innocents murdered in the night, of kidnapings with no return, of exploded mines maiming children and parents in buses—all because Hanoi controls and fuels the aggression in South Vietnam. I see a determined people who have been fighting communism since 1954, bleeding in human lives on the average of 500 soldiers a week, desperately striving to establish political order so that they can live, prosper, and enjoy the blessings of freedom, in peace.

Yet, I also see that rather than cease aggression in the face of South Vietnamese resiliency and determination to resist, Hanoi has increased support of the Vietcong by infiltrating more supplies and North Vietnamese regular army combat forces. Thus, we have had to respond with combat forces to the South Vietnamese call for assistance, and until Hanoi halts its aggression, we must continue to defend freedom in South Vietnam.

WIDOW'S REPLY

I receive many touching letters from some of our soldiers and from the families of some of our soldiers, who understand what they are fighting for. They understand the importance of today's task in Vietnam in relation to America's continued freedom.

In closing, I would like to read a brief quotation from a young mother. I had lunch with her husband a year ago in December in Vietnam. He was a brilliant young officer, among the top of his West Point class, a Rhodes scholar, and one of the people that we had looked to for leadership in tomorrow's Army. He was killed by a sniper's bullet as he was accompanying a Vietnamese patrol in his area of responsibility. I wrote his widow, as I do the families of all of our people who die in Vietnam, and I received a reply from her. In this reply, she said:

"I now realize that the cost of freedom is truly a terrible one, but I can assure you that one of my deepest beliefs is that our freedom must and shall prevail, whatever the cost."

These words show that our Nation's strength lies not in its things material. Our strength lies instead in the enduring dedication of our people to America's heritage, in our courage, in our willingness to sacrifice leisure, comfort, talents, even life itself, for the sake of our fellow men and our Nation's high purpose in the unfolding fabric of history.

Red's Long-Range Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious aspects of the South Vietnamese war is the manner in which Cambodia is assisting the Communist aggression in Vietnam. Cambodia, which has received hundreds of millions of dollars in taxpayers' money in the form of aid, has betrayed our friendship and has virtually joined the camp of the Communist aggressors. For all too long there has been a reluctance among too many officials in this country to face up to the Cambodian problem and take the steps necessary to protect the lives of U.S. fighting men and our allies engaged in the Vietnamese war, and whose efforts are handicapped by Communist utilization of Cambodia.

Consequently, it was with considerable satisfaction that we learned of the recent report that our military commanders in South Vietnam have at least some limited authority to pursue Communist forces from Vietnam across the Cambodian border.

This situation is the subject of a very informative column by Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, appearing in the South Bay Daily Breeze, Torrance, Calif., and in other papers served by the Copley News Service.

Because of the manner in which this column by the VFW national security director, General Hittle, explains the seriousness of Cambodia's assistance to Communist aggression, and specifically its effect upon the war in South Vietnam, I include the column at the conclusion of these remarks:

THE CHANGING SCENE: REDS' LONG-RANGE STRATEGY

(By James D. Hittle, brigadier general, USMC, retired)

WASHINGTON.—The decision to permit U.S. troops to pursue Communist units across the Cambodian border marks another critical step in the ever-widening war.

It is about as close as one can come to a jungle version of the seagoing "hot pursuit" doctrine. From now on when Communist forces are getting pummeled on the South Vietnamese side of the border, they won't be able to drift back and thus escape combat defeat.

But there is far more to the breaching of the Cambodian border sanctuary than the pursuit across it.

What we are seeing is the continued expansion of the conflict. It is another example of how artificial, and hence futile, it has been for us to try to restrict the scope of the war to an area smaller than what is actually involved in the Communist offensive.

Contrary to what the demonstrators and protesters are saying, this is not unilateral escalation by the United States. We and the South Vietnamese aren't turning a localized conflict into a larger one.

The reason is that the South Vietnamese war never really was a local one, neatly confined by issues and operations within the national borders.

The war in South Vietnam, as important as it is, is but a part of the overall Communist war of aggression in southeast Asia. We should have openly recognized long ago that we were involved in a southeast Asian war, not a South Vietnamese one.

Communism has marked all of the southeast Asian peninsula as a target and the Reds have conducted their offensive with deliberation.

The strategic groundwork has been astutely laid for the long-range offensive to seize the southeast Asian peninsula. A key aspect of the Red drive was the creation of the Laotian-Cambodian corridor. Red military action in Laos combined with Cambodian Prince Norodtm Sihanouk's betrayal of U.S. friendship to give the Communists a central zone extending down the length of the southeast Asian peninsula from the Red Chinese border to the Gulf of Siam.

This Laotion-Cambodian corridor does many things. It splits the peninsula; it outflanks Burma from the northeast; it carries Red aggression to the borders of South Vietnam and Thailand. It provides the overland supply route—the Ho Chi Minh Trail—for carrying supplies southward from the Communist bases in North Vietnam and Red China.

Within the last few months the Communists have further disclosed their southeast Asian plans by bluntly announcing Thailand is next on their target list. Already Red terrorism is on the increase in the frontier areas of both Thailand and Malaysia.

All of this illustrates how the Communist general staffs look on the southeast Asian peninsula as a single arena. The current phase of Red aggression requires the seizure of South Vietnam and the expulsion of U.S. power from it. The reason: to clear their eastern flank. If they can do this, they can, with greater freedom of action, then turn southward against Thailand and Malaysia.

The decision to pursue across the Cambodian frontier is a partial recognition that we cannot restrict the conflict to the South Vietnam sector when the Reds are waging war throughout the peninsula.

Good Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have complained of irresponsible coal operators who strip the countryside without properly replacing the soil. I was author of the bill calling for a study of strip-mined lands by the Secretary of the Interior, and I sponsored reclamation of mined areas on the public domain in the Appalachia bill.

Both the study and the reclamation work are going forward as planned, but meanwhile mining companies which have always been good neighbors are continuing to provide forests, agricultural and grazing lands, and recreational areas in the regions which they mine.

There is another phase of coal mining requiring particular attention for the public welfare, and I am happy to report that four operators in western and central Pennsylvania have been complimented by Pennsylvania's Secretary of Mines for developing methods to handle acid mine discharges.

Dr. H. Beecher Charmbury last week paid special tribute to the following companies for their efforts in complying with the State's new clean streams laws: Bethlehem Steel Corp.; Barnes & Tucker, of Barnesboro; Rochester & Pittsburgh Coal Co., Indiana; and the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

These companies are good citizens. Other operators should make every effort to follow their example.

Vast Change in Greensburg in Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

VAST CHANGE IN GREENSBURG IN DECADE

Greensburg is a different city than it was 10 years ago.

Residents of this community do not recognize how far reaching this transformation has been as much as former residents upon their return here.

The change has been gradual but significant.

Advent of new schools and new public works brought about the dawn of a new era here and in Decatur County as well.

In 1956, the principal industries were: Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp., Consolidated Veneer Corp., now Mitchell Industries, Inc., Cyclone Fence Co., and Dry Clime Lamp Co.

Bohn continues as one of this city's most valued industries with a high record of stable employment. Mitchell Industries, Inc., is approaching its 20th year of production in Greensburg, marked by steady employment and expansion.

A decade ago, Cyclone Fence Co. was singing its swan song as a Greensburg industry. Following termination of its operation here, the main building was purchased by Carol Cook, Inc., which in its dress operation employs more people than Cyclone in its heyday.

Other portions of the former Cyclone plant are now utilized by the Hanover Wire Cloth Division and Indiana Wire Products, both gaining in output.

A decade ago, Dry Clime was beginning to show its potential in its development as a leading firm in the infraray field. Its greatest progress has been made in the past 10 years.

The objective of the Greensburg Chamber of Commerce and the city administration a decade ago was to provide facilities which would make this city more attractive to industry.

Meanwhile, completion of Interstate 74 near this city in the early 1960's served as another stimulating factor.

The parade of industrial progress commenced in 1958, when Delta Faucet Co. announced its decision to locate a plant here for manufacture of Delta patented single-lever faucets. Not only has this company added to its floorspace three times but it has just completed a major expansion for use in plating, buffing, and polishing.

In 1959, the Randall Co., now a division of Textron, Inc., selected Greensburg for its first plant in Indiana. This operation has become of economic importance to this community.

On May 15, 1962, annoucement was made that Bearings Co. of America a division of the present Federal-Mogul Corp., would construct an industrial facility in Greensburg for the manufacture of ball bearings. Acclaimed as the most modern bearings plant in America, BCA began operations here in the early summer of 1963. In 1965, the company installed new equipment and increased its employed personnel by a third.

Providing diversification in industry have been two new industries, which located in Greensburg in 1963 and 1964. The first of these, Crown Zellerbach Corp., produces plastic film bags for many uses. Crown Zellerbach is installing additional machinery, which in the near future will mean expanded employment.

Rafco Plastics Division of Gulf Oil Corp. located here in 1964 and began production of polyethylene film late in that year. Currently, Rafco Plastics Division has started a new addition in order to gain more space for its operations and for warehousing in serving Midwestern markets.

Both Crown Zellerbach and Rafco Plastics have considerably exceeded initial estimates of employment at the time their plants were opened in Greensburg.

In addition, Greensburg has several smaller industrial operations, which contribute to the economy of this community.

Circulation of the Greensburg Daily News has increased from 5,000 in 1956 to 5,775 in 1966. Now in its third year is WTRE-FM, which plans to buy property near Greensburg for future expansion. Another operation, Decatur County REMC, has acquired land west of the city. Two new shopping centers have been opened.

Various utilities have expanded their operations during the past 10 years. Public Telephone Corp. has installed a dial system, provided for direct dialing and now uses a microwave tower. The Decatur County Rural Water Corp. was formed in 1965. The Greensburg Municipal Water Works has expanded its system.

In 1956, Edgewood Acres was the principal subdivision, adjacent to Greensburg. Not only has Edgewood Acres been expanded but over a half dozen new subdivisions have become the site of new homes.

Development of Lake Santee is becoming the equivalent in economic value to a new industry in Decatur County.

Expansion in several Decatur County communities has occurred in the past decade, notably at Westport and St. Paul.

Development of industry has brought new families to this community. Key figures in the new industries have become active in the life of this community.

The change in the past decade has brought to this community a balance between agriculture and industry. In the field of agriculture, new peaks were registered in 1965. Livestock prices have turned upward, benefiting the economy of Decatur County.

A decade ago, youths from farms had to seek employment in larger centers. Now, many of them are finding employment opportunity in their home community.

There have been many other evidences of change: new rental establishments; remodeling of store fronts and interiors; new street illumination downtown; peak deposits in banks and savings and loan associations; improvements by fraternal groups; expansion of recreational facilities; improved municipal facilities; and numerous other types of developments.

The past decade in Greensburg and Decatur County can be characterized as a period of remarkable progress.

Subterfuge Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting and illuminating editorial appeared in last week's issue of the Sturgis (S. Dak.) Tribune, entitled "Subterfuge Spending," which certainly is food for thought for every Member of Congress who last year voted for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and who must certainly be interested now in how it is being administered.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the RECORD and suggest that every Member read it. It follows:

SUBTERFUGE SPENDING

We listened to an explanation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act enacted by Congress last year at the annual Meade County school officers' meeting here Monday, and left the meeting in a state of shock. We suspect a lot of the school board members did too.

The speaker was a representative of the State department of public instruction who has been assigned the task of coordinating implementation of the Federal act in South Dakota. He disclosed that South Dakota is eligible for a Federal grant of $7 million under this act and he pointed out the funds will be allocated in other States if not utilized here.

He candidly reminded that, whether or not the school board members approve of this new Federal program, the money is going to be spent somewhere and South Dakota districts might just as well take advantage of the funds allocated to this State. It was not this "use it or lose it" attitude that shocked us, however, as we have become conditioned to this philosophy of public spending. We are reluctant to accept the wisdom of this philosophy, but we think it must be conceded that the general public has accepted it.

What shocked us was his explanation of the intent of the act and how it is being interpreted to make Federal funds available to virtually every school district in the land, whether they need them or not. The act, he explained, was designed to finance the schooling of educationally deprived children and the funds allocated under it cannot be used for general education purposes.

He pointed out the Federal funds are available only for specific projects outside the scope of general education that are oriented toward helping the educationally deprived child. These projects, he added, must cost a minimum of $2,000 to even be considered. However, he said two or more districts may join together in providing these new school projects.

But what is an "educationally deprived child?" Under strict interpretation of the act, he explained, it means a child coming from a family of less than $3,000 per year income. Now, public education in South Dakota, and we assume elsewhere, is not offered on a financially segregated basis. The student from the poorest family gets the same educational opportunities as the student from the wealthiest family in our public school system. The act was obviously geared for urban centers where pockets of poverty can be easily identified.

It became apparent some months ago that a more liberal interpretation of the act's provisions was necessary if South Dakota and other States like it are to share in this massive Federal aid to education program. So the Federal funds were allocated to the districts on the basis of the percentage of students each of them are estimated to have of the total number of families in the State with incomes under $3,000 per year counted in the last Federal census.

The fact that each district is assumed to have some students from low-income families automatically qualifies it for a share of the county's allocation. However, specific projects not already in the school program are required for release of the Federal funds. A district may inaugurate more than one new project, depending on its needs, but each project is evaluated independently on its merits.

Under this formula, Sturgis Independent School District No. 12 qualified for $27,000 of the $72,000 allocated under the act to Meade County. The Government, based on the last census, estimates there are 335 "educationally deprived" children in Meade County. The Sturgis district is using most of its allocation for the new kindergarten project. It plans to use the remainder on summer remedial projects. Now, of course, the kindergarten program here is open to all youngsters of the qualified age, regardless of the income status of their parents. The summer remedial programs will be too.

The real shocker at Monday's meeting came when the speaker explained the expanded definition of an "educationally deprived" child as determined in conferences between State and Federal officials. "Every school has some children that aren't doing as well as other children," he commented, "and the Federal funds can be used on projects to help them." In other words, under this compromise definition, a poor student is also "educationally deprived." This, apparently, is justification for use of the Federal funds in financing summer school remedial programs. But a "poor student" is not necessarily a student from a poor family.

The speaker disclosed the Federal funds can even be used to finance the training of teachers for special remedial courses. He added that most applications for project approval in the State so far have come from the independent districts. But he reported there are many possibilities for the common school districts to qualify for the funds allotted to them too. We certainly agree with him there. And, like the man said, if these districts don't dream up qualified projects, the money will be shifted to districts in other States that do.

The new Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been heralded as a great boon to the educationally deprived. It is subterfuge, however, to contend that the act is being implemented only to help students from poverty-income families. It is, actually, being used to provide additional courses open to all students. It is merely assumed that some of the students will be from poverty-income families or will be poor students in the academic sense. This is not to say that these additional courses are not beneficial or worthwhile. But it shows how the act has been interpreted to pump Federal funds into all school districts that enlarge their curriculums.

The speaker at Monday's meeting preferred not to comment on the question of whether or not the Federal funds will lead to Federal control of the schools. He opined that it is too early to tell and added that there are many differences of opinion on the question. He conceded, however, that there is much red tape connected with gaining approval of projects qualifying for the Federal funds. But there is little doubt that the act has been liberally interpreted to make it possible for all districts to qualify for the Federal money.

It would have been far better, in our opinion, if the Government had turned the $7 million over to the South Dakota school districts without any strings attached. We have no doubt that the districts would have put the money to good use. It would have avoided the need for subterfuge and eliminated a lot of unwieldy administrative procedures.

Where Are the Protests Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the voices of protest within our country against the American position in Vietnam have been sobered and silenced, to a large degree, by the ominous Communist rebuff to President Johnson's peace overtures.

Those voices which earlier were lambasting the administration for what they felt was its passive pursuit of peace should now, in all fairness, be blasting the enemy for its refusal to embrace the peace overtures. But, unfortunately, they are rather strangely silent, as the following editorial from the Deseret News of January 29, 1966, points out.

The Communists' rejection of our peace bid adds a rather ominous dimension to the belligerence that the Red Chinese have been showing for many years. It is reminiscent of Hitler's attitude 30 years ago.

The defense of South Vietnamese people against the vastly superior aggressor has become a grim and distasteful business, as was the prospect of standing up to Hitler in Czechoslovakia and Austria. But history teaches that, from our failure to face that challenge, far bloodier consequences followed.

The Deseret News editorial, "Where Are the Protests Now?" raises some questions that the critics of our Vietnam policy, and for that matter, all Americans should be asking themselves. I ask my colleagues to study the editorial in full:

WHERE ARE THE PROTESTS NOW?

As President Johnson and his advisers weigh the agonizing decision whether or not to resume bombings in North Vietnam, has anyone noticed a thunderous silence?

What has happened to the voices of the professors and the artists and the students and the draft card burners who were so loudly demanding peace?

For the past month and more, the administration has engaged in a most energetic campaign for peace. It has sent its representatives to capitals throughout the world where there has been any chance of meaningful progress being made. The President has proclaimed his readiness to talk peace at any time, without prior conditions or other qualifications. Other world leaders have added their voices for peace.

No one can doubt the sincerity of the effort. It has been accompanied by a moratorium on bombing in North Vietnam so that no excuse of provocation could be possible.

Through it all, only silence and scorn have come from North Vietnam and its puppeteer, Red China. Silence, except for the roar of terrorist bombs.

Where now are the voices of the Americans that were raised so vigorously against the administration's war policies?

Why do we hear not a single word of praise from them for what the United States has done in search for peace?

Why do we hear no condemnation of the Peiping-Hanoi axis for refusing to make the slightest move toward peace?

What force, what guidance really lies behind the Vietniks that makes them so critical of their own Government, so blind to the faults on the other side?

We recognize, of course, that many of the demonstrators are sincerely and honestly concerned about the killing of Vietnamese, the danger of expanding war, the loss of Americans in such a faraway land. So are we all.

But in their sincerity and honesty, why is it so difficult for them to recognize the reasons why leaders of both political parties and the great majority of Americans believe, also sincerely and honestly, that we must make the effort in Vietnam?

Is it because there are among the nameless, faceless leaders who feed them ideas, persons whose real loyalty is not to America, but elsewhere?

Most Americans earnestly hope that a way can be found, and soon, to continue the moratorium on bombing North Vietnam, that fighting can be limited on the ground that peace talks can begin, that Americans can be pulled out of Vietnam, that those people can live in peace and dignity and self-determination.

But most Americans also recognize that the barriers standing in the way of such a happy solution have not been erected by Washington, but in Peiping and Hanoi.

Lake Central Tries To Help Muncie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board currently has under consideration a case involving continuation of much-needed air service in Muncie, Ind.

It was my privilege to appear before this Board and add my support to that of Lake Central Airlines and the Muncie Chamber of Commerce for retaining service through Muncie from Chicago to Cincinnati.

This service represents a critical need for the Muncie area which is highly urban and industrialized. Not only is the service necessary for adequate passenger use, but for the air freight demands of the many industries and businesses located in the Delaware County area.

As we all anxiously await the CAB decision on this case, the Muncie Evening Press published a recent editorial which briefly describes the importance of the efforts to secure this air service.

In order that Members of Congress and the various governmental agencies be apprised of this critical situation affecting our area, I request, under unanimous consent, the editorial be published in the Record.

The Muncie Evening Press editorial follows:

LAKE CENTRAL TRIES TO HELP MUNCIE

Lake Central Airline and the Muncie Chamber of Commerce made an excellent presentation in behalf of Lake Central's plea to continue airline service between Muncie and Cincinnati.

The decision rests with the Civil Aeronautics Board. Since a Federal subsidy is involved, the CAB is studying the feasibility of continuing the service.

Muncie must have airline connections.

It now has connections only with Chicago and Cincinnati. It needs more connections, not fewer connections.

To the great credit of Lake Central, the airline recognizes this need and is doing everything possible to retain what we now have and to get more, if possible.

Heavier use of Lake Central facilities would be Muncie's best way of supporting the Lake Central program.

Quillen, Metcalf, and Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it has been said time and time again that east Tennesseans are hearty, hard working souls who refuse to give up, especially when they know they are right. Maybe it is the fresh mountain air and the beauty of the area that encourages them. But, at any rate east Tennesseans are loyal and durable—whether they are farming on a rocky hillside or debating in Congress.

Such a combination of farmer and statesman put Del Rio, Tenn., on the map last year and has kept the spotlight turned there in 1966. This team was none other than my fine colleague Jimmy Quillen of Kingsport and a constituent of his from Del Rio, Mr. Wilford Metcalf. The U.S. Government claimed Metcalf was trespassing and even cutting timber from U.S. land without authority. Not so, said Metcalf, the land "is mine." He wrote his Congressman who joined the fight, a success all the way.

This interesting story has appeared in many newspapers and in national publications such as Life magazine. This month it is condensed in Reader's Digest. It is a fine tribute to Jimmy Quillen and to the spirit of east Tennesseans, and I want to share it with others by placing it in the Record:

THE MAN WHO WOULDN'T "LAW" WITH UNCLE SAM

(Condensed From Life, by Warner Ogden)

A man can still buck the bureaucracy and win. All it takes is determination, a good Congressman—and being right.

"There just ain't no way for a poor man like me to win when he laws with the Government."

Lean, sun-bronzed Wilford Metcalf, 48, hunkered up in a cane chair to a kitchen table in his house high on a remote mountainside in Appalachia. Laboriously he scribbled on five ruled sheets of school notepaper, pushing a ballpoint pen that belonged to one of his four children.

His 140-pound frame was tireder even than when he hoed his six-tenths of an acre of burley tobacco or milked his three cows on what level patches he could find on his cliff-hanging farm. That agricultural outpost is outside Del Rio about 12 miles east of Newport, Tenn. Metcalf and his wife, Eliza, were born and brought up in this section. He was among 13 boys and girls of a pioneering couple who had fought and loved these hills.

But a cloud now shadowed that pastoral scene. A few weeks before, the postman had jolted up the twisting road in a pickup truck and put two envelopes in the tin mailbox outside the tiny four-room house. The letters were from the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee. One accused Metcalf of "claiming some 55 acres as being your property when, according to our records, this land is part of the Cherokee National Forest, acquired by the U.S. Government in 1935." To "quiet title to this property" Metcalf would have to relinquish any claim to the land within 30 days or face a Government suit. The other letter charged Metcalf with cutting timber on U.S. land without authority and said he was responsible for "damages" of $1,717.52.

The one-two punch brought back a dread which had possessed Metcalf 4 years ago, but which in recent months he had convinced himself was groundless.

After Metcalf, partially disabled by a fungus affliction on his feet and hands, had limped back from the war in Germany to his beloved mountains, he had married Eliza. With his small pension the new husband purchased a farm of 86 acres on Cane Mountain for $800. To eke out the living he was able to wrest from the stony mountainside he turned to logging. He was cutting pine one day in August 1961, when a ranger stopped him and said the land was the Government's. Shocked, he hurried down the mountainside to his cabin and wrote a letter to Senator Estes Kefauver. As time went by with no further word from the Government, he thought his worries were over.

Then, some 20 months after Senator Kefauver's death, the dire letters came. Heartsick, he debated whether to fight or to get out. Then one afternoon he scrawled a letter to his Congressman, James H. Quillen, a Republican from Kingsport. It came right to the point:

"Enclosed is two letters that I got from the Government. They are threatening to put me in court over something that they are wrong about and I am right about. The Government claims I owe them $1,717.52 when by rights they should owe me. You loose even if you win when you try lawing with Uncle Sam. That's the reason I ask you to try to present my side of the case to the Government. I can barely feed and take care of my family and I can't spare any money to fee lawyers to fight with the Government.

"This is my side of the story and it's true. If it hadn't been for our small pension my wife and I couldn't a raised our youngins. It has been hard but has also been rewarding as Preacher Pat Davis says. We ain't complaining. We didn't need to awful much money till now that the Government is after us. After we bought our farm, I registered my deed and my deed plainly calls for my property line to go to the top of the mountain. I sold some of my timber and while we were a cutting it the ranger he comes by and says I am on Government property. I quit cutting and when the Government threatened me a few years ago I writ Senator Kefauver and asked him to explain my side of the story. * * *

"Senator Kefauver took up my argument and I thought it was all taken care of and I left laying on the ground what timber was there when the ranger come by. I still claim the line runs to the top of the mountain but

I can't afford to law over a little strip of mountain land so am willing to lose the timber I done cut.

"This big bill of $1,717.52 staggers me. Do you realize how much that is? My whole farm ain't worth that much. Will you try to get the Government to survey the line and use my deed and talk to the oldtimers here about the property line? Sometimes I think the Government just surveys and uses what deeds and lines that is to their best advantage rather than taking a broad and fair look and trying to reach the right decision. I can't afford to pay a man to survey and I understand the Government has their own surveyors so get them to survey and take into consideration that me and Eliza own what our deed calls for.

"If they won't do that then you have my permission to trade with the Government. I will take the $1,717.52 and give them my whole farm. Right now I ain't got the money to hardly buy clothes for my family much less fight with the Government.

"I read in the paper that Congress was and the President was fighting poverty. That's good and I'm for it but tell the President if he has any poverty left over from some place to please send it down here. It's better than us mountain folks has been use to. Mr. Congressman, this Government lawyer just gave me 30 days to do something about this. I sure would be obliged if you would take my case up real soon. I ain't had a good night's sleep since this Government lawyer writ me.

"Your friend,

"Wilford Metcalf.

"P.S.: Eliza says and she is right that if it takes it to settle this that we will give the Government the 55 acres if they will get off our backs. We bought this land in good faith and the Government has never surveyed or established a line that any body knows about."

Representative Quillen fired off a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture requesting a resurvey. He also made a plea on the House floor for his constituent.

It took almost 3 months to complete the paperwork and fieldwork—more nights in which Metcalf couldn't get a good sleep. Quillen got the news first: whatever the land was that the United States acquired in 1935 it wasn't any part of Metcalf's farm. Title had been quieted, all right. It was Metcalf's, right to the top.

Quillen called a Del Rio man who had a phone, and the man called Metcalf to the house from where he was hoeing tobacco. He listened to Quillen's news, and all he could say for several moments was "Wow."

Word spread, and friends streamed up the mountainside to celebrate. When Metcalf heard company was coming, he went to work on some boulders that choked the steep pathway. To get one out of the way he tied a stout rope to it, passed the rope around a young green oak and tugged until the rock was dragged beneath a chinquapin tree next to the oak. "That," he puffed, "is almost as good as a pulley. Can't afford pulleys."

How can the Government win when it laws with a man like that?

Nineteenth Century Circus Capital of the Nation, Delavan, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the sawdust and spangles that mark the world of the circus and the delights of the big top with its scenes of mirth, melancholy, and pure joy each year add up to topnotch entertainment for the young and old.

Recognition of Delavan, Wis., a fine community in my district, as a place where this magic land of the circus all started, is now to be marked by the issuance of a commemorative circus stamp on May 2, 1966, by the U.S. Post Office Department.

In order that my colleagues might be aware of the wonderful circus history of this community, I am pleased to present this brief factual history.

There is considerable documentation to support the title of "19th Century Circus Capitol of the Nation" for Delavan.

It was in the years of 1847 through 1894 that this community served as the headquarters for more than 20 circuses. The first names to stand out in the spotlight are those of Edmund and Jeremiah Mabie, who purchased approximately 400 acres in Delvan for the purpose of establishing winter quarters for their Mabie Bros. Circus. The Mabie circus, in 1847, circuited the Midwest in a caravan of 42 wagons and at the time was the largest show in the United States. Most of the 110 circuses that later organized in Wisconsin, were offshoots of the Mabie organization.

Delavan quickly absorbed the circus atmosphere and it became the hub of life for many circus people. In the early 1860's, William Cameron Coup, a Mabie Bros. Circus roustabout, settled down in Delavan to begin a profitable business of livestock breeding.

Coup, however, failed to resist the glittering attraction of derring-do and pink cotton candy and soon found himself back in the world of canvas, wild animals and ringing applause.

The real golden age of circuses began in 1871. Coup literally pushed P. T. Barnum into the limelight, where he began moving toward a role as America's greatest showman of the times.

Coup was Barnum's righthand man in the venture and served as his general manager of the embryonic Barnum Circus. In the 1870's, Coup built what was to be the first Madison Square Garden in New York City, where circuses and topnotch events were to be staged throughout the years.

The man from Delavan, W. C. Coup, is generally acknowledged to have been one of the great circus innovaters and was a keystone figure in its growth. He is credited with introducing the piggyback method of loading and unloading the animal and supply and concession wagons and other circus paraphernalia. Records also verify that the German and British armies adapted Coup's piggyback plan to transport artillery.

Coup figured out a way to build wagons of larger capacity and adaptable to travel on flatcars and is remembered as the circus man who was the first to put together a second and then later, a third ring under one tent.

His shrewd business sense led to unbeatable advertising techniques, a sharp selection of towns for circus itineraries, and the initiation of half-rate circus day railroad excursions which brought in additional thousands from outlying areas.

The man from Delavan also had a technical side and devised the "king pole" which to this day still is utilized to support three-ring tents.

Coup's remains are buried in Delavan's Spring Grove Cemetery. Others who gained fame in the early days of the circus also lie at rest in Delavan. There are more than 80 of the circus circle of famous who are buried there. These include: Matthew Buckley, who in 1826 exhibited one of the first circuses under canvas; his two sons, Harry and Edward, who operated the sideshow with the original Barnum circus; Elizabeth Dockrill, who was billed as "the greatest equestrienne who ever performed" (her husband, Richard, was equestrian director of the Barnum and later Barnum & Bailey Circus for 30 years); George Slocum, a clown in over 30 different circuses between 1830–91, and the Mabie Bros., who may be considered the progenitors of all Wisconsin circuses and most of the national circus enterprises.

A female pachyderm whose trumpeting and tricks delighted circus fans for years also remained in Delavan after death, her weighted body lowered into Delavan Lake.

In 1948, Delavan was selected as the site of the Wisconsin Circus Centennial, attended by more than 25,000 people. In 1964, the Circus Historical Society held its national convention in Delavan.

On May 1–2, special activities are planned in Delavan to highlight the commemorative stamp issuance and much credit goes to W. Gordon Yadon, Delavan's postmaster, for spearheading the arrangements which will bring many circus celebrities and other dignitaries to that community to join in the occasion.

Teamwork for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, today's rural communities are no more free of problems than today's urban centers. The President's recent message to Congress made that fact abundantly clear.

To this end, according to a recent editorial in the Christian Science Monitor, "President Johnson's proposal for a new regional planning program makes sense."

The Monitor added that this new concept of regional planning goes to the root of the difficulty, and it makes the point that the small town and even the county has not shown itself able to provide the kinds of services needed by today's rural community.

I think that my colleagues will be interested in this comment by the highly regarded Christian Science Monitor:

> It would be relatively easy to draft such a program at the Federal level and it would not require a big money outlay, as such

things go nowadays. But success of the program, if adopted, will depend upon the degree to which the localities themselves use initiative in drafting and carrying out their plans. Some rural communities, thanks to vigorous local leadership, already have found that teamwork on the part of small towns and counties pays off.

This newspaper's comments on the President's recommendations are well taken, and I offer them for insertion in the RECORD.

TEAMWORK FOR PROGRESS

It is pleasant to picture rural communities as free of today's urban problems. But a drive down the main street of many small towns in farming country reveals one empty store after another. Each tells a story of defeat—of economic change that was not met with social planning.

Even the consolidated school, which looks so fine from the highway, is not meeting rural needs in many cases. Rural education lags woefully behind that of the cities, surveys show. Many other types of service common in the cities are nonexistent in rural areas. Among them are such necessities as good water supply, adequate policing.

In view of these facts, President Johnson's proposal for a new regional planning program makes sense. It goes to the root of the difficulty—that the small town (and even the county) has not shown itself able to provide the kinds of services needed by today's rural community. It appears lacking in equipment to cope with the changes brought about by the automobile and mechanized farming.

The President's proposal is designed to encourage small local units to team up for progress. It would enable the people to form community development districts based on the trading and commuting pattern of the area. Such districts could include several counties and a number of small towns. Federal grants would be offered those communities which present plans meeting standards set by the Secretary of Agriculture.

It would be relatively easy to draft such a program at the Federal level and it would not require a big money outlay, as such things go nowadays. But success of the program, if adopted, will depend upon the degree to which the localities themselves use initiative in drafting and carrying out their plans. Some rural communities, thanks to vigorous local leadership, already have found that teamwork on the part of small towns and counties pays off.

Statement of Dr. Gaylord Parkinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a statement released on February 1, by Dr. Gaylord Parkinson, chairman, Republican State Central Committee of California; Republican State Chairmen's Advisory Committee, and the Western Conference of Republican State Chairmen.

Dr. Parkinson's statement is a powerful challenge to the Republican Party, and points up the many failures of the last two administrations. The statement is objective, concise, and hard-hitting.

This statement was delivered at a press conference in Washington, D.C., attended by some 30 members of the press, including representatives of the major television networks, but, as usual, the news media failed to give complete coverage to the Republican Party. I assure you that had such a statement in reverse been made by the chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of California—incidentally, the largest State in the Union—it would have been given banner headlines in the press throughout the country, and would have been featured on the television networks. I recommend its reading.

STATEMENT OF DR. GAYLORD PARKINSON

Any government should be judged on its ability to cope with the great problems of its time, on whether it has succeeded or failed to meet the great challenges it faces while in power.

It is an amazing fact that on the substantial issues of our time, the Democrats have failed. It is amazing because the Democrats have enjoyed overwhelming political power at all levels, as well as the tremendous power that comes from controlling the expenditure of hundreds of billions of dollars. Yet they have so mismanaged that power and so misjudged the Nation's problems, that almost no progress has been made in the last 5 years.

To cite four major failures:

1. The so-called war on poverty is being lost because it has turned out to be the biggest bureaucratic boondoggle since the NRA and the WPA.

2. The civil rights drive has been marked by more bloodshed and turmoil than could have been imagined a few years ago. Laws enacted under great political pressure have failed to achieve domestic harmony and peace. The Watts riot occurred after the enactment of these laws.

3. No progress has been made in reducing the burgeoning crime rate. The administration has no solutions for this increasingly critical problem.

4. But the biggest and most crucial failure is that of war. Today, as we were 15 years ago, we are bogged down in a major Asian land war. Vietnam is fully as brutal a conflict as Korea was. The enemy is fanatical and implacable. Yet this administration fumbles along by fits and starts, changing its policies week by week, with no solution for ending the confrontation.

I can tell you this: If this country had a Republican Congress and a Republican President, we would find a way to win that war and a way to win the peace. The history of the Republican Party in this century points up the fact that when we are entrusted with Government we adopt and pursue policies which keep the peace. Not a single Republican President since the turn of the century has been in office when war started. The United States has enjoyed 32 years of peace in this century under Republican Presidents, including the last 8 under Dwight Eisenhower. Republicans have kept the peace. This is a record all Americans can be proud of.

This is not to say that the Democratic Presidents have deliberately plunged us into war. Far from it. Republicans believe that all our wars of this century have been just wars against real aggressors. And Republican leaders have joined Democratic Presidents in a bipartisan effort to win them.

War is the result of the failure of governmental policies. It is the failure of diplomacy and the conduct of foreign affairs that brings war. Democrats have been "failure-prone" in foreign affairs, as well as in domestic affairs.

During the Eisenhower administration, confrontations which could have degenerated into war did not, because of strong diplomatic action and unflinching deployment of the Armed Forces. Four instances illustrate the point: Quemoy and Matsu Islands, Lebanon, West Berlin, and Suez.

In South Vietnam, in 1960, President Eisenhower had only 700 U.S. military personnel. They were advisers. President Johnson will have 400,000 Americans there by the end of 1966. They will be fighters. Only two men died there in 1960. Since 1961, we have had almost 10,000 casualties. As a citizen political leader, I am not qualified to say what must be done there. But I do know that Republicans in office have always followed the only sensible course of peace through strength. Vacillation has never been our policy, as it is of this administration. In wartime we would never promulgate a "guns and butter" attitude. We would never say to the people, "Go on, live it up, enjoy yourselves, we're rich. Sure, American servicemen are dying in the jungles of South Vietnam, but we can afford the war and be affluent too. Everybody have a good time. Live the 'good life'."

On the contrary, Republicans would say, "This is serious business, America." We would say, "Let's tighten our belts temporarily and get this thing over with quickly, and then with peace restored we can get on with building an ideal society."

And this business of "guns and butter" can be laid squarely on the doorstep of Lyndon Johnson. Can you imagine other Democratic Presidents, for instance, Woodrow Wilson, or Franklin Delano Roosevelt, calling for such a policy in time of war? On the contrary, they rallied the country to put forth its best efforts. But L.B.J., the "compleat politician," tries to rally votes with fantastic domestic expenditures and run a crucial war at the same moment. He is failing at both.

As a citizen political leader I can tell you this: There is a new breed of Republican abroad in the land. He is part of a whole generation grown up since the 1930's. He is in his twenties, thirties, and forties. He is not a moss back. He is not an economic royalist. He is part of the broad-based American middle class. He is the guy next door who works downtown and has a family to support. He comes in all colors, shapes, and sizes.

Today, these new Republicans are mobilizing. With their new vigor, we're going to win elections this year and in the future. We expect to elect a new, vigorous Republican Congress in 1966. And a new and dynamic Republican President in 1968.

Then we will see to it that the conflict in the Far East is brought to a swift and honorable conclusion, and we will reinstitute policies which maintained the peace in the past, and which can do so again in the future.

Request To Retain and Enforce Delaware Valley Milk Marketing Order No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, last October and November the Department of Agriculture conducted hearings on its proposal to terminate Milk Marketing Order No. 4 for the Greater Philadelphia area. This is the order under which milk producers in Maryland, including many fine constituents of mine, in Delaware, in Pennsylvania, and in southern New Jersey, sell their milk in accordance with Department of Agriculture regulations which, in turn, are based on legislation adopted by the Congress.

The Department has stated that it wants to terminate the order, or change it to provide a different kind of marketing arrangement, because of its inability to enforce its minimum price provisions. Consumer prices are not involved, but my constituents and 90 percent of all dairymen and handlers operating under the order indicated at the hearings last November that they want their present order retained and enforced.

They have shown that our Delaware Valley area will lose $10 million a year in milk proceeds, without a penny's benefit to the consumer if the Department abandons the present so-called handler pool which has served our area successfully for 23 years.

I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal courts in Pennsylvania and Trenton gave the Department of Agriculture full enforcement support when, under pressure of the dairymen, it finally moved last year against two suspected violators of the order.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues that members of the delegations representing the Delaware Valley area jointly and severally have advised the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, that it is our considered judgment that this milk marketing order should not be abandoned or changed because of our Government's supposed inability to cope with a few violators. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when our Government changes or abandons its laws and regulations because of its inability to enforce them, we as a nation indeed are in trouble.

Further insight into this situation, Mr. Speaker, is contained in editorials in three fine newspapers serving my constituency. I refer to the Queen Annes Record-Observer, of Centreville, Md.; the Kent County News, of Chestertown, Md., and the Preston News and Farmer, of Preston, Md. At this point I would like to insert into the Record these three well-reasoned editorials, with the hope that they will illuminate this urgent matter for my distinguished colleagues, and assist the Secretary of Agriculture in the determination which he will make shortly and which is so important to the dairy farmers of this four-State area.

[From the Centreville (Md.) Record-Observer, Jan. 27, 1966]

A Change Would Hurt

Eastern Shore milk producers and dealers supplying the Greater Philadelphia area are greatly concerned over the U.S. Department of Agriculture's announced intention to change the marketing arrangement under which they have functioned successfully for 23 years.

F. Bennett Carter, prominent Queen Annes County dairy farmer and the president of the Inter-State Milk Producers Cooperative, said this week that 649 producers on the shore are affected and the estimated annual loss would be nearly $1 million to this area if the marketing order is lost.

The Department of Agriculture says that it wants a change because it cannot enforce the minimum price provisions of its present marketing order in the face of chiseling by a handful of dairies which apparently pay kickbacks to brokers or other middlemen. It is said that one of the principal offenders of the Philadelphia order is a huge New York-based cooperative which is in the forefront of those calling for a change.

The change they want, which the Department may order, would absorb the Philadelphia or so-called Delaware Valley area into their New York-New Jersey market order. This, the interstate group is fighting.

At the very least the New York-New Jersey producers want to force abandonment of the handler pool arrangement in the Philadelphia area. This would result in a loss of 50 cents per hundredweight of milk for the 5,800 farmers supplying the Philadelphia area and an increase of 6 cents per hundredweight to those primarily supplying the New York market, or a loss of some $10 million to the economy of the Delaware Valley area—which includes the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

Over 90 percent of the Philadelphia milkshed dairymen have urged the Department of Agriculture to retain the order they have worked under since 1942. They have also asked that the department amend the order to put the middleman under the order's jurisdiction so that it can be enforced.

Congressman Rogers C. B. Morton, of the First District, Maryland, is fighting hard to retain the order—every milk producer on the Shore should write immediately to their Congressman and the two U.S. Senators (Daniel Brewster and Joseph Tydings) calling for them to ask the Department of Agriculture to keep the market order.

This sounds like the American way. The Department of Agriculture should no more think of abandoning an order because of infractions—at least not until it has made an all-out effort at enforcement—than we should consider abandoning laws against murder because some are still committed.

[From the Preston (Md.) News & Farmer, Nov. 25, 1965]

Thanksgiving—and Still No Peace in the Valley

The U.S. Department of Agriculture Dairy Division, which has become known as the Dairy Dynasty, because of actions and pressures instigated by its Director, Herbert Forest, has held extended hearings in Philadelphia on the Delaware Valley milk marketing order No. 4.

Most milkmen abhor these constant and costly hearings and wearing pressures put on them, their dealers, and their cooperative by the USDA. Until recently they believed the USDA was established to serve farmers. They consider the dairy dynasty actions the work of a chauvinistic, unreined, and obsessed wise guy. Some compare these pressures to destroy their agribusiness to the scandalous persecutions of the Mad Monk Rasputin, who finally was separated from his highhanded Russian palace position by a group of young noblemen in 1916.

Several important factors should not be overlooked by the 800 dairy farmers-milk producers, on the shore who are members of the interstate cooperative headquartered in Philadelphia and those politically inclined might better understand, if they have not already discovered it, the power of the nearly 5,000 voters in the families of these 800 members.

Merchants and others economically inclined, including business and community leaders, might also remember the fact that interstate this year is sending some $12 million milk money into the Eastern Shore counties, where their member-producers live.

Farmers as well as businessmen and other residents might also take cognizance of the powerful fact that the interstate is reported to be the best milk cooperative in the United States, because of its faithful work for farmers and dealers.

One good evidence of this cooperative's splendid service to farmers, the economy of Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, is that its members, under Milk Order No. 4 in 1964–65 were paid an average of about $5.35 per 100 pounds for their milk, while the average under the Baltimore Milk Order No. 16 was about $4.80. Fifty-five cents per hundred pounds is important business.

The New York State milk price under order No. 2 is said to average about $4.40 per hundred pounds. All figures are blend prices.

The simple difference between these milk orders is that the Philadelphia Order No. 4 is an individual dealer-handler order under which the farmer-producer ships his milk to the certain dairy, or handler, in the market order area, while farmers under the New York-New Jersey Order No. 2 and Baltimore Order No. 16 ship under what is called a market pool order.

The secret of interstate's operations, if there is one, is another simple fact that interstate is run by its members and operates on an 8-cent service charge from each 100 pounds of milk sold.

A high percentage of the farmer-members milk is sold as fresh table milk, and only small part of it is sold as manufactured class II milk. This plan keeps the blend price high. Interstate does not operate a milk manufacturing plant.

Interstate actually collects only about 1½ percent on each dollar of sales of farmers milk. Cost of administration, selling milk, on radio and TV, in magazines, and in cooperation with several dairy promotions, organization comes out of the 1½ percent. Who else administers and sells on such a low rate?

The Baltimore milk area has been a surplus milk area and apparently the production of surplus milk is encouraged.

Of particular interest is the new position of the Maryland Farm Bureau giving its full support to the uninterrupted continuation of Philadelphia Milk Market Order No. 2 as is.

It was reported a year or so ago that the Baltimore Milk Producers Cooperative loaned half a million dollars of their members money to the Maryland-Virginia Cooperative to build an addition to the giant milk processing plant at Laurel, Md. It was said at the time this addition was to make powdered milk to use up the surplus. A plant that big requires lots of class II milk (surplus).

Many farmers have wondered if there is some sort of program going on that encourages farmers to overproduce and therefore do themselves harm by working for a lower milk price. Inter-State is close to the ideal cooperative function of keeping production as near to demand as possible.

There are indications that the "dairy dynasty" has some sort of mania for wanting to tie all of the Atlantic Coast States from Maine to Miami into one great big market pool which would give all eastern dairy farmers a lower price, rather than building up the dealer pool operation, getting all farmers a better price and helping the economy.

It is now clear to milk men that the USDA Dairy Division is not working for farmers and not until the forest is cleaned out will there be "peace in the valley."

[From the Kent County (Md.) News, Jan. 26, 1966]

Our Milk Economy

The admitted inability of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to enforce Milk Order No. 4, under which many Kent producers, along with all other Inter-State Milk Producers' Cooperative members operate, appears about to result in the surrender of the Philadelphia milkshed to New York interests with a resultant loss of some $10 million annually to producers in Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

The mandate from Congress to the Department of Agriculture is that it be responsive to the wishes of the farmers concerned in producing milk it is hardly doing that.

Recent hearings on the marketing order clearly demonstrated that producers shipping to the Philadelphia milkshed overwhelmingly favor the present marketing arrangement.

The dispute now raging does not affect prices to the consumer. It does, though, seriously affect dairy farmers, many of them in Kent and Cecil Counties, where the annual loss under the proposed change would amount to almost a million dollars.

These farmers want violators punished. It is to their interest to eliminate the chiseling brokers and crooked middlemen who take kickbacks from unscrupulous suppliers.

There is no reason why the USDA can't change the present order to make it enforcible.

While the price to the consumer may not be affected, the loss to the economy right here in Kent County would be seriously felt. Thus it behooves, not only the milk-producing farmers but all of us to do something about it.

Congressman Rogers C. B. Morton, gave great support to the milk producers during the recent Federal hearings in Philadelphia. We suggest you, all of us, write him in support of our farmers.

We suggest, further, that letters be addressed to Carlton R. Sickles, Maryland's Congressman at large, who has been most receptive to appeals for support on Eastern Shore matters.

This possible loss to our economy should not be taken without a fight. It is your battle as well as that of the farmer-milk producers. Pitch in.

O'Hare-to-Midway Crewless Skybus Called Possibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times carried a most revealing article by its distinguished writer, Fletcher Wilson, on the possibility of linking Chicago's Midway Airport with O'Hare Field in Chicago through the use of a new skybus service.

My colleagues are aware of my continuing effort to reactivate Midway so that some of the congestion we now experience at O'Hare, and in particular, the long delay in the holding pattern before landing, can be alleviated by transferring a greater degree of flight operations from O'Hare to Midway.

I was very pleased to learn that Mr. George L. DeMent, one of the most respected constituents in my congressional district, who serves as chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority has indicated that possibilities exist for linking Midway with O'Hare through this new type of transportation.

There is no question that one of the main deterrents for reactivating Midway on the major scale has been a link of rapid transit connection between the two airports.

Many of my colleagues here in Congress who travel from Washington to Chicago and then catch connecting flights to their respective districts, I am sure, will share my great pleasure in learning that the efforts to improve traffic service at O'Hare by reactivating Midway continue to draw the attention of our top public officials.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 2, 1966]

O'HARE-TO-MIDWAY CREWLESS SKYBUS CALLED POSSIBILITY

(By Fletcher Wilson, Sun-Times correspondent)

PITTSBURGH.—George L. DeMent said here Tuesday, after riding an experimental skybus, that such a vehicle might someday serve to connect Chicago's O'Hare and Midway Airports.

The chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority said the crewless, rubber-tired bus run by computers on an elevated track would be a "natural" for transporting passengers between the two fields, if Midway becomes busy again.

DeMent and Bernard L. Marsh, Skokie Village manager, took a ride on the lightweight, automated mass transit system that travels in the air on a narrow stiltway.

Marsh and DeMent are among more than 1,100 persons gathered for the first International Conference on Urban Transportation. All the visitors have traffic troubles back home.

TOLD TO STAY AWAY

So many more came than were expected that interested Pittsburghers were told to stay away to make room.

The skybus is a monorail built by the Westinghouse Corp. in a public park here at a cost of nearly $3 million.

The project was sponsored by the Port Authority of Allegheny County, operator of the Greater Pittsburgh Transit System, which still includes red streetcars.

Westinghouse subcontracted portions of the nearly 2-mile-long skybus system to 30 other companies.

Tuesday, for the first time, three 18,000-pound cars seating 28 and holding 70 persons, ran around the clock to show it could be done at one push of a button.

The cars operate at 50 miles per hour on a looped track set up on an attractive concrete and steel structure supported by single I-beam columns.

In addition to serving as a connection between airports, DeMent said, "the skybus would be right for carrying passengers from the Loop to McCormick Place if somebody would subsidize the operation."

"This is the most exciting transit development I have seen," he asserted.

Marsh said steps are being taken to acquire a strip of the old North Shore Line right-of-way, from the end of the Skokie Swift at Dempster in Skokie, 9,000 feet north to Old Orchard Road. The Chicago & North Western Railway now owns the land.

"Skybus trains or conventional buses could operate there," Marsh said. The project is dependent upon obtaining Federal or other funds and consent of the CTA to operate the line.

DeMent repeated to Marsh the CTA's traditional position:

"We will take on any line guaranteed not to show a loss."

AIRPORT CONTRACT

Westinghouse has signed a $3 million contract to install a skybus at a new airport in Tampa, Fla., to carry passengers 1,000 feet from the terminal to airplane boarding areas. A college is inquiring about an installation.

The keynote speaker at the opening of the 3-day convention refined the Skybus concept.

Leland Hazard, chairman of the Rapid Transit Committee of the Allegheny Port Authority, spoke of a 10,000- to 12,000-pound car running on a structure trim and small enough to go anywhere in the city, even inside buildings.

Present transit cars range in weight from 45,000 pounds in Chicago to 80,000 in New York City.

"Here is the challenge," Hazard said.

"Do we have the wit to get rapid transit out of the ground? Do we have the engineering imagination to translate lower-weight cars into lower costs throughout the whole system; to make bridges across rivers, structures winding uphill, loops and loops within loops?"

Hazard, professor of industrial administration in the Graduate School of Carnegie Institute of Technology, said the system he envisions would bring a decline in the number of autos and buses per thousand population.

"No one need sell his motor stock," he declared.

"But some three-car families will fall to two. Some from two to one. And the percentage of no-car families will be larger because a higher percentage of people will live in high-rise apartments near the rapid transit lines."

City officials, legislators and members of civic organizations predominate among persons attending the conference.

Good Selection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this country has had the good fortune of having top administrators at the head of many departments and bureaus. Of these, none has worked harder or been more effective than R. Sargent Shriver.

Those of us who have had the opportunity to work with Mr. Shriver know that he has performed distinguished service on two fronts—as the head of the administration's war on poverty and as Director of the Peace Corps.

As the Nashville Tennessean has observed, the fact that Mr. Shriver will now devote his full time to fighting poverty demonstrates "the sincerity of President Johnson's expressed intentions to make certain that the poor shall not suffer fresh deprivations to finance an escalation of the Nation's Vietnam effort."

The Tennessean's editorial is a tribute to both the President's good judgment and Mr. Shriver's ability, and I ask permission to have it inserted in the Record.

GOOD SELECTION IN MR. SHRIVER

The sincerity of President Johnson's expressed intentions to make certain that the poor shall not suffer fresh deprivations to finance and escalation of the Nation's Vietnam effort is demonstrated by his latest action.

The Presidential decision to harness the full energies to Mr. Sargent Shriver to a stepped up war on poverty, indeed, endorses a commitment deeper than any mere request for heavier poverty program funding.

The earlier success of Mr. Shriver as creator, nourisher, and deeply sensitive administrator of the Peace Corps from infancy to international recognition made him a logical choice to lead on the battle front against poverty.

Mr. Shriver will now have the challenging task, of testing of possible weapons for a home front war on poverty, then marshaling of the most suitable brains, stratagems, and agencies into a full scale task force capable of achieving victory.

It is a tribute to the toughness of a man that Mr. Shriver was able to stretch himself so thin for so long at both the Peace Corps job and the poverty war assignment. This toughness seemed at odds with the high degree of sensitivity with which he met every driving inquiry of every American youth seeking fresh challenge, and new idealism in the Peace Corps.

Those who have observed and admired the work of Mr. Shriver under two Presidents have no doubt that he will breathe into his new full time job the same dedication and inspiration that made the Peace Corps accepted around the world—and at home as well.

President Johnson has made a good selection and the Nation should benefit from it.

Australia Supports Decision To Resume Bombing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, reactions to President Johnson's recent decision to resume bombing of military targets in North Vietnam have come from nations around the world. Undoubtedly one of the most significant of these, however, has been the expression of support and endorsement registered by the Australian Government through the country's Prime Minister, the Right Honorable Harold Holt.

The fact that the Australian Government speaks here as a participant in and not a mere observer of the defense of South Vietnam from Communist aggression gives this statement validity and importance. As one of the countries who share our commitment to uphold the rights and dignity of the people of South Vietnam, Australia stands firm in recognizing this decision as "realistic and necessary."

Prime Minister Holt fully points out the true significance of the sincere and genuine efforts of the United States toward peaceful negotiations. Regretably, in Peiping and Hanoi those efforts were met by repeated accusations of insincerity. Further demonstrating its contempt for those efforts, North Vietnam used the bombing lull to rebuild its own war machine.

Prime Minister Holt puts the vital issues relating to the resumption of bombing into perspective. I, therefore, recommend his statement to my colleagues.

TEXT OF STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA, THE RIGHT HONORABLE HAROLD HOLT, ON FEBRUARY 1, 1966

President Johnson has made a statement about the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam directed against installations and transport routes used for the conduct of warfare in South Vietnam.

The bombing was suspended in December, even though an earlier pause in bombing last May had evoked no positive response, and even though there were strong military reasons for the continuance of bombing. The North Vietnamese authorities had, for a period of months, increased the rate of infiltration of armed men to South Vietnam. In the last 6 months of 1965, many thousands of North Vietnamese soldiers entered South Vietnam as units and equipped for open warfare.

The purpose of the bombing has been not to destroy the regime in Hanoi or break the economy of North Vietnam, or to shatter the basis of the people's livelihood, but to damage or destroy those military installations and facilities which enable Hanoi to supply and support its own forces in the south and those of the Vietcong.

The suspension of the bombing was of a very substantial military and political significance. It meant a self-imposed denial by the United States of the use of a valuable military weapon. It was part of a program of action designed to encourage North Vietnam to turn back from its course of increasingly open military intervention in South Vietnam. Having suspended the bombing, the United States undertook active diplomatic efforts to make known its genuine wish for an end to the warfare and for discussion leading to a just solution by peaceful means. Governments of Communist countries and of nonalined countries which might possess some influence in Peiping and Hanoi were approached. Direct contacts were made in some capitals where the United States and North Vietnam were both represented.

From Washington and Saigon, the Australian Government was kept fully informed of these developments. Mr. Averell Harriman visited Canberra for discussions with us. The approaches made by the United States were widely welcomed throughout the world. But regrettably, brought no sign of any disposition on the part of the other side to modify its determination to continue the war. On the contrary, the North Vietnamese took advantage of the respite from bombing to repair and improve their system of infiltration. A considerable volume of traffic has passed through this system into South Vietnam; certainly in larger volume and at a faster rate than would have been possible if bombing had been continued to impede it.

Private contacts brought forth no positive responses. Peiping, Hanoi and the Liberation Front have denounced the U.S. efforts, describing them as a maneuver to cover up an intensification and expansion of aggressive war in Vietnam. The Liberation Front pledges itself to make greater efforts to strike harder at the heads of the aggressors, deal them heavier punishments and make them realize that their only honorable path at the present time is a quick withdrawal from South Vietnam. The latest U.S. initiatives have thus been rejected as summarily and emphatically as have other efforts made in the past.

It has consistently been the view of the Australian Government that North Vietnam must not be permitted to remain a haven immune from military risk, from which military aggression against the south can be mounted with impunity. Because we believe North Vietnam cannot be left free to mount military operations against South Vietnam and against the American, Australian, New Zealand, and Korean soldiers who are helping to defend the country, we firmly support the American decision as realistic and necessary. It remains our hope, however, that the North Vietnamese and those associated with them will recognize that their aggression will not be allowed to succeed. We must hope that the time is not distant when they will join in finding a just and peaceful solution. While the aggression continues, it will be met firmly by resistance in which Australia will play its part. We know that the United States will remain alert and ready to explore any indication of willingness on the other side to move towards a settlement on just terms.

The U.S. readiness in this respect is indicated by the request of the U.S. Government for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in Vietnam.

Letter to United Nations Special Committee on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of a letter I have received, dated January 24, 1966, and addressed to the United Nations Special Committee on the situation with regard to the implementation of the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. I am sure the contents of this letter will be of great interest to all my colleagues:

TO CONSIDER SOVIET RUSSIAN COLONIALISM IN UKRAINE

JANUARY 24, 1966.

To the United Nations Special Committee on the Situation With Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since I have as yet received no answer to my charge against the Soviet Government of May 6, 1963, on the matter of an investigation into Russian colonialism in Ukraine, I beg, apropros of the murder of Stefan Bandera, leader of the Ukrainian anticolonial liberation movement, who, on the instructions of the Government of the U.S.S.R., was on October 15, 1959, murdered on the soil of a foreign, sovereign state, the Federal Republic of Germany, to renew today in my capacity as head of the last independent Ukrainian government on Ukrainian soil my charge against the Soviet Government and especially against Alexander Shelepin, as organizer of the murder.

On this occasion I also base my case on the investigation made by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary under the leadership of Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and others.

The U.S. Senate committee has investigated the methods of the Government of the U.S.S.R., employed particularly on the captive nations, and has reached the conclusion that murder and kidnaping are instruments of the official Soviet policy. The Government of the U.S.S.R. has used these methods in Ukraine in particular, as well as on freedom leaders living abroad. The U.S. Senate has published the sentence and oral opinion and written elaboration of the verdict of the

Supreme Court of the Federal Republic of Germany in the case of Bogdan Stashinskiy, from which the highest German court unequivocally verifies the guilt of the Government of the U.S.S.R. and particularly of Alexander Shelepin in the murder of Stefan Bandera with both documents and facts and condemns them. The U.S. Senate has further confirmed the guilt of the Government of the U.S.S.R. with fresh evidence.

I charge the Government of the U.S.S.R. and Alexander Shelepin with—

1. Infringing human rights by murdering the Ukrainian freedom leader, Stefan Bandera, and the anti-Communist political writer, Prof. Lev Rebet;
2. Transferring and carrying on the use of cruel colonial methods in the struggle against the liberation urge of a captive nation on the territory of a foreifgn sovereign state;
3. Infringing the sovereignty of a foreign state by preparing and executing on its territory the murder of the Ukrainian freedom leader Stefan Bandera and the anti-Communist political writer and scholar Prof. Lev Rebet.

I assert that the Government of the U.S.S.R. has most grossly infringed the United Nations Charter, preamble, chapter 1, article 1 and others and resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization.

I request the Committee on Colonialism to investigate my charge against the Government of the U.S.S.R., to condemn Russian colonialism in Ukraine and other occupied countries, and to denounce this crime against peace and security.

In this context I should like to mention the precedent in international law of the infringement of Argentina's sovereignty by Israel in the case of the criminal Eichmann and the statement made by the Security Council. In the case of the murder of the anticolonial freedom leader and hero, Stefan Bandera, however, and of the infringement of the sovereignty of the Federal Republic of Germany by the Government of the U.S.S.R. the Security Council of U.N.O. has expressed no view and made no mention of the matter whatsoever.

The whole complex of questions to be investigated by the Committee on Colonialism is connected with the threat to peace and security entailed in the infringement of the sovereignty of the Federal Republic of Germany, and should therefore also come before the Security Council.

I enclose the U.S. Senate's documentation and ask you, as Chairman of the Committee, to bring the charge I have made before the Committee, so that—

(a) After its investigation of the complex of Russian colonialism in Ukraine it passes a resolution and

(b) In connection with the establishment of the threat to peace and security of the U.S.S.R. recommends the Security Council to make further investigations.

In accordance with article 6 the U.S.S.R. should be expelled from U.N.O. and the whole complex should be further laid before the International Court of Justice in The Hague.

Since I make my appearance before the committee as spokesman for a nonsovereign people struggling for its freedom and independence, I ask those members of the committee who stand honestly for the ideals of U.N.O. and for indivisible freedom and national independence, and for personal freedom and human dignity for the peoples and individuals of the Russian colonial empire, to take up my charge as their own and to follow it up within the framework of the legal possibilities contained in the Charter of the United Nations.

Yours respectfully,

Yaroslav Stetzko.

Former Prime Minister of Ukraine.

Ray Shafer Next Governor of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we in Pennsylvania are proud of the achievements of all Pennsylvanians during the administration of Gov. Bill Scranton. This is the fourth year of amazing progress for Pennsylvania.

This advance shows what can be done under enlightened and progressive leadership by the Republican Party. The Pennsylvania programs are fiscally sound, efficient, and well aimed to meet and solve the problems of the 20th century.

One of the leaders of Pennsylvania for the past 3 years with Bill Scranton, has been Lt. Gov. Ray Shafer. Ray Shafer has presided with vigor and competence over the Pennsylvania State Senate, a fine body in which I was privileged to be a member before my World War II military service.

Ray Shafer has served as head of the Pennsylvania Republican legislative policy committee, and chairman of the important new State council on community affairs, with great success.

Ray Shafer has been endorsed for the Republican nomination for Governor by the Republicans of the Pennsylvania State Senate and the Pennsylvania State House of Representatives, as well as by Governor Scranton, and Attorney General Alessandroni.

Ray Shafer has also been endorsed by the Republican State committee, the State policy committee, and by the Republican chairmen and vice chairmen of the Republican county committees of Pennsylvania's 67 counties, as well as the women's Republican organizations, and the Young Republicans of Pennsylvania under the able leadership of John T. Acton. U.S. Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania and the Pennsylvania Republican delegation of the U.S. House of Representatives in Congress, have strongly endorsed Ray Shafer for Governor, a swell as the State Republican ticket.

It is a pleasure to call to the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people this new turn of events in Pennsylvania, which means so much for Pennsylvania's continued progress and success.

I offer for the Congressional Record the excellent article by John Chamberlain, appearing in the Washington Post for Thursday, February 3, 1966:

These Days: A Portent in the Republican Sky

(By John Chamberlain)

Harrisburg, Pa.—The Republican Party may be in a bad way nationally, but in Pennsylvania it is already squared off for the 1966 State election with scarcely a cloud in the sky. The main reason is that the State's tall, friendly and incredibly hardworking Lieutenant Governor Raymond P. Shafer, a man with a rangy George Romney look, has managed to lock up the right to the Republican nomination for Governor to succeed Bill Scranton while all the other aspirants were busy talking.

The Shafer achievement must be reckoned as one of the slickest operations ever carried out. In the first week in January they were saying in Harrisburg that there was no "leading candidate," and that Governor Scranton still had options in picking his successor. But by the second week in the new year, Scranton, who had sounded out the State through his personal trips and those of his State chairman, Craig Truax, was ready to give Shafer his blessing. Shafer had it anyway. All that remained to be done was to induce the other contenders to settle for lesser spots on the ticket.

So the Pennsylvania Republicans have unity, forced by a methodical campaigner who knew how to get it. They also have a candidate who upholds the "conservative with a heart" theory that the objectives of the Great Society can be achieved by methods that will not bypass either the State capitals or local communities. The pitch in Harrisburg is that the Republicans under Scranton have beaten the Federal Democrats to it in making Pennsylvania prosperous and in setting up programs designed to clean up rivers, save the land from stripmine uglification, and provide good education for every community.

The Pennsylvania Republicans have statistical cards to trump President Johnson's aces. When Democrat David Lawrence was Governor, State unemployment was 7.4 percent compared to a national 5.3 percent. But for 7 straight months in 1965 the State rate dropped below the national average. More than 100,000 persons had left the relief rolls under Scranton to find gainful employment.

The gains, no doubt, were due in some part to national prosperity. But, as a salesman who had helped attract some 800 new plants to Pennsylvania in 1964 and 1965, Scranton is in a position to say he planned it that way. Under a Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority (PIDA), which stood ready to grant loans for factory construction in areas where unemployment ran over 6 percent, the State has had its own depressed areas program.

It has also had its own equivalent of the Federal Department of Urban Affairs type of forward planning. Democrats in Philadelphia will tell you that Shafer, a smalltown man from Meadville and Allegheny College in the northwestern part of the State, is the secret weapon of what has been called "the squirearchy," which for years allegedly kept the Republicans from recognizing the problems arising from the mid-20th century urbanization of the Nation. But the Democratic criticism does not reckon with the fact that Shafer, as head of his party's legislative policy committee and chairman of a provisional council on community affairs, has played a big part in the creation of a new State cabinet-level department of community affairs. This will be the State's counter to the new Department of Urban Affairs in Washington.

To sell the department of community affairs and other elements of the Scranton program, Shafer had carte blanche to visit all 67 counties of the State. Touching base four or five times in most of them, Shafer built his own formidable organization. The public announcement of his candidacy was made through formal channels on a Monday, but he had sent prior notice to 440,000 Pennsylvanians in a huge mailing on the previous Saturday. It could be that Scranton had already settled on Shafer, who happens to have been a Yale school classmate of Poverty Fighter Sargent Shriver, Republican House leader, Gerald Ford, Senator Peter Dominick and Supreme Court Justices Potter Stewart and "Whizzer" White. But Shafer had made it on his own.

He will be a formidable bet to keep at least one Northeast industrial State in the Republican column.

Revolution in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to call to the attention of the House an article printed in the fall, 1965, issue of the George Washington University magazine, entitled "Juan Bosch Speaks About Revolution in Latin America."

This article contains excerpts from an interview granted by Mr. Bosch to one of my constituents, Mr. James A. R. Johnson, of North Hollywood, Calif. The interview took place shortly after Mr. Bosch's government was overthrown—at a time when the former President of the Dominican Republic refused to see representatives of commercial news media.

Mr. Johnson represents a number of young Americans who are taking an increasing interest in international affairs. He is constantly seeking new information, new insights, to gain greater understanding of our Latin American neighbors.

Hopefully, through his efforts and those of our returning Peace Corps volunteers and servicemen, there will arise an enlightened leadership across the Nation which can contribute fresh and dynamic viewpoints to our foreign policy.

The article, which was cited by the Los Angeles Times of December 10, 1965, and the Miami Herald, of December 11, 1965, immediately follows:

JUAN BOSCH SPEAKS ABOUT REVOLUTION IN LATIN AMERICA

(An interview by James A. R. Johnson)

(INTRODUCTION.—After his ouster from the Dominican Republic in October 1963 and before the major attempts begun last spring to reinstate him as President of the Dominican Republic, Juan Bosch granted a taped interview to James A. R. Johnson. Mr. Johnson, now a university law student, was then stationed in Puerto Rico with the Air Force. The scholarly ex-President consented to be interviewed by Mr. Johnson—for students. The interview was on tape and was recorded at Mr. Bosch's home in exile in Puerto Rico on February 27, 1964. He had refused previous requests for interviews with commercial organizations, and he told potential lawyer Johnson that he never expected to assume public office again. Since then, of course, he has changed his mind. Excerpts from his conversation printed here tell of his hopes and beliefs that "the next revolution is this: we are going to live as brothers, not as enemies."

(Student Johnson is a graduate of Occidental College where he majored in history. Several of his interviews, taped during 2 years in Puerto Rico as a lieutenant in the Air Force, have been used in Occidental College courses and also on educational radio stations.)

Question. Could you prophesy what might happen in the future in Latin America?

Answer. I think that we have before us a very intense revolutionary process in Latin America. Maybe some of our countries are going over to the Communists and others to another form of government; that I cannot realize now. But a revolutionary process we have before us.

Question. Will it be then a choice between a violent revolution and a peaceful revolution?

Answer. In some countries it could be a peaceful revolution. But now, it is late to make a peaceful revolution. The countries like Uruguay, Costa Rica, Chile with a very high level of democratic evolution and (which are) very advanced in the social process will remain democratic. But the countries like Nicaragua, Guatemala, Honduras, and the Dominican Republic, Paraguay, Peru, Ecuador—maybe not. But you can note that Mexico * * * had a revolution 50 years ago; that Bolivia had a republican revolution 12 years ago; that Uruguay had a revolution 50 years ago—a political, peaceful revolution, very advanced—that Chile is a country with a very good democratic basis from the last century, that Costa Rica had its revolution 16 years ago. But the people have not had their revolution (and) they are going to have it.

Question. Many people have said that in Latin America the people are not ready for a democratic form of government; that it is a matter of time before they become used to the idea of democracy and self-government. Is that true?

Answer. That's true. But what happened is that the treatment of the problems of the people in a democratic way is very uneasy (hard) when this people is not ready for democracy. So the change in most cases I think is coming by revolution, by violence.

Question. And there would be no other way but violence?

Answer. There will be violence, either by the people or violence by the governments. There will be a revolution or a dictatorship. But not the kind of dictatorship that we have known. Not the one of yesterday and today—of one man trying to win money (take the spoils of government) for himself and his family. It will be a different kind of dictatorship; a dictatorship of an institutional group of men with the idea of service to the country. The next few years are years of violence in Latin America. This is my opinion. And you Americans must be ready to live with countries in a revolutionary process.

Question. What were the conditions in the Dominican Republic after the assassination of Trujillo, and after the period of turmoil and difficulty, when you became President?

Answer. Economically, the country was in a very bad situation. The country was very poor. Most of the people were without work and without hope. There was no political organization. And there was no knowledge or experience of freedom to guide us. The morning that the Trujillo family left the country the country was decapitalized. The country did not have enough capital to start production again. It was a very unstable situation. The groups of power in the Dominican Republics which are the merchants, the military people, the high middle class, and the Catholic Church which had been backing Trujillo all the time became afraid of a Communist revolution in the Dominican Republic.

They were afraid because they knew nothing about a political or sociological development. A Communist revolution is not possible in the Dominican Republic. It would be easier to have a revolution in your country than to have one in ours. But for them any kind of freedom—of exercise of freedom for the people was communism. As you can find here in Puerto Rico, and in other countries, people do not know what communism is. But they know that communism is something very bad, but not what it is. So everything that is not good for them is communism. Freedom was not good for them. Because when there was freedom, the military who had committed assassination under Trujillo could be accused.

A merchant who became a rich man in business with Trujillo could be accused. And the Catholic Church, which had backed Trujillo very strongly all the time.

You know, some priests could be accused. So freedom was bad for them. Very bad thing for them. Which is the worse thing? Communism? Democracy or communism? For them, both were bad. This was the case. The country was not ready for democracy.

Question. Could you explain a little more why you feel that a Communist revolution could occur more easily in the United States than in the Dominican Republic?

Answer. First, you have an industrial organization, industrial society. So you can survive in any political regime. Second, because you have a people very developed in technical knowledge. We have not. A country like the Dominican Republic could not be Communist. You see the situation in Cuba. Cuba was to the Dominican Republic as you are to, maybe, Canada. Cuba is very developed compared to the Dominican level. And Cuba is in a very developed compared to the Dominican level. And Cuba is in a very bad situation. Our country has no basis for a Communist revolution. We have no technicians. We have no industry. We have our exportation industry and sugar. You cannot have a Communist organization in a rural society. That is not possible. The Russians have people for a market, mining, land for agriculture, you know. But we are 300,000. What kind of industry can we create in the Dominican Republic for the Dominican people?

Question. Finally, President Bosch, as a philosopher, as an author, a professor, what advice or philosophy or words of wisdom do you want to give to students?

Answer. The young people have before them now a world with tremendous change. In the next 10, 15, 20 to 25 years things are becoming very unstable. And the young man who is going to find a living in this world must be first of all honest. He must fight for his beliefs, honor his ideas with honesty. If they are Americans: I think that young people have a message to give to other people; that by working and trying to understand the other people's problems and trying to be members of a great family in America, we can establish a better society for the future. But we must think every day that the United States is not an isolated society in this world.

Most of what is going to happen in Latin America should be causing change in the United States. So you must help to build a new Latin America, a new democratic society in Latin America, to maintain, to preserve, your democracy in the United States. That's all.

Question. What is the message which Americans have to tell to others?

Answer. Your knowledge especially, your knowledge. Your conscience of freedom. And your strength, which is not now a strength maintained in the strong by force but in the feeling that an Indian in Peru, and in Bolivia, or a Negro in Haiti, or a mixture of people in Mexico is a man with a soul, with a brain, as you are in Montana, or Alabama, or New Hampshire. So that men have been created equal, by the Creator and must be as brothers in a new society. We have not lived, really, in the world as brothers. We have been living as enemies. And the next revolution is this: we are going to live as brothers, not as enemies.

Ellison McKissick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Ellison McKissick, South Carolina, the South, and the United States lost a great humanitarian, a pioneer industrialist, and a great American.

Mr. McKissick was president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute in 1950. Thus honored by those in the textile industry, he very ably served the entire industry and our country during a critical period of world history.

The following splendid editorial, which is a fitting eulogy to Mr. McKissick, appeared in the Greenville News on February 2, 1966:

ELLISON SMYTH MCKISSICK

The story of the life of Ellison Smyth McKissick, the manner in which he lived it, the productive uses to which he put it, and the accomplishments which marked it, should be an inspiration to the builders of the new South for generations.

An engineer by profession, a gentleman by instinct, and a textile pioneer by circumstance and choice, Mr. McKissick made an extraordinarily strong impression on his era.

Wherever the name was known, it was highly respected among business and industrial leaders. Wherever the man himself was known, he was held in esteem and affection.

And nowhere was this more vividly illustrated than by the regard held for him by the men and women who worked, not for him but with him for that was his method of operation, in the family enterprise he, his father and sons acquired and developed in part but mainly built from the ground up.

They have kept it a family enterprise by daring to try the new and to be different in this day of stock trades and mergers. Many textile innovations started in McKissick-owned and operated plants, for Mr. McKissick had an affinity for new ideas. One of the most recent rounds of wage increases started in the Alice Manufacturing Co. of Easley.

Mr. McKissick's relations with his employees, or coworkers, was highly personal. He knew hundreds of them by name and many present employees are of the second and third generations to find careers in his plants. In lean times, he helped to provide schools, homes, and churches for his people. In better times, he shared the profits of the company with them.

Mr. McKissick was noted for a personal diffidence unusual in a man of his accomplishments. Although a man of many talents, he abhorred the public spotlight.

Some years ago a reporter for the News approached Mr. McKissick with the idea of doing a story on his ability as an architect-engineer. At the time the textile executive was busy drawing up the plans for a new mill, something few if any of his contemporaries could have done. Courteously but firmly the reporter was rebuffed and told—without a trace of sarcasm but with simple honesty—that in Mr. Kissick's opinion there were any number of things more interesting to report.

He was literally and figuratively a builder of the southern textile industry. He headed some of its organizations and liaison committees and led it into new and better paths. When he decided to expand, or build a new plant, the result was invariably something different and more modern.

Personally, he was strikingly handsome and courtly in manner, treating all men, great or humble, as equals. His quiet manner never quite hid the spring steel of the war hero he was in 1917–18 or the compassionate but firmly competent industrialist he became.

We extend to his family, to whom he imparted so many of his fine qualities, our deepest sympathy. We and thousands of others share their loss and their grief.

H.R. 12456 and H.R. 12478—Horton Bills To Attack Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce my introduction of two new legislative measures, H.R. 12456 and H.R. 12478, to focus an increasing Federal attack on the Nation's leading natural resources problem, water pollution.

One of the lessons of living is that we do not always see everything we are paying for and sometimes we do not even realize how high these costs are. Water pollution is a prime example. This contamination of streams, rivers, and lakes is expensive for every one of us.

Pollution increases the cost to municipalities and industries of obtaining fresh water, it impairs recreational resources making them more costly to maintain, and poisons in the water around us destroy useful aquatic life.

I have developed a special interest in water pollution because of my service on the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. Among our accomplishments so far was persuading the President to issue an Executive order directing all Federal agencies in the Nation to clean up their own facilities.

A second attack came with the passage by Congress last year of the Water Quality Act. This legislation provides for the establishment and enforcement of antipollution standards in interstate streams. It also increases Federal financial assistance for construction of community sewage plants.

However, I feel there is much more to be done to control water pollution, and with that in mind I introduced this new legislation to cope with the ever-increasing problem.

One bill, H.R. 12478, gives a tax incentive to industries that build waste treatment works.

The second bill, H.R. 12456, amends present Federal law to further help cities, towns, and villages improve their sewage facilities.

These legislative proposals are intended to make an effective end to water pollution a national priority by encouraging local governments to match greater Federal assistance and by stimulating businesses to spend the money necessary to control pollution-causing conditions from their factories.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of my colleagues to these measures and urge their prompt and positive consideration.

Will Television Enter the House?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a recent editorial in the Keene, N.H., Evening Sentinel, reprinted from the Newport, N.H., Argus-Champion. It refers to a bill which Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, and I introduced along with eight of our colleagues. I am pleased to include the editorial at this point:

IGNORANCE DANGEROUS

The antics of scoop-happy, irresponsible news hawks in the coverage of the Lindbergh kidnaping trial constitute one of the most disgraceful chapters in the history of American journalism.

Worst than that, the public reacted to them in a series of Government edicts restricting the use of microphone and camera, edicts that today are helping to produce an ignorant electorate.

Because of the excesses that made a circus of what should have been a most serious trial of an accused man who eventually went to the electric chair, the courts of the United States wrote canon 35, which holds that the use of a microphone or camera in the courtroom "is calculated" to destroy the dignity of the court.

In the 31 years since that trial, however, cameras and microphones have been improved so that their presence would not even be noticed in a courtroom and most newsmen have developed a realistic sense of responsibility.

So the rule that prevents the use of camera or microphone to help the public understand the conduct of our courts, is as obsolete as the star chamber proceeding that the open trial is supposed to prevent.

In the interest of freedom, of intelligent self-government, we need more of the realistic reporting of public affairs that can be reinforced by the use of microphone and camera

New Hampshire ought to be proud that Second District Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND is taking the lead in trying to give the people of America the right to know what their House of Representatives is doing.

He has introduced bills that would permit the use of microphone and camera in the House of Representatives. Presidents of the United States, he notes, can cause electronic reporting from the House, but when they leave the Hall the microphones and cameras go too.

"In my opinion, this is wrong," he says. "The electronic media, in the interests of elementary democracy, should be permitted to bring the public to the floor of the House to hear the debates which will decide their future."

Mr. CLEVELAND's bill ought to have the support of every Congressman who does not fear that it will expose his incompetence as cupidity.

And its principles ought to be written into law not only in Washington, but in New Hampshire, to insure the right of every citizen to witness Government agencies at their work, and to look at every public record

The absence of such laws not only protects the corrupt or the incompetent, it contributes to the ignorance that puts freedom in jeopardy.

Ike and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. RACE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying to see the wide support the President has received for his decision to resume air strikes in North Vietnam. It seems to me that of these, none is more important than the forthright, strong statement by President Eisenhower.

The former World War II supreme commander believes that President Johnson acted in the only way possible. His support of renewed air action over North Vietnam is without reservation.

General Eisenhower's outspoken endorsement of the President's decision to resume bombing in the north after the 37-day pause is both "timely and welcome," the Washington Star commented in a February 2 editorial entitled "Ike and Vietnam."

The Star reiterated General Eisenhower believes that President Johnson "unquestionably has made the correct decision in ordering resumption of the bombing."

General Eisenhower has made it clear that if we fail in Vietnam we would have to face the aggressors on other battlefields in southeast Asia. And he added:

> I'm for winning the battle here (in Vietnam) and not in some more remote place not of our own choosing.

The words of this beloved former President and wise commander will be heard—and listened to. We are indeed fortunate to have his advice and the President to have his support. Because my colleagues may want to peruse the editorial to which I have referred, I hereby submit it for publication in the RECORD.

IKE AND VIETNAM

It is no secret that General Eisenhower in the main has approved and supported the policies which the Johnson administration has been following in Vietnam.

Nevertheless, his outspoken endorsement of the President's decision to resume bombing in the north after the 37-day pause is both timely and welcome. It is timely because the President, during the past few days, has been under heavy attack in the Senate, primarily from a minority group of liberal Democratic Senators. Despite the fact that they are in the minority, however, the continuing criticism in the Senate is bound to contribute to confusion in the country and in some degree to shake public confidence in the soundness of Mr. Johnson's decision.

So the vigorous statement from the former President, in whose administration we first began giving aid to Saigon, is welcome. His two overwhelming Presidential victories testify to the size of his following in the United States. And most of the American people, we believe, will prefer his judgment to that of the Morses, the Fulbrights, and the Gavins.

In an interview with the New York Times, Mr. Eisenhower said the President "unquestionably has made the correct decision in ordering resumption of the bombing. An indefinite pause, he added, would only give "sanctuary to those responsible for sending guerrilla forces and supplies into South Vietnam" in the effort to impose their will on the Government and people of that country."

Mr. Eisenhower has no sympathy at all with the comments from Senators to the effect that we are escalating the war while "playing at brinkmanship with a nuclear world war III." He also rejects General Gavin's suggestion that we should lodge our forces in coastal enclaves while pursuing peace efforts. What, he asked, would the Vietcong be doing throughout the rest of South Vietnam while U.S. forces sat securely in their enclaves?

If we fail in Vietnam, he continued, we would have to face the aggressors on other battlefields in southeast Asia. And the World War II Supreme Commander concluded with this: "I'm for winning the battle here (in Vietnam) and not in some more remote place not of our own choosing."

A beleagured and harrassed President needs the support of all Americans, especially those in a position to know what they are talking about. For this reason if for no other we are glad that General Eisenhower has seen fit to speak out forthrightly at this critical time.

Mrs. Marcos, the First Lady of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the more charming advantages of our democratic form of government is the prominent role that is given to the First Lady. Because we in America have been blessed with a succession of outstanding First Ladies and because we are cognizant of the influence that a First Lady can exert in a country, we look with great respect and expectation to the new First Lady of the Philippines—Mrs. Ferdinand Marcos.

Mrs. Marcos recently demonstrated a keen awareness of the importance of her role when she said in an interview with Ligaya Fruto of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin that her goal during her husband's tenure is to work toward the advancement of the arts. She is particularly interested in establishing a national theater and a national museum. As a member of one of the oldest political clans of the Philippines and as a graduate of the St. Paul's College and the Philippine Women's University College of Music and Arts, she is unusually well qualified for the task.

The people of the Philippines look to Mrs. Marcos not only as a leader in the arts, but also as a symbol of the good that will come to them during the administration of President Marcos. As a person who has met Mrs. Marcos and who has been completely charmed by her beauty and personality, I believe that the people of the Philippines will not be disappointed.

I commend for your reading the interesting article by Miss Fruto, about the First Lady of the Philippines which appeared in the January 18, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

MRS. MARCOS SEEKS PHILIPPINE ISLANDS NATIONAL THEATER, MUSEUM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Star-Bulletin staff writer Ligaya Fruto left the Philippines yesterday aboard the liner *President Cleveland* for her return to Hawaii. She has been on an extensive tour of the Far East. This latest article is an exclusive interview with the new First Lady of the Philippines, Mrs. Ferdinand Marcos.)

(By Ligaya Fruto)

MANILA, PHILIPPINES.—"To keep up with Ferdinand (Marcos) you have to have some kind of a mind," said Mrs. Marcos, First Lady of the Philippines, who is noted for the beauty of her face and form.

Filipinos torn by political strife, repeated disillusionment, and the economic and moral ills that threaten their survival are agreed on one thing:

They believe they have one of the most beautiful and capable First Ladies in the world today.

Tall for a Filipino and with the serene, honey-colored radiance of a true Malayan beauty, Imelda Romualdez Marcos has the warmth and charm which have swayed voters and impressed diplomats and make her the greatest asset to a man of Marcos' brilliance and ambition.

That she has a mind, too, she demonstrated during an interview in Malacanang Palace, the White House of the Philippines.

In a simple linen dress, with gold-toned pearl jewelry that were her husband's Christmas gifts to her, she looked as calm and unruffled at 11:30 a.m., as she must have looked at 8:30, or some 20 visitors before.

"I seem to be busier than Ferdinand," she laughed. "He was through for the morning three visitors ago. But I don't mind. It takes two to do a job like this.

"I have no illusions about the difficulty of this position. But although I am young in years (she's 33) and in experience, I know I can seek the counsel of older and wiser people.

"I have confidence that my husband and I can do the job."

Mrs. Marcos' pet project is the establishment of a national theater and a national museum.

"Filipinos by their heritage are musicians and artists," she explained. "Everywhere you go musicians are appreciated.

"Japan is now becoming the first nation in musical development in Asia. Why not the Philippines? We have the best musicians—everywhere—here.

"The same thing with culture. We've been using fine porcelain and china even before other peoples in the world. Yet our wonderful artifacts are gathering dust in some school warehouses, unseen and unappreciated.

"I'd like to ask Ferdinand to work for the passage of a bill to prevent artifacts from leaving the country. We should have them on display in a museum to show the richness of our culture."

A national theater and a museum are necessary if Filipinos are to be made aware of this heritage.

"Awareness is half the battle," she said.

"I have to work to get these two essential national institutions within the 4 years of Ferdinand's administration. No matter how much I might strive to get them done after his term, I may not have the influence to accomplish what I should.

"So I'll have to work hard in the next 4 years."

Mrs. Marcos is intensely convinced that the hopes of her people are reposed in her husband's and her own conduct in the next 4 years.

"Our people were so desperate that we have to show them how sincere we are," she said. "They said that no matter who gets the Presidency, the same unpleasantness—graft, corruption—will result. We have to prove to them that we are different."

The First Lady admitted that her position is fraught with "great temptation."

"If your heart is not strong and your will to be good is weak, you'll fall along the way," she said.

"Jewels by the ganta are offered to you. I cried one day because I was so insulted. How can anyone thing that I can be bought?

"Luckily for us, Ferdinand and I have more than enough that we need for this position. I shall make it a point to accept only gifts of food and flowers, perishable things that one can not very well refuse."

Manila-born Mrs. Marcos is the daughter of a prominent Leyte lawyer, a scholarly man more interested in music and culture than in public life.

Her uncle was a justice of the Supreme Court, who wrote the preamble to the Philippine Constitution. Another uncle became mayor of Manila.

Other members of her family have become Senators, Congressmen, Ambassadors and Governors, giving substance to the claim that the Romualdezes belong to one of the mightiest political clans of the country.

Mrs. Marcos majored in history and English and minored in home economics for her bachelor of science degree in education at St. Paul's College, where her father was dean of the college of law.

She also studied for 2 years in the Philippine Women's University College of Music and Arts.

She and her husband believe that 11 is their lucky number. "My husband was born on September 11, and we got married after 11 days of courtship," she recalled.

"We had our first child, Maria Imelda, about 11 months afterward.

"We were sure we were going to win this election because this is the 11th year of our marriage.

"Our marriage," she added simply, "is truly one in a million.

"If we are separated even for just a little while, he sends me telegrams or calls by long distance. And he always brings me back little presents.

"The present last Christmas," she said, fingering her goldtoned pearl ring surrounded by 11 diamonds, "came with a card inscribed, 'To My Golden Girl.' Our marriage is truly out of this world."

She said that they never had any problems with their three children—the other two are Ferdinand, Jr., 7, and Irene, 5. They are all at the top of their classes and do their homework without prompting.

"Ferdinand checks their homework before they go to bed," she said.

Even now? she was asked. "Yes, specially now," she replied. "This is to make up for the times he could not do so during the campaign.

"As long as you make children feel loved and wanted they'll be OK.

"I think all wives will agree with me that our first responsibility is to take care of the homefront for our husbands and the upbringing of our children. Then we can go on to civic duties."

Mrs. Marcos believes that one of her civic duties will be to promote tourism for the Philippines.

"Small places like Switzerland and Honolulu make hundreds of millions of dollars a year on tourism. The Philippines makes only about $3 or $4 million.

"Tourism is everybody's job. I think we should get the press to cooperate—ask it to keep from sensationalizing crime and play down other publicity that scares tourists away.

"I would also like to see a Philippine marketplace where products will be of top quality and fairly priced.

"This marketplace should have a money exchange facility and a place where folk dances and fashion shows may be given."

Certainly one of the best dressed women in the Philippines, the First Lady said she has all her clothes made in the Philippines and often of native materials.

She said that she would rather have one good dress than 10 mediocre ones.

She glories in her role of Galatea to her husband's Pygmalion.

"I have often said during the campaign that whatever I am, I am Ferdinand's creation," she said, smiling.

"He has done so much for me. I've always been so sheltered as a girl.

"He has helped me so that I can grow up a little with him, not side by side with him, but a little behind him."

Views of Representative Bingham on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have continued to receive a number of communications expressing profound concern about the situation in Vietnam and asking for my views.

First let me say that I know of no one in the Congress or in the administration who does not share this concern. The dark tragedy of the present situation, and the difficulty of seeing any light ahead, are evident to all.

Last December I urged the President to undertake new initiatives looking toward a peaceful settlement of the conflict, including working for a ceasefire, a suspension of the bombing in the north, and clarification of our willingness to deal with representatives of the National Liberation Front at the negotiating table. Naturally, I applauded the peace offensive, including a suspension of bombing in the north, which the President undertook late in December, even though he did not go quite as far as I felt would have been desirable.

On January 21, I joined with 76 other Members of the House in urging the President to continue suspension of the bombing in the north and more actively to seek the assistance of the United Nations in achieving a peaceful settlement.

I was therefore disappointed when the President approved a renewal of the bombing in the north, although I could understand the pressure he was under in terms of short-range military considerations; that is, trying to impede the flow of manpower and equipment from the north which would be used against our forces in the South. At the same time, I welcomed his decision to submit the matter to the Security Council of the United Nations, particularly in asking the Security Council—instead of trying to impose a solution—to seek "a conference looking toward the application of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962," "cessation of hostilities under effective supervision," and "the establishment of a durable peace in southeast Asia." While it will be difficult to obtain the desired action from the United Nations, either from the Security Council or a special session of the General Assembly, it is certainly worth trying, particularly from the point of view of further underlining to the world the United States' desire to achieve a peaceful settlement.

I am also glad that the President reiterated his intention to continue his peace offensive through other channels. I find it difficult to understand why Hanoi has been not only unresponsive to these efforts, but openly scornful of them. And I also find it difficult to understand why many groups in this country that have been so vocal in urging the course of peace upon the U.S. Government have so far, to my knowledge, not directed any comparable pleas to the Government of North Vietnam.

I continue to believe in the desirability of maximum debate and discussion of this desperately important subject in the Congress, both on the floor of the House and the Senate and in the appropriate committees. At the same time, I think it should be borne in mind that a large majority of both Houses of the Congress supports the President. While there has been some criticism that the President has not asked for a new resolution, to take the place of the one that was adopted at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incident, I have no doubt that a new resolution reaffirming the President's authority to take whatever steps he deems necessary under the circumstances would be overwhelmingly adopted.

It should also be borne in mind that the President is under tremendous pressure from many Members of the Senate and the House, as well as from some of the generals and admirals in the Pentagon, to take more drastic action than he has done in an effort to seek a military victory. He needs support in resisting this pressure, and I would urge all those who agree with me that any such escalation of the conflict would be a disastrous error, which would not shorten the conflict in Vietnam and which might eventuate in war with China or the Soviet Union or both, to express these views in writing to the President. These communications will carry more weight with the President and his advisers if they reflect an understanding of his determination not to withdraw from Vietnam but to seek a peaceful settlement under which the right of the South Vietnamese people to determine their own future will be assured.

I continue to believe that in looking at Vietnam, we must keep in mind the broader considerations. On the one hand, we have to keep in mind our reputation for determination and for keeping faith with our friends and allies. On the other hand, we must be aware of the fact that the ultimate threat in the

Far East is Communist China and that any steps we take which tend at drive an unwilling and fearful North Vietnamese Government irredeemably into the arms of Peiping are destructive of our ultimate objectives for the area.

Who Needs an Ombudsman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, television station WBBM-TV in Chicago carried an extremely interesting editorial on January 26 which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, particularly since proposals for establishment of an ombudsman have been suggested to the Congress.

I thoroughly agree with the editorial that any citizen who needs assistance today can get such assistance either from his Congressman or other representatives to various levels of government in the community.

Mr. Carter Davidson, editorial director of WBBM-TV, has performed a significant public service and effectively shot down trial balloons recently launched around here for creation of an ombudsman position.

The editorial follows:

WHO NEEDS AN OMBUDSMAN?

If we are not careful, we are going to get a new word in the language—and a new face on the public payrolls. The word is "ombudsman." It comes from Sweden, and it means, literally, representative of the people. As it works in practice, the ombudsman speaks up for ordinary citizens like us, who get caught up in the tangles of governmental redtape.

You, yourself, may have had some experience in the frustration of trying to get something done, or a complaint heard, by some office of government. Chances are you ended up mumbling to yourself about "what chance does a little guy have trying to fight city hall?" In theory, an ombudsman, especially elected for the job, would fight your fight for you. And, in theory, it is a good idea. So good, in fact, that there have been proposals for establishing the position of ombudsman here in Illinois.

A bill to create such a post was introduced in the last session of the State legislature but got lost in the shuffle. The same was true in California, where we are told the ombudsman bill came close to passage. Now there is agitation in New York State to establish an ombudsman there.

We can be fairly sure the effort will be renewed in Illinois next year when the general assembly meets again. We do not need an ombudsman in Illinois, or in the city of Chicago. We already have several. All you have to do is use them. You have two U.S. Senators, your Representative in Congress, an alderman in city hall and a whole galaxy of State representatives and senators. They occupy the offices they hold because they promised you, at election time, they would represent your interests.

Write to them, or call them on the telephone. They are your ombudsman, your representatives. At least that's what they get paid for being, and the better ones earn their pay.

In our view, we don't need to hire an ombudsman to get us out of any tangles of governmental redtape. We need to use the representatives we already have. That's why we have them.

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission

SPEECH
OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, a few short years from now, between 1973 and 1983, we will be celebrating the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution, and the bicentennial of our national commitment to the principles of liberty and equality set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

There is no question that this bicentennial will be marked across the land by countless local, State, National and international activities, stretching through a full decade, under the auspices of innumerable public authorities, learned societies, and historical, civic, patriotic, philanthropic, and professional organizations and groups.

There is no question that we will enjoy a great range of conferences and convocations, scholarship and analysis, and pomp and pageantry.

There is no question that this bicentennial will be the greatest celebration in the history of our Republic—but there is no assurance that it will be as great, as thoughtful, and as mature as the occasion requires. I personally believe that it is the ideals rather than the relics of the Revolution that we should emphasize.

Given the magnitude of the bicentennial, and the wealth of talents and resources involved, careful planning and comprehensive coordination are both difficult and essential. In my judgment, the job can only be done by a blue-ribbon national commission with ample time and authority, and with the confidence and cooperation of the many groups and agencies involved.

Last week the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] and I introduced identical bills, H.R. 12252 and H.R. 12260, to establish an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission as the best agency for this tremendous task.

The Commission we propose would have 31 members, including the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House; 4 Senators and 4 Representatives; the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities; and 15 members from private life, appointed by the President. The President, Vice President, Speaker of the House, and the five executive-branch officials designated would be ex-officio members of the Commission.

Because the full dimensions of the bicentennial cannot be determined at once, the Commission would devote its first 2 years to comprehensive planning. During the first year of its existence, the Commission is directed to convene a national assembly of representatives from the Federal Government, the States, and all interested groups. This assembly would discuss possible bicentennial activities and make recommendations to the Commission.

Based on the assembly's conclusions and its own preliminary work, the Commission would submit a full report to Congress within the first 2 years of its existence. As described in our bills, this report would include discussion of a great range of possible activities; recommendations for the allocation of financial and administrative responsibility among various public and private authorities and groups; and such legislative enactments and administrative actions as the Commission considers necessary.

In fulfilling its broad responsibility to plan, encourage, coordinate, and conduct bicentennial activities, the Commission would be authorized to consult, cooperate with, and seek advice and assistance from all appropriate Federal departments and agencies, State and local public bodies, learned societies, and historical, patriotic, philanthropic, civic, professional, and related organizations. Conversely, all Federal departments and agencies are authorized and requested to cooperate fully with the Commission, with more specific directives being given to the Secretary of the Interior, the Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities, and the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Archivist of the United States to develop appropriate activities and projects in their respective fields.

Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission is not designed nor intended to preempt the field and preclude, or even monitor, local and private efforts. Its goal is just the opposite: To encourage all interested groups, to offer information, to help provide advice and technical assistance, and to orchestrate a vast collection of activities and projects into a bicentennial of unprecedented scope, depth, and quality.

Toward this goal, the planning procedures established under this bill are especially important, for all posibilities must be surveyed and studied before final recommendations are made and final arrangements begun. The continuity of leadership provided by this Commission will be vital, too, for without it, the most careful planning could be for naught.

In developing this legislation, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] and I have consulted with many interested individuals, and have studied the experience of previous commemorative commissions, particularly the Civil War Centennial Commission. In the weeks ahead, we will be seeking the advice and counsel of many groups and individuals throughout the Nation. We hope to obtain the interest and support of many of our colleagues in the House, so that an early hearing on this bill can be obtained.

Teach Them and Poverty Will Flee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a reporter, Margaret Josten, of the Cincinnati Enquirer, has written a seven-part series on the antipoverty program in Cincinnati. Today, I include the third part of her series to illustrate the kind of reporting that helps inform the public about the various antipoverty programs at work in our communities under the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

TO EVERY MAN HIS CHANCE—TEACH THEM AND POVERTY WILL FLEE

(By Margaret Josten)

An Einstein or an Aristotle could put together an antipoverty program without emphasis on education—and it would be a miserable failure.

Nearly every study of the Nation's poverty stricken, now estimated to number about 35 million, shows lack of education to be at the root of the problem. If only those with knowledge and/or skill can live decently today, what happens 10 years from now?

In Hamilton County alone, bureau of unemployment compensation figures show close to 70 percent of the jobless have less than a high school education. Of that percentage, more than half quit school before completing the 8th grade.

Although the local economy was booming toward the end of 1965, a total 16,200 persons were out of work.

It is no surprise, therefore, that most of the approximately $8 million being spent here in the war on poverty is for education in one form or another.

Preschool programs to stimulate the physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development of children 4 and 5 years old may eventually be recognized as the most successful attacks in the war on poverty.

ENROLLED IN CITY, 560

Approximately 560 children living in Cincinnati's poverty pockets are enrolled in centers which have been set up at eight elementary schools. The original cost of the program was $135,000; renewal, $268,429. Sponsor, Cincinnati Board of Education.

A similar preschool program was operated for 80 children in Lincoln Heights in January through September of 1965 at a cost of $33,812. The renewal of the program cost $219,444 because it was expanded to include 340 deprived children from 6 other school districts—Three Rivers, Deer Park, Sycamore, Lockland, Loveland, and Norwood. Sponsor, Hamilton County Board of Education.

The preschool programs known as Operation Head Start were operated during the summer by the Cincinnati Board of Education, at a cost of $249,225, and the Hamilton County Board of Education, at a cost of $33,937.

Head Start was considered so successful both nationally and locally that President Johnson, in one of his expansive moods last fall, said it would be enlarged to operate year round. Indications are, however, that the money simply is not available to do any such enlargement.

The Cincinnati Montessori Society has in operation a $36,766 program scheduled through March 30. It is giving about 75 culturally and environmentally deprived children, 4 and 5 years old, education to stimulate physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development.

One class in the Montessori method began July 19 at Findlay Street Neighborhood House. Two others began in September at the Millvale and Winton Terrace metropolitan housing projects.

THE 1,100 IN YOUTH CORPS

Another key program in the war on poverty is that which has become known as the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

There are two types of corpsmen—those in school and those out of school. The in-school programs for economically disadvantaged boys and girls, 16 to 21, are aimed not only at increasing their employability, but providing them with part-time jobs and other services so they may remain in school.

Approximately 1,100 boys and girls now are being aided in this manner through an NYC program sponsored by the Cincinnati Board of Education. The original program, running from February to September 1965, cost $64,664; the renewal, scheduled to operate to August 1966, is costing $93,550.

The NYC program sponsored by the Hamilton County Board of Education in 14 school districts currently is aiding close to 500 students in 14 school districts. Cost of the program scheduled to run to August 1966, is $393,890.

Nearly 248 students were aided in the original program, May through August 1965, at a cost of $165,105.

Generally eligible are pupils from families with incomes less than $3,000 a year.

Work-study programs are also operating here to provide employment for undergraduate and graduate students needing aid to begin or continue college-level education.

UC, XU CONTRACTS

The University of Cincinnati has a $129,750 contract with the U.S. Office of Education which is expected to aid an estimated 200 students before its expiration in June.

Xavier University has a work-study contract totaling $39,915, and the Ohio College of Applied Science has one for $23,500. Costs of administration are borne by the three institutions wtih work-study programs.

Three other local programs are related to education:

A basic literacy program sponsored by the Cincinnati Board of Education at a cost of $82,000. This is aimed at helping out-of-school youth and adults gain knowledge and practical skills necessary in attaining better jobs, higher pay, self-confidence.

A Lincoln Heights School social work project sponsored by the Hamilton County Board of Education in cooperation with the Urban League. Original cost was $17,939; renewal cost, $25,033.

This program provides casework services for a school district with a high absentee, truancy, and dropout rate. Lincoln Heights is an isolated, low-income, all-Negro community unable to provide adequate resources for development of children. The aim is to keep children in school and to raise their academic achievement level.

School-community centers serve thousands of persons living in Cincinnati's economically depressed neighborhoods. The program sponsored by the Cincinnati Board of Education involves keeping 40 school buildings open through evening hours.

PURPOSES VARIED

The purpose is to give tutoring, counseling, and library services; to increase understanding between the school, community agencies, and residents; to provide sociocivic, educational, cultural, and recreational help in meeting the communities' specific needs.

Particular attention is given activities designed to improve family life.

Cost of the school-community program between January and September 1965, when over 7,000 persons were served in 7 school buildings, was $162,293. Now, many thousands more are being served with 40 buildings staying open at a cost of $501,298.

Although dental work on needy children may have nothing to do with education per se, there are those who feel that poor performance in school can often be traced to health problems.

The Federal Antipoverty Office has therefore given the Cincinnati Board of Education $192,064 to repair the teeth of an estimated 14,000 children from low-income families. The board is giving $15,919 toward the program.

A survey undertaken in schools serving poverty pockets showed 90 percent of the youngsters needed dental work.

Fine Schedule for February National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, FEBRUARY 1966

The gallery is open weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

MONDAY, JANUARY 31 THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 6

Painting of the week: Zurbarán, "St. Jerome With St. Paula and St. Eustochium" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 51, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "The Splendid Scene." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Peddler by Hieronymus Bosch: A Study in Detection." Guest speaker: Lotte Brand Philip, professor of art history, Queens College, Flushing. Lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Henri Honegger, cellist; Claire Madeleine Pallard, pianist. East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7 THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 13

Painting of the week: Canaletto. "View in Venice" (Widener collection), gallery 55. Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "The Pastoral Scene." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Comparisons in British and American Sculpture." Guest speaker: Hubert Dalwood, ceramist, London, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: the Feldman String Quartet of Norfolk, Va., and Charles Byrd, guitarist, East Garden Court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14 THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 20

Painting of the week: Sully. "Lady With a Harp: Eliza Ridgely" (gift of Maude Monell

Vetlesen), gallery 69. Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Artists' revisions in their paintings. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Back to the Salt Mines—European War Art Repositories Revisited." Guest speaker: Lamont Moore, school of drama, Yale University, New Haven. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Edwin Grzesnikowski, violinist; Ann Huddleston, pianist. East garden court 8.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21 THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 27

Print of the week: Goya. "Bullfight at Bordeaux" (Rosenwald collection), central lobby. Wednesday through Saturday 12 and 2. Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Altarpieces. Rotunda, Wednesday through Saturday 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Tuesday 1, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Eccentric Behavior and Conformity in Artists Before the French Revolution." Guest speaker: Rudolph Wittkower, processor of art history, Columbia University, New York. Lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Gary Towlen, pianist. East garden court 8.

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

The 25th anniversary year: 1966 marks the 25th year that the National Gallery of Art has been open to the public. A special celebration will take place on March 17, the anniversary of the opening date. Throughout the year a series of events will be held in commemoration.

New gallery film: The new color film on American painting, "The American Vision," will be shown to the public on Saturdays at 2:15 p.m. in the auditorium. The 35-minute film is the winner of an award at the New York International Film and Television Festival.

New publication: First in a series of 25th anniversary publications: "Summary Catalogue of the European Paintings and Sculpture" in the National Gallery of Art. 192 pages, 6" x 9". $2.85 postpaid. For the first time since 1941, a complete check-list in one volume.

New reproductions: Color Postcards. Copley, Detail from "The Copley Family"; Degas, "Mlle. Malo"; Gérard, "The Model"; Modiglini, "Chaim Soutine"; van Gogh, "Roulin's Baby"; Henner, "Alsatian Girl; Picasso, "Pedro Mañach"; Toulouse-Lautrec, "A Corner of the Moulin de la Galette"; Picasso, "Le Gourmet"; Renoir, "Girl with a Hoop"; Matisse, "Pot of Geraniums."

Radio picture of the week: As a result of the popularity of last year's programs, a new series will run from February through June. To subscribe, send your name and address to Radio Picture of the Week, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. 20565. Orders taken only for complete series of twenty. $5.50 postpaid. Checks should be made payable to: N.G.A. Publications Fund. Each reproduction on 11" x 14" heavy paper, suitable for framing, comes with a short explanatory text in a portfolio cover.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuouslyy, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

Creston News-Advertiser and Des Moines Register Support Amendment To Abolish Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, as I stated in the RECORD yesterday, there is a pressing need for the Congress to approve and send to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment that would abolish the electoral college and replace it with a modern and realistic system for electing the President and Vice President.

In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members editorials in favor of abolishing the electoral college from the Creston (Iowa) News-Advertiser of January 28, 1966, and the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of January 29, 1966.

As both editorials point out, existing constitutional provisions give presidential electors the opportunity to ignore the results of the popular vote in their States and cast their ballots for any man they might desire.

Obviously, this is a threat to democratic government. I can see no logical reason why this threat should not be removed from our Constitution by doing away with the electoral college and individual electors.

If action along this line is to prove successful, the general public will have to be made aware of the dangers of the electoral college, and I therefore think the News-Advertiser and the Register are to be commended for devoting editorial space to this subject.

The two editorials follow:

[From the Creston (Iowa) News-Advertiser, Jan. 28, 1966]

ABOLISH ELECTORAL COLLEGE

The administration—and Congressman BANDSTRA, of the Fourth District, is most active in this effort—has proposed the abolishment of the electoral college system in choosing the President of the United States.

A change in this procedure seems very much in order.

There is a very logical reason for this. The electoral college, in effect, is not used.

For example, when Iowa votes for President of the United States, the people cast popular votes for the candidates listed at the top of the ballot. The winning candidate in the State total receives Iowa's electoral votes, which are now nine. In 1964 this was Mr. Johnson. In 1960 it was Mr. Nixon.

But under the present system, Iowans actually elect nine presidential electors. These persons meet following the general election and cast the Iowa votes for President. By practice, they cast them for the winner in the popular vote.

But, by the Constitution, they are not required to do this. They can vote for whom they bloody please.

This system was provided when the Constitution was adopted because it was felt people would vote for someone—an elector—who would know more about the persons who should serve as President. Communications were slow in those days—by courier. And so information about candidates didn't get around very well.

It probably had a merit of some sort then. Though it didn't leave the decision of election in the hands of the people. And that is where Americans think it should be—which it should be.

But the electoral college system has prevailed down through the years. In 1960 several electors voted different from the popular vote. But it didn't affect the final outcome—the election of Mr. Kennedy. But it could have.

So it does seem in order that the matter of voting for President should be set up procedurally as most people think it is—the electoral votes go to the man for whom the majority of the people in the State voted. And no "middle-man" business in between.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Jan. 29, 1966]

ABOLISHING ELECTORAL COLLEGE

President Johnson has repeated his request to Congress to launch a constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college but to retain the present basis of allotment of electoral votes to the various States. Under the present system a State has one electoral vote for each U.S. Senator and Representative.

The way the system works in Iowa and most States is this. Each Iowa party nominates nine electors whose names do not appear on the ballot. Instead the names of the presidential and vice presidential candidates of the parties appear there. Votes cast for the presidential teams are counted as votes for the electors. Electors who are thus chosen usually vote for their party candidates for President and Vice President. Legally they do not have to do so, however.

What Johnson is proposing is that the electors be eliminated and the electoral vote be cast automatically for the presidential and vice presidential pair that got the most popular votes in the State. Under the present system civil rights opponents in Southern States might use slates of uncommitted electors to blackmail the major parties.

This is possible because the presidential contest would be thrown into the U.S. House for decision if no major candidate were able to get a majority of the electoral votes. By electing unpledged electors who would withhold their votes from the major contenders, a majority vote among the electors might be prevented unless civil rights compromises were promised. A move of this kind was attempted in 1960, but President John Kennedy succeeded in polling an electoral majority without eight unpledged Democratic electors in Mississippi, six in Alabama and one in Oklahoma, who voted for Senator Harry Byrd, of Virginia.

If the race did go to the House, each State delegation there would have one vote regardless of the size of the State, a system which President Johnson rightly regards as undemocratic. He would like to change that, also. It is in the national interest that House decisions be avoided because of the danger of minority rule and the possibilities of cabals. With one vote per State a southern minority might be able to block indefinitely a decision it didn't like.

Some supporters of electoral college reform would like to change the way electoral votes are allotted. There are proposals to take away from the States the two electoral votes based on U.S. Senators, to allot electoral votes to districts within the States, to divide them according to the proportional vote in each State or to do away with electoral votes entirely, basing election instead on the total national party vote. Supporters of such changes will regret that they are not incorporated in the President's plan.

In view of the fact that 268 such proposals have failed to win agreement since 1889, Johnson may have preferred not to complicate the task of obtaining adoption of his plan. It is needed to forestall a present danger and should be adopted without prejudice to other efforts for election reform.

Air Pollution in New Jersey and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, February 3, reports that, "Despite new controls, air pollution in Los Angeles County last year hit the highest level since 1956."

This one-sentence report illustrates an often-overlooked fact about air pollution, that unless governments at all levels plan and execute a comprehensive, coordinated and vigorous attack against sources of pollution the problem will continue to grow worse until it literally overwhelms us. Pollution of the air we breathe, in other words, is increasing at a greater rate than our efforts to control and eliminate it, even in a relatively advanced area such as Los Angeles County.

As the representative of a congressional district in which air pollution is a severe problem, I was asked to write an article on the subject for the New Jersey Education Association Review as a part of a series dealing with critical issues in the State. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the article, which was published in the November issue of the Review:

SEWER IN THE SKY

(By Florence P. Dwyer)

Fresh, clean air—essential to life, health, and happiness—is notoriously in short supply, especially in the heavily populated regions of the Garden State.

Cross the Hudson River into New Jersey at almost any point and the assault on one's olfactory sense is immediate and intense. Odors from chemicals, oil, auto exhausts, waste disposal, and a multitude of other sources mingle, and penetrate even the least sensitive of noses.

It is possible, of course, to adjust to the virtually permanent and unpleasant condition of air pollution—by simply ignoring it—but is it wise? Medical experts tell us that we are literally poisoning ourselves by breathing the foul fumes that pass for air.

If the situation is bad in populated industrial areas generally, it is critical in northeast New Jersey.

Yet, we have hardly begun to attack this threat to the lives and safety of our people. In the face of overwhelming evidence we are doing little more than testing. We have laws in New Jersey and the Nation to control air pollution. These are often weak and inadequate statutes and are insufficiently enforced. However, up to date our regulations may be, we do little to provide the funds, facilities, and personnel needed to make them effective.

PRESENT LAWS ARE INADEQUATE

What makes our present laws inadequate and our current efforts more or less futile is that the sources and conditions of air contamination are increasing—not standing still. We cannot make headway until we move faster and farther than the growing rate at which we pollute the air.

How bad is air pollution? Much worse than most of us may realize. In dollars and cents, the economic costs of air pollution in the Nation are estimated at $18 billion annually. These are imprecise estimates and probably on the conservative side, since they cannot take account of the indirect consequences of polluted air.

The variety of pollutants which pervade our atmosphere—benzyprene, oxidants, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxide, other hydrocarbons, and large and small suspended particles—are responsible for the growing volume of damage. Destruction of crops and livestock, plants, flowers, and clothing, corrosion of metals, deterioration of buildings and other materials, and layers of dirt and grime everywhere are the visible results.

Far more important are the effects on the lives and health of human beings. For older people, especially, who may be more susceptible to cancer, heart, lung, and other respiratory diseases, air pollution has often been a direct cause of death. Even on the healthy and at low concentrations, doctors agree that polluted air has a long-term disabling effect and is a major cause of crippling and fatal diseases.

Recent history dramatically illustrates the tragic results of air pollution. Here is a rollcall of disaster: 1948, 20 dead and 6,000 violently ill in Donora, Pa.; 1952, 4,000 killed in England during a week-long smog; 1953, 200 deaths in New York City in one air pollution incident; 1962, 300 to 400 lives lost in London; 1963, in New York City again, 405 deaths traced to a 15-day period of intense air pollution.

WE ARE "SITTING DUCKS"

The disquieting truth is that we in New Jersey are "sitting ducks" for air pollution. New Jersey is the most densely populated and most heavily industrialized State—producing and breathing in far more than our share in pollutants.

The bulk of our population and industry is concentrated in the small, six-county northeast corner of the State. The land is flat and invites the dangerous air inversions which trap fumes, gases, and particles under a layer of warm air and turn the area into a vast aerial garbage heap. Inversions occur in New Jersey about 40 days in each year.

The air pollution problem, experts warn, is on the verge of overwhelming us. Proportionately, the thin band of air available as an aerial sewer is no thicker than the skin of an apple. Yet, automotive emissions—which account for 50 percent of our pollution problem—will increase by 75 percent in the next 10 years without effective controls. The United States is now producing enough trash, the disposal of which is another major source of contamination, to fill a freight train 150 miles long every day. By 1980, total urban trash production will triple to 1.5 billion pounds a day.

In the face of a threat of this magnitude, it is clear that New Jersey and the Nation are doing too little to control the spread of poison through the air. It's a job that demands leadership—from Federal, State, and local governments and from private industry. We need more research, to find better ways of identifying, measuring and controlling pollutants, including more efficient motor vehicle power plants and waste disposal methods.

We need higher standards for clean air, more inspectors, stiffer penalties. We need to replace urban traffic jams with modern mass transit facilities. We need more effective regional and interstate cooperation, for air pollution knows no boundaries. New Jersey must do its part.

AWAIT ACTION IN CONGRESS

The Clean Air Act of 1963 and the 1965 amendments—recently passed and now signed—represent the beginning of a national effort to curb auto exhaust and dispose of wastes without pollution. It's only a beginning. Unless it quickly becomes much more, we shall only cause a slight delay in our otherwise inevitable flight to disaster.

We have much of the technical know-how and the means to develop the rest. We have the money needed to do the job. What is required now is popular determination.

It's our air and it's supposed to be free. But it's costing our lives and health and resources. Let's make it free again.

(Editor's Note.—Florence Dwyer is serving her fifth term as a Member of the House of Representatives from New Jersey's Sixth Congressional District. She is on the House Committees on Banking and Currency and Government Operations and is a member of the Intergovernmental Relations and the Consumer Affairs Subcommittees. A resident of Elizabeth for more than 40 years, Mrs. Dwyer was first elected to the New Jersey State Legislature in 1949 and reelected for three more consecutive terms. She was chairman of the assembly's education committee. This article is the second in a series dealing with critical issues facing New Jersey.)

Former Peace Corpsmen in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article that appeared in the January 1966 issue of the Peace Corps Volunteer, and which tells of the fine work three former Peace Corps Volunteers are doing in Alaska's war on poverty, through coordinating VISTA activities in Alaska. Thanks to the contributions of Donald Johnson, Gerald Miller and Michael Valentine, all of whom have completed tours of duty with the corps, many Alaskans have benefited greatly from the domestic Peace Corps. The article follows:

FORMER PCV's AID ALASKAN POVERTY WAR

(Note.—Information on the three returned volunteers was gathered by Charles Overholt, Peace Corps writer-photographer.)

Three Peace Corps volunteers have transferred their community development talents from the Equator to the Arctic Circle by joining the Alaskan war on poverty.

Gerald Miller and Michael Valentine, former volunteers in Ecuador, and Donald Johnson, who served in Guatemala, are field representatives for Alaska's Office of Economic Opportunity. They direct the antipoverty program in three of OEO's four Alaskan regions. They coordinate VISTA (domestic Peace Corps) activities and meet directly with communities where there are no VISTA volunteers.

Gov. William A. Egan says that the three returned volunteers are making "the most constructive impact upon poverty in Alaska in its 100 years under the American flag."

"I can't say enough for these ex-PCV's," the Governor adds. "They're showing concrete results that are bettering the lives of thousands of our citizens."

"The projects in OEO are essentially rural community development projects," says Miller. "We're helping the people help themselves, just as we did with the Indians in the Ecuadorean Andes."

The Alaskan population (about 250,000) reaps the highest individual earnings in the Nation But over 48,000 members of the same population, Aphapaskan Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts, the "natives," have the lowest per capita income in the United States

Miller, 43, pays a monthly rent of $180 for a 1-room apartment in Fairbanks where he spends perhaps three nights a month The rest of the month he visits Alaskan villages

He attends council meetings composed of Eskimo whalers, fishermen and, in Barrow, a schoolteacher and a Catholic priest from the "lower 48," as the Alaskans call the rest of the mainland States.

"You're eligible for two VISTA volunteers," Miller told the Barrow Council, "but volunteers go only where they're invited If you want them, they'll help you to begin community action projects—set up Head Start programs, fill in your forms for small business loans, or process your proposal for a Job Corps establishment But only if you want them"

In Alaska's southwest, where 68 percent of the population is Indian and Eskimo, the average income is $1,952, and a dozen eggs cost $1.08 Don Johnson, 25, went there after completing his Peace Corps service last summer

A typical village in his district is Napaskiak, 50 minutes by dogsled from his headquarters at Bethel. Napaskiak, the home of 180 Eskimos, is a fishing village on king salmon waters

When Johnson asked the village council to tell him what the village needed most, the council unanimously decided on a refrigeration plant to store next summer's salmon catch

A councilman also suggested that an airplane be based in the village. There are no roads, and the village has to rely on an air charter service or dog sleds for supplies.

Another councilman voted for a herd of reindeer, the only livestock that can survive the Alaskan environment.

"We aren't operating a giveaway program here," Johnson said, "any more than we did in Guatemala. All the suggestions made by the village council will, if implemented, require hard work on the part of the Napaskiaks. But if they really want it, I'm here to help."

Mike Valentine, 23, operates from Anchorage—his territory stretches 150,000 miles from the last island in the Aleutian chain (closer to Tokyo than Seattle) to Juneau.

Valentine's biggest problem is Kodiak Island.

"We fly lots of men carrying their briefcases into the villages of Kodiak," an Aleut bush pilot remarked. "The villagers have seen them come, and they've seen them go, and the pots remain empty."

Kodiak City's king crab industry booms, but in an island village like Old Harbor, which was destroyed by a 1964 tidal wave, the 219 Aleuts are dependent on the fish they can catch today, and the fish they might catch tomorrow.

During the winter it is impossible to dock the fishing vessels necessary to the village's economy. Ships put in near Kodiak City, a 40 minute, $50 flight to the north. In the winter, the Aleuts must depend almost entirely on seal hunting for their daily meals.

Sven Haakinson, Old Harbor's restaurant owner, says, "All we want is the opportunity to work and make a living in Old Harbor. Welfare would kill us by destroying initiative." But the villagers believe Mike Valentine when he tells them how self-help community action programs raised living standards in Ecuador. "If he lived with those Ecuadorians and made his life a part of theirs, as he's doing here in Alaska, he must care," says Haakinson.

Phone Tax Is Ridiculous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of legislation to repeal the Federal excise tax on telephone service, I was very disappointed to hear the President recommend that such tax be reinstated. It was originally imposed as a "temporary" wartime measure over 20 years ago. Since the telephone is such a great necessity, it does not seem right that it should be singled out for tax purposes.

Philip W. Porter has hit the nail on the head in his column which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 27, 1966. I ask that it be included herewith:

PHONE TAX IS RIDICULOUS

(By Philip W. Porter)

President Johnson said it would cost more tax money to run the Vietnam war, and recommended various ways to raise it. We shouldn't object. Certainly it will. But there was one he should have skipped—putting back the telephone tax to 10 percent.

Advancing withholding tax percentages makes sense; it will bring in more money sooner. Restoring the excise tax on new cars won't really stop people from buying them; they're fascinated with the auto, almost to the point of worship.

But putting back the phone tax, right after it had been cut from 10 to 3 percent, is unnecessary. I hope enough Congressmen get their backs up and refuse to do it. There must be better ways to raise the dough.

The 10-percent phone tax was put on as an emergency, and endured ever since the Korean war, simply because it's almost impossible to remove a tax once it's on. But why tax phone calls, rather than gas or electricity usage?

Some businesses depend on the phone almost entirely for selling. Long distance calls, so easy to dial directly now, are the life blood of many interstate businesses.

Busy executives and high-powered salesmen can be anywhere in the country, and still remain in as close touch with their offices and clients as in the hometown. Like the airplane, the convenience of the phone has removed distance. It is no real problem to talk overseas these days. (During the height of the commotion over Bob Manry's voyage last summer, we were on the phone to England three or four times a day, often for 30 to 40 minutes a time.)

With this the situation, it's ridiculous for the Government to tax phone use. They might as well tax us for breathing. It's a real nuisance tax. And the fact that it was cut from 10 percent to 3 percent just a few weeks ago (January 1) gave us the first opportunity to realize how much we were being soaked. The plan, enacted last year, was to drop the tax to 2 percent next January, then 1 percent a year later, then zero. Congress ought to leave this intact.

Other than eating, there is not single thing the ordinary American does more often than use the phone. Housewives do their visiting on it, businessmen sell products and give orders over it, kids practically live on it, to such an extent that some permissive parents provide a separate phone for them.

Doctors couldn't function without phones; they answer emergencies, prescribe for small complaints (sometimes big ones, too) over the phone, are always on call. Drugstores need them. Police departments need them; so do fire departments (police and fire boxes are outdated today, by comparison). Newspapers get 75 percent of their information by phone.

No individual, and no government, is ever completely satisfied with details of a tax structure. Nevertheless, the President should be required to dream up other sources to tax than the phone. I hope enough Congressmen and Senators, of both parties, tell L.B.J. to look elsewhere.

Legislative Developments in the Antitrust Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a statement I made on legislative developments in the antitrust field before the antitrust law section of the New York State Bar Association in New York City, February 2, 1966. The statement follows:

LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE ANTITRUST FIELD

Your chairman's invitation to discuss legislative developments in 1966 in the antitrust field was most welcome. I look forward to these annual gatherings of the antitrust law section of the New York State Bar Association where we can survey new antitrust developments and examine into the current posture of enforcement matters.

The outstanding feature of the 1966 legislative program is the fact that the antitrust program must compete with the considerable number of other programs that are being requested by President Johnson. The demands on the time and attention of Congress during 1966 promise to create a legislative traffic jam that will parallel the vehicular traffic jams recently endured here in the city of New York.

The President has requested legislative action on a wide variety of subjects, and many of them will have to be handled by the Judiciary Committee. The scope of the work that is being assigned to the Judiciary Committee, in fields other than antitrust, as a result of the legislation that has been requested by the President, is extensive. We have, for example, the following subjects, most of which are complex and controversial:

In civil rights, there will be measures in three fields to implement past legislative gains. The President has requested action with respect to the sale and rental of housing, protection to civil rights workers by means of criminal sanctions, and steps to assure responsibility in jury action.

Four-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives.

Reexamination of judicial districts and creation of additional judgeships.

Reformation of the electoral college.

Regulation of the traffic in narcotics, and the rehabilitation of drug addicts.

Bail procedure revision.

Reinforcement of the programs that deal with organized crime.

Reformation of our election laws to eliminate corrupt practices and to put campaign financing limitations on a realistic basis.

The foregoing is only that part of the President's program that will be handled by the Judiciary Committee; other committees have similar burdens. As you can see, bills dealing with antitrust subjects necessarily will have to be fitted into the schedule with these other legislative objectives.

In the antitrust field, the year 1966 is bringing into focus divergent forces that shape the relationship of government to business. The antitrust legislation that is now proposed reflects the development and transitions that have occurred in the U.S. economy since the enactment of the basic antitrust statutes, the Sherman Act in 1890 and the Clayton Act in 1914. During this 75-year period, the American economy has made the transition from a basically agricultural economy, in which markets were determined in accordance with a more nearly classical model. There were many independent units, no one of which with sufficient power to disturb by its own action the processes by which prices and sales were made. Now, it is a characteristic of nearly all of the major industries that a few very large organizations dominate the business, and give guidance and support to the varying numbers of much smaller corporations that operate in the same market.

In other words, during this period our economy has changed from an agricultural base to an industrial base, and our industrial organization has gone from diversity to one of concentrated powers.

Antitrust legislation and antitrust enforcement problems in 1966 reflect these changes and are responsive to this transition that has occurred in American business. Some of the bills that are being propposed treat affirmatively with antitrust policy in the traditional mold. These are bills designed primarily to give effect to and to encourage competition among roughly equal industrial units, no one of which has an overwhelming advantage over its competitors. The premerger notification bill, and the Interlocks in Corporate Management Act that I have introduced fit this category of affirmative traditional antitrust legislation.

On the other hand, and supplementing this traditional approach, there are other legislative proposals that stem from the recognition that the problems that have developed as a result of industrial concentration cannot be resolved completely within our traditional antitrust framework. Insofar as these bills do not rely primarily on the creation of conditions where the forces of competition are able to provide automatic solutions, these bills are negative in character to traditional antitrust policy. In varying degrees, they seek to erect administrative or governmental restraints in the marketplace, and they are designed to provide an operational curb to the powers exercised by dominant firms in concentrated industries. Greater recognition is given to the fact that direct governmental intervention sometimes is necessary to support and maintain the economy, and less reliance is placed on automatic application of competitive forces. My price notice bill is an example of this type of antitrust legislation in 1966. Other examples include the truth-in-packaging and the truth-in-lending bills.

PREMERGER NOTIFICATION

As a result of the ruling of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in the Union Oil Company case.[1] I have reintroduced the Premerger Notification Bill, H.R. 7780. In the *Union Oil* case, the court ruled that a civil investigative demand issued by the Attorney General under the Civil Process Act, which we enacted in 1962, may not be used to investigative a proposed merger of acquisition that may be in violation of the Celler-Kefauver Act. The ninth circuit affirmed the district court ruling that the civil investigative demand may not be used to investigate prospective violations, as distinguished from existing violations. As a result of this ruling, the Department of Justice is relegated to the investigative tools that it possessed before enactment of the Civil Process Act.

You will recall that in the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses I had sponsored premerger notification bills. These bills in general would require corporations that are proposing to merge to give advance notice of their plans to the Attorney General and to the Federal Trade Commission and to wait for a period of 60 days before consummating the transaction. Premerger notice had been requested by the enforcement agencies for many years. They need a tool which enables them to take action that is necessary to prevent completion of the merger before its legality is determined. For antimerger law, as amended, by the Celler-Kefauver Act, to be effective, it is necessary to avoid the problems that are involved in unscrambling the eggs.

My efforts to secure enactment of a premerger notice bill were suspended, however, when the Antitrust Civil Process Act, with its civil investigative demand, was enacted. In accordance with the recommendation of the Department of Justice, the civil investigative demand, to some extent, was to take the place of premerger notice.

The Judiciary Committee's report (H. Rept. No. 1386, 87th Cong., 1st sess.) noted that the Antitrust Civil Process Act somewhat reduced the need for a premerger notification law. In this regard, the Judiciary Committee report stated:

"During this period the Department of Justice had urged premerger notification legislation. Bills to enact such legislation have been pending in several Congresses. A comprehensive civil investigative demand statute would serve some of the purposes of, and hence might obviate the need for, premerger notification legislation."

Notwithstanding the increased enforcement effort that has followed enactment of the Celler-Kefauver Act, as well as the number of affirmative and favorable decisions by the Supreme Court that interprets its terms, it is clear that the merger movement that commenced after World War II has not perceptibly abated. The Federal Trade Commission reports the following number of mergers in the decade 1955–64:

1955–59	5, 811
1960	1, 345
1961	1, 724
1962	1, 667
1963	1, 479
1964	1, 797

It is my understanding that, in 1965, the total number of mergers amounted to 1,895.

Such a flood of business consolidations necessarily contributes to the increasing concentration in American industry. In addition to the information collected in the House Antitrust Subcommittee's early investigations into steel, aluminum, and other industries, this trend toward concentration has been documented in this Congress by the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly investigations entitled "Economic Concentration."

In the light of this continuing flood of mergers, antitrust enforcement agencies need the additional tools that are provided by the premerger notice bill. At the present time, the enforcement agencies in order to find out about a merger are relegated to screening newspapers and trade publications. While many mergers are reported in these sources, it is equally true that many mergers of consequence are not reported in any of the leading financial manuals and journals, and a considerable number are never reported in any source. Representatives of the Federal Trade Commission last year testified, with respect to the Commission's ability to discover mergers, as follows:[2]

"Again I would like to emphasize that in a good many cases the Federal Trade Commission in the course of investigations of particular acquisitions discovers that companies have made additional acquisitions which had never come to our attention from any other source."

My premerger notification bill will correct this situation. The bill, perhaps more important, also affords the enforcement agencies a reasonable period of time to study the competitive implications of a proposed merger to determine whether to seek a preliminary injunction to restrain its consummation pending adjudication of its legality. This will help solve the practical problems involved in the unscrambling of corporate eggs in mergers that have been entered into in violation of the Celler-Kefauver Act.

CORPORATE MANAGEMENT INTERLOCKS ACT

On March 12, 1965, after an extensive investigation during the 88th Congress, the House Antitrust Subcommittee published a 270-page staff report, entitled "Interlocks in Corporate Management." This staff report is a comprehensive work on the problems involved in this part of the antitrust law. It contains a thorough study of all Federal legislation relating to corporate management interlocks since enactment of the Clayton Act in 1914. It also contains a complete analysis of the cases that have arisen under each of these statutes. Finally, the staff study contains a vast quantity of detailed information on the current structure of interlocking relationships among a representative sample of 74 major U.S. corporations.

My bill, H.R. 11572, the Corporate Management Interlocks Act, follows the bill that was suggested in the staff report as an appropriate basis for further study and hearings. The bill eliminates, from an analytical and academic viewpoint, all known loopholes that have been disclosed in the various statutes prohibiting interlocking corporate managements.

The bill in turn follows the policy of the Clayton Act, and the other ancillary statutes, in its basic opposition to interlocking corporate managements. In its report, the subcommittee staff found that there is a scarcity of evidence that shows how current corporate management interlocks affect specific business transactions. The practical effects that the provisions of the bill will have necessarily must be determined from information to be made available at hearings. The bill, as it now stands, serves as a basis for further consideration, so that the results that reasonably may be anticipated from specific amendments to existing law may be thoroughly probed.

In its report, the staff found that the statutory prohibitions seeking to prevent interlocks in corporate management have been singularly ineffective. In this connection the report states:

---

[1] *United States* v. *Union Oil Company of California*, 343 F. 2d 29 (1965).

[2] Testimony of Dr. Willard F. Mueller, Director, Bureau of Economics, Federal Trade Commission, hearings on Economic Concentration, before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, on Mar. 16, 1965, p. 504, 89th Cong., 1st sess.

"Notwithstanding the assertions that the Clayton Act, in its interlocking directorate provisions, embodies the legislation that had been requested by the President, it has proved to be too restricted in scope to be effective. Section 8, in its coverage of industrial and commercial companies, is restricted to directors and, hence, fails to include all those members of management whose interlocks would have the same effects as those of directors. The provisions relative to banks apply only to horizontal interlocks and do not prohibit ties with the corporations that do business with banks. Industrial and commercial corporations are not prohibited to have indirect rather than direct links, nor are they prohibited from interlocking with suppliers or customers who are not competitors.

"In any event, limitations on the scope of its prohibitions, and the easy avoidance of section 8's express restrictions has resulted in a failure of enforcement even as to those interlocks where there is a practical certainty that competition is adversely affected."

In addition to the failure of the Clayton Act provisions to achieve their purpose, the staff found that the ancillary legislation that has been developed in the various regulatory statutes also has been ineffective. In this connection the staff report stated:

"The ancillary legislation and the implementing regulations that have been developed to reinforce the Clayton Act's interlocking directorate prohibitions are as much a patchwork as sections 8 and 10 of the Clayton Act itself. From industry to industry and from agency to agency the types of interlocking relationships sought to be controlled, the persons subject to the laws' prohibitions, the tests to be applied for an administrative approval, the penalties imposed on violators, and the administrative philosphies are discrepant as frequently as similar.

* * * * *

"The regulatory bodies whose enabling statutes authorized enforcement of prohibitions against interlocks, tended to slump into a pattern where approval generally was granted to industry applications for other prohibited interlocks. Over the years the tendency for a regulatory body to become identified with the industry problems in which it is immersed has manifested itself, insofar as the problem of interlocking managements are concerned, in sympathy for the industry viewpoint. In relation to the multitude of other problems that the regulatory bodies daily confront, the problems of interlocks in corporate management apparently have not been considered to be of major significance."

H.R. 11572 would amend the present section 8 of the Clayton Act by inserting a completely new section. The new section would make interlocking corporate managements, of the type set forth, unlawful unless the Attorney General has granted approval upon a due showing that, in consideration of all relevant factors, the interlock accords to the maximum extent practicable with the objectives of the antitrust laws. This provision gives the Attorney General a considerable degree of flexibility in approving situations that may be appropriate in the light of current industry conditions.

Unless the Attorney General has granted his approval, the bill provides that the same individual may not serve as a director, as an officer, or as an employee with management functions of two corporations that (a) are actual or potential competitors, or (b) there is the relationship of an actual or potential customer, supplier, or source of credit or capital, or (c) where principal business in purpose or in fact is the holding of stock in, or control of, stock in another company. These proscriptions apply to the persons involved, to the corporations, as well as to representatives or nominees of the persons involved.

The bill applies to corporations that have capital, surplus, and undivided profits of $1 million or more. One of the companies must be engaged in commerce.

Interlocking relationships between parents and subsidiaries, where the parent owns 50 percent or more of the voting stock, are exempted.

By its terms the act would become effective 24 months after enactment. It would supersede all inconsistent provisions, but would not repeal any other provisions, of all other Federal laws that deal with interlocking managements. In the insurance business, for example, the bill would take precedence over the provisions of the McCarran-Ferguson Insurance Moratorium Act.

I invite your attention to this bill and solicit your comments. I have hoped that introduction of the bill would stimulate further discussion.

PRICE NOTICE

The third bill I wish to discuss is the price notice bill, H.R. 11870. This bill is an example of the type of legislation that provides a framework for the increase of Government participation in business decisions that has come about to supplement the free play of competitive forces that is envisaged in traditional antitrust law policy. A bill of this type has become appropriate and necessary because, as a result of the high level of concentration in American industry, in certain basic industries the pricing action of one firm is sufficient to distort the market and to cause reverberations throughout the entire economy. In other words, this is an aspect of the perennial problem of how the antitrust laws can be adapted to cope with the forces present in oligopolistic markets. Since World War II, the Congress has repeatedly been confronted with the necessity to devise methods that can deal with the problems presented by oligopoly in American business.

It is clear that an additional, or a new, force in the marketplace is required to assure the well-being of all of the people is not endangered by the business decisions of a few. Industrial concentration has created a condition where the forces of competition alone do not seem to be sufficient. We must proceed cautiously, however, and be careful not to go too far. We need a way to supplement competitive forces, not replace them. Elimination of the automatic guidelines afforded by competition would require direct Government intervention and control. In manufacturing industries, this cure may be almost as bad as the disease. Certainly our experience in direct governmental controls in World War II demonstrates that such Government intervention creates a host of problems, and their solution is not readily apparent.

The fact that four times in the last 3 years, the President of the United States has had to take extraordinary action to combat proposed price increases in basic industries underscores the problem, and demonstrates the need for some new legislative tool. My bill, H.R. 11870, is a modest effort to provide such a tool.

In 1962, the steel industry proposed a price rise, in the face of and notwithstanding the concern of the President's economic advisers that excessive inflationary pressures necessarily would result. In 1965 the aluminum and copper industries similarly tried to increase prices in an inflationary manner. In 1966, elements of the steel industry wanted a price hike in structural steel, which, according to the President's economic advisers, would have been inflationary and injurious to the economy. In each instance the President had his busy schedule abruptly disorganized, and had to resort to vigorous action to safeguard the interests of all of the people.

Such confrontations between the President and industry are undesirable, destructive, and are incompatible with orderly Government-business relationships.

The bill that I have introduced will accomplish the following:

In addition to the steel industry, the aluminum industry, the petroleum refining industry, the copper industry, and the automobile industry, the bill would provide a method to identify basic industries in which the private pricing action of one firm is of nationwide concern and is contrary to the interests of the public to avoid inflation. One standard relates total industry sales to the gross national product. Information needed to establish the precise percentage relationship on an informed basis will be secured in hearings on the bill.

A 60-day waiting period, prior to the effectiveness of such a price increase, is provided. During this time the forces of both sides can take the matter to the public, and explore likely results of the proposed price increase. During the waiting period, if appropriate to the circumstances, hearings could be held by interested congressional committees.

Panic buying of articles affected by proposed price increases would be avoided. After the completion of the waiting period, the price increase would be retroactive to the date of announcement.

Maximum freedom from direct Government interference in the private sectors of the economy is retained. The Government would not establish mandatory price ceilings or direct price controls. If the Government is unsuccessful in its efforts to cause a recision, the proposed price increase would be effective at the end of the waiting period.

Administrative problems that attend direct Government regulation, and expenditures that would be involved in the establishment of a new Government agency, are avoided.

In conclusion, I woud point out that as is usually the case, there are a number of additional antitrust and antitrust related bills that have been introduced and are waiting for action. There are bills dealing with price discrimination problems, territorial franchise problems, dual distribution and organized professional team sports.

It is always a pleasure to meet with a congenial group to discuss highly technical matters of mutual interest. The assistance derived from the interplay of viewpoints in a professional organization with the stature of antitrust law section is invaluable. I look forward to your comments on this legislation.

Miss America Visits Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of my colleagues to a visitor in our Nation's Capital. Miss Debbie Bryant, Miss America of 1966, is visiting Washington, D.C., for the first time since she began her reign in September of last year. Since her selection, Miss Bryant has traveled over 60,000 miles in the United States—meeting new people and making new friends.

Debbie has recently been in her home State of Kansas making plans to begin her junior year at the University of Kansas where she will do premedical work in chemistry. She was honored at Kansas Day festivities in Topeka last Saturday, where she was named Kansan of the Year.

As she traveled throughout the country, Debbie has made a name for herself not only for her poise and beauty but also as an outstanding example of the best in American youth.

It is my pleasure to offer a sincere welcome to such a fine young woman.

Representative Tenzer Rebuts "Dear Colleague" Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague JIM MARTIN, of Alabama, circulated a "Dear Colleague" letter dated January 26, 1966, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1966, at page 993. In his letter he refers to the "bill of particulars" inserted in the RECORD of January 20, 1966, by another colleague, JOHN BUCHANAN of Alabama which appears beginning at page 811.

Mr. Speaker, to clarify the subject raised by our colleagues JIM MARTIN, and JOHN BUCHANAN, of Alabama, I call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appears in the Birmingham News of January 23, 1966 which follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Jan. 23, 1966]

REASON FOR FEDERALS: DIDN'T REGISTER ENOUGH VOTERS, KATZENBACH SAYS

(By James Free)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—Street demonstrations in Birmingham had no influence on the Justice Department decision to send Federal voting examiners to Birmingham and Jefferson County, according to the man who made that decision.

He is Nicholas Katzenbach, Attorney General of the United States.

"It ought to be plain from the record," Katzenbach said in an interview. "Neither the presence of the recent street demonstrations nor the absence of demonstrations earlier played any part in the decision. The issue was availability of the chance to register. There simply was not enough availability or access to the registrars—considering the large numbers of both Negroes and whites of voting age who are not registered voters."

Justice Department officials explained the lack of access this way. Jefferson County, they said, did little or nothing to expand registration opportunities for Negroes after the Voting Rights Act went into effect last August, when only 26,255 of the county's estimated 116,160 Negroes of voting age were registered voters.

Less than 4,000 Negroes were registered in December and the rate so far in January has been about 2,000 a week. More than 74,000 Negroes and over 100,000 whites of voting age are still unregistered in the county, the department estimated.

Only 10 more weeks of registration by local boards will be offered, since the lists close 2 weeks before the State Democratic primary on May 3. At the present 2,000 a week rate, only 20,000 of the remaining 74,000 voting age Negroes would be put on the rolls before the election.

The Department considered this access to registration to be inadequate, especially in view of its reports indicating that Jefferson County registrars had for some years deliberately tried to slow down registration of Negroes.

On several occasions, in writing and verbally, high Justice Department officials had suggested that night registration and neighborhood registration be offered in Jefferson County. And when more than 800 Negroes were registered in Birmingham on Saturday, January 15, the Department figures that this definitely proved that large numbers of Negroes could not get to the courthouse during regular business hours. From this, they concluded that night registration would go a long way toward solving the problem.

A department spokesman said the Jefferson County board never responded to the several proposals for night registration. In fact, the board's latest letter to the Justice Department did not even mention the proposal, according to an official here.

In weighing the significance of this, the Department took into account reports in its files showing that Jefferson County had offered night registration in October 1964, during drives conducted mainly by white civic organizations.

"We held off sending in the Federal examiners as long as we could," explained a Department spokesman. "The 15 additional clerks for registration helped out for those who could come in during the day. And Saturday registration helped out for those who could not come in during the week. And night registration opportunity, it seemed to us, became a must, if there was to be a full compliance effort. But the county board's attitude was that it had gone as far as it intended to go."

Civil rights groups kept reminding the Department that Fulton County, Ga. (Atlanta), with roughly the same number of Negroes as Jefferson County, has 62,000 Negro voters to Jefferson's present registration of 41,930 Negroes; that New Orleans, with only a few thousand more than Birmingham in Negro population, has some 50,000 Negro voters.

But, more to the point, neither Atlanta nor New Orleans has an election coming up soon, and Birmingham does.

There were, of course, political and public opinion pressures on officials at both ends, in Birmingham as well as in Washington. At times these officials appeared to understand the other fellow's problems, at other times they didn't seem to be talking the same language.

Communications at the official level between Alabama and Washington, D.C., are better than they were a year or two ago. But there still seems to be plenty of room for improvement.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days later the Birmingham News in an editorial explains why the conclusions reached by our colleagues, JIM MARTIN and JOHN BUCHANAN, do not appear to be in harmony with the facts. The editorial in the Birmingham News of January 25, 1966, follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Jan. 25, 1966]

"WHO'S QUALIFIED" IS NO ISSUE

Fears have been expressed by some that Federal voting examiners who began operating in Jefferson County yesterday will register numbers of persons who otherwise would not be qualified to vote.

Such feeling appears to result mostly from misunderstanding of the examiners' procedures and of the qualifications which must be met before an applicant will be certified by the Federal officials as a qualified voter.

A check at both offices shows that a prospective voter must meet basically the same requirements whether he applies to county registrars or Federal examiners.

Part II of the "Application for Registration, Questionnaire and Oaths" form used by county registrars in Alabama—the section of the State voter registration form dealing with personal information about the applicant—contains some 40 questions.

CSC Form 805-A, "Application To Be Listed Under the Voting Rights Act of 1965," the form used by Federal examiners, contains only 11 questions.

But there is no reason to assume that the shorter Federal form opens the door to registration of people who could not qualify to vote if they applied to county registrars.

The Federal form requires an applicant under oath to state length of residency in the State and at his present address, and to declare whether he is a citizen of the United States, whether he has ever been convicted of a crime other than a traffic violation, and whether he has ever been declared legally insane by a court.

The Federal examiners disqualify prospective voters on the same grounds as county registrars—age, residency, citizenship, insanity, or conviction of a disqualifying crime. The Federal officials use the same Alabama list of disqualifying crimes used by county registrars.

The Federal examiners do not actually register an applicant. That responsibility still rests with the county board of registrars, who are furnished a list of names of individuals who have been issued Federal certificates of eligibility (CSC form 807).

Upon receipt of the list, the county registrars have 10 days to challenge any name on it—if, for example, investigation shows that the individual does have a criminal record which would disqualify him. (Such an individual also would be subject to Federal penalty if he had given false information to the examiners.)

Timothy Mullis of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, coordinator of Federal examiners in this region, said that if such a disqualification can be established even after the 10-day challenge period expires, the name can and will be removed administratively from the list of those certified to be eligible to vote.

The Federal examiners do not require an applicant to establish literacy or to state his educational level. The Jefferson County Board of Registrars has not been administering literacy tests to applicants since passage of the Voting Rights Act in August 1965, which forbids such tests in States which are affected.

Most of the challenges of those certified by Federal examiners in Montgomery County, where they have been working for some time, have been based on alleged illiteracy, according to Mullis. He said that such challenges have been summarily denied (that is, no hearing is scheduled as is provided for because the Voting Rights Act does not recognize literacy tests, challenges on such basis as criminal record, etc.). An appeal will be heard by a Federal appellate court in Jacksonville, Fla., next month, he said.

Jefferson County Board of Registrars Chairman W. M. Gwin's only criticism of the form being used by the Federal officials was that it required only that an applicant state his age rather than list his precise date of birth. Gwin said the birth date is needed to establish eligibility to vote (at 21) and exemption from poll tax payment (at 45).

Mr. Mullis said that although the form only requires the listing of age, the Federal examiners in practice are now including date of birth.

Gwin indicated that as long as the Federal examiners are furnishing that item of information on those they certify, he sees "no reason why we can't get along."

Gwin said that it might be necessary to put on additional clerical help to check for possible criminal records of voter applicants. Heavy registration by the county board in recent weeks already had caused a backlog he said, and the number will be increased now by those examined by Federal officials.

But there appears to be no basic conflict between the two offices over who qualifies to vote and who doesn't.—James E. Jacobson.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to our colleagues Jim Martin, and John Buchanan, of Alabama a reading of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and some of the testimony given at the hearings before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

Birmingham Area Chamber of Commerce Protests Attorney General's Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 20, from the well of this House, I made a report on the excellent work of the Jefferson County Board of Registrars in attempting to facilitate the registration of all persons in Jefferson County who had a minimal interest in registering and voting.

On that same day we received word that Attorney General Katzenbach had decided to send Federal registrars into our county. Typical of the reaction of the leadership of our city to this regrettable decision is the letter from Mr. Walter Bouldin, president of the Birmingham Area Chamber of Commerce, and Mr. Crawford Johnson III, chairman of the board, written at the direction of the board of directors of this body.

As a member of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, I endorse this excellent statement and am confident that it expresses the feeling of the entire membership and the overwhelming majority of the citizens of Birmingham:

Birmingham Area Chamber of
Commerce, Inc.,
Birmingham, Ala., January 28, 1966.

Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

Dear General Katzenbach: As representatives of the major portion of the business and professional community of the Birmingham area, we have been instructed by our board of directors to convey to you our deeply felt protest against your action in sending Federal examiners to the Birmingham area under the Voting Rights Act.

Under that act, your action required you to find that you have received complaints you believed meritorious that persons had been denied the right to vote on account of their race or color, or to find the appointment of examiners otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment.

There is no merit in any complaint that persons are being denied the right to vote on account of their race or color in the Birmingham area, as the Jefferson County Board of Registrars had, long before the appointment of Federal examiners, been registering applicants, white and Negro, freely and promptly without impeding registration by any test or device. There has been, so far as we are able to ascertain, no substantial claim that any registrant was discriminated against in that process.

Your decision as to Federal examiners must, therefore, have been based upon a finding that the appointment of examiners was otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment. In making that finding, the act required that you consider what bona fide efforts were being made in the Birmingham area to comply with the 15th amendment. There can be no doubt that such bona fide efforts have been made.

The Jefferson County Board of Registrars has, since January 1 of this year, more than tripled the number of registration clerks, including the addition of Negro clerks. They have extended their registration days from 3 days per week to 5 days per week, one of which is all day Saturday. The capacity of the facilities of the board of registrars to register voters has been far greater than required by the number of applicants for registration. Even on the Saturday preceding your action, applicants for registration were fewer than could have been registered by the board. Those truly desirous of registering have had ample opportunity to do so.

We cannot escape the conclusion that the only basis for appointment of Federal examiners was to make registration more convenient. Considering the gravity of sending Federal examiners to take over a function of a State, a function which is guaranteed to that State by the Constitution of the United States; considering that this action, in addition to affecting the integrity of constitutional government with all the harmful consequences inherent in such an action, was an encouragement of demonstrations such as those which preceded your action, demonstrations which invloved so many unlawful acts that injunctions against them have been issued by the Federal court of this district, the mere increase in the convenience of voter registration is, in our judgment, a basis so inadequate for your action as to justify our protest and to require your reconsideration.

Sincerely,

Walter Bouldin,
President.
Crawford Johnson III,
Chairman of the Board.

Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, if there is one task which this session of the 89th Congress must undertake this year, it is the job of reappraising last year's work. It behooves each Member to deliberate carefully on the programs of the first session and to examine some of the inequities of its legislative products.

I have received a letter from Hal Chase, Jr., which documents very clearly many of these inequities. It compares the Government's traditional allowance of $600 per child from total personal income to the Government's own costs of aiding people under the programs of the Great Society. Under unanimous consent, I include the letter in the Appendix of the Record.

Hal Chase & Sons,
Batesland, S. Dak., November 11, 1965.

As you are one of our lawmakers and also a vital cog in our Government I would like to ask you how much you figure it costs to rear a child?

You allow us taxpaying parents only $600 a year to feed, clothe, house, and train a youngster.

Yet to feed, clothe, house, and train a youngster in your Federal Government Job Corps you spend $4,536 per year.

You allow taxpaying parents $600 deduction for the care and feeding of each child. Yet under the Cuban refugee program, you assume minimal upkeep requires $1,200 a year, and if the Cuban boy or girl is attending school, an extra $1,000 a year. How come you shortchange us homefolks?

In the austere environs of a Federal prison, you have discovered that it costs—to maintain one person—with no frills, no luxuries, and no borrowing dad's car—$2,300 per year.

Under social security, you will pay $168 a month to maintain the elderly. What makes you think we can maintain our young'uns on $50 a month?

And the VISTA program (Volunteers in Service to America) spent $3.1 million this last fiscal year to turn out only 202 trainees. That indicates that the cost of maintaining and training one youth for 1 year is more than $15,000.

Or how much do you spend upkeeping one youngster in military uniform? I'll tell you in case you don't have the figures handy, housing, $55.20 a month; food, $30.27 a month; clothing upkeep, $4.20 a month, that comes to $1,076.04 a year. How in the world do you expect parents to provide all these things, plus clothes, recreation, books, medicine, for $600 a year? With the above figures you will have to admit the Government admits it can't be done.

Yours truly,

Hal Chase, Jr.

Students Aid VC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, according to press reports, certain individuals who call themselves the Medical Aid Committee for Vietnam have sent a check for $500 to a representative of the Vietcong.

According to preliminary information I have received the law does not prohibit this action and if further research does not disclose any provision of statute under which such individuals can be prosecuted, it is my intention to introduce a bill to provide criminal penalties for such action.

Included at the conclusion of my remarks is a news item published in the Washington News on January 25, 1966:

Students Aid VC

Berkeley, Calif., January 25.—The Medical Aid Committee for Vietnam announced yesterday it had sent a check for $500 to a representative of the Vietcong in Prague, Czechoslovakia, "for medical supplies for the victims of U.S. aggression in Vietnam."

The committee stirred up a controversy on the University of California campus in November when it began soliciting blood donations for "all victims" of the Vietnam war.

When the International Red Cross said it could not deliver blood to North Vietnam, the organization raised medical funds.

Army Doctors in Hawaii Make Notable Advance in Malaria Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker there are few news stories that can surpass the excitement evoked by reading an article on a breakthrough in the treatment of a disease. Such a breakthrough was reported in the treatment of the dreaded malaria on Tuesday, January 18, 1966. The news is especially timely since an estimated 1 out of 3 GI's in Vietnam has been contracting this dreaded disease. There is no question about the morale boosting effect the news of this breakthrough has had on our troops in Vietnam.

The heroes who discovered the combination of drugs that could break the relapse cycle of the recurring type of malaria are Col. Frank L. Miller and Col. James A. Orbison, medical officers who are assigned to U.S. Army, Tripler General Hospital in Hawaii. They have by their tireless efforts to discover this "wonder mix," proven again that the war can be fought just as heroically in the laboratories on the homefront as in the swamps of Vietnam.

I commend to the readers of the Congressional Record the article written by Lyle Nelson on the breakthrough in the treatment of malaria which appeared in the Thursday, January 20, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

Two at Tripler Hailed for Breakthrough in Malaria Fight

(By Lyle Nelson)

Back in the days of World War II, GI's took so many atabrin pills to avoid malaria they turned yellow.

And if they threw the pills away they often came down with malaria, which causes chills, a fever, a headache, and a rotten feeling in general.

Then came the Vietnam war and a tougher strain of malaria popped up. It resisted the medicine that seemed to work at Guadalcanal and other tropical battlegrounds.

Now this type of malaria appears to be licked, thanks to the men at Tripler Hospital.

Finding a cure for anything in the field of medicine is part luck and part attention to the smallest detail in analyzing research and laboratory data.

CREDIT TWO COLONELS

Special credit at Tripler for finding a possible way to solve the malaria problem in Vietnam goes to Col. Frank L. Miller, chief of pulmonary and infectious diseases, and the man he works for and with, Col. James A. Orbison, chief of the department of medicine at Tripler.

Malaria has become a big problem in Vietnam. In some areas 1 out of 3 GI's got the bug.

Tripler took in 285 victims last year.

Miller started watching how often they suffered relapses and what drugs or combination of drugs they were taking, in Vietnam and after they arrived at Tripler.

He discovered that malaria attacks reoccurred among men who had taken different combinations of drugs with one exception.

WONDER MIX

The wonder mix appeared to be pyrimethamine (a sulfone) and quinine.

Miller and Orbison found they could break this relapse cycle with this combination.

Hints of this finding came from similar malaria research being conducted among volunteer prisoners at the Illinois State Prison in Joliet.

The word on pyrimethamine and quinine is now being passed along to hospitals between Washington and Saigon.

Army officials in the Pentagon discussed the breakthrough Tuesday.

Miller and Orbison will discuss the matter before Honolulu's civilian doctors at the regular meeting of the American College of Physicians at the Mabel L. Smyth Auditorium February 23.

THE CAUSE

Malaria is caused by a parasite which works its way into the red blood cells after a victim is bitten by a mosquito bearing the disease.

Victims are treated in two ways.

First, doctors administer drugs that will help prevent malaria "bugs" from growing and developing.

In cases, like those at Tripler, where it is too late to do this, they try to break the relapse cycle.

It is in this cycle, between the active and dormant stages, that they achieved what appears to be a cure.

Not only will the finding be good news for servicemen in tropical areas but for discharged Vietnam veterans who are having relapses of malaria.

One such case in Colorado recently proved fatal. He apparently was no longer taking pills.

It's almost a case of better yellow than dead.

Challenge to the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun Times carried an excellent editorial in its February 2 edition dealing with our efforts to bring the whole Vietnam issue before the United Nations. I fully agree with the Sun Times editorial that the United States has handed the United Nations a problem that will be harder to solve than any that body has undertaken in the past. But I also agree that if the U.N. can indeed resolve the Vietnam conflict, it will attain a new scope of respect and dignity not only in the United States but throughout the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, the Sun Times editorial follows:

Challenge to the U.N.

The U.S. resolution to the U.N. Security Council on Vietnam was brief and to the point. It recommended that "appropriate interested governments" arrange a conference "looking toward the application of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in southeast Asia." The first order of business of the conference would be to arrange an end to the fighting in Vietnam.

If the Security Council does take on the task its members will undoubtedly discover—and hopefully appreciate—some of the difficulties the United States has struggled with in its efforts to stop Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

It is doubtful that the U.N. Security Council can come to any solution of the Vietnam conflict without consultation with either Red China or North Vietnam or both. The wording of the U.S. resolution is such that room has been left for the Security Council to invite these nations to the conference. Whether they would accept such an invitation is another matter. Hanoi has refused, in the past, to accept a similar invitation made by the U.N. on the grounds that it did not recognize that international body.

The United States has handed the U.N. a problem that will be harder to solve than any that body has undertaken in the past. If the U.N. does make the effort to solve the crisis in Vietnam and it is rebuffed by the aggressor nations it then faces an even greater problem—a direct and open challenge to every member U.N. nation of the right of the nations of the world to live in peace.

Roscoe Drummond Defends U.S. Decision on Bombing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there are conclusive reasons why the bombing pause in North Vietnam could not be continued indefinitely without some constructive response from Hanoi.

In pinpointing these reasons, no one, it seems to me, has done a better job than Columnist Roscoe Drummond.

In a February 2 column in the Washington Post, entitled "The Lull Ends—The United States Shows Its Mettle," Mr. Drummond stated that the decision will effectively unify the country behind the President. "It was a painful decision," he wrote. One reason for its necessity, he said, was the fact that "Ho Chi Minh confirmed publicly that he would not negotiate until after unconditional surrender by South Vietnam and removal of all U.S. forces."

A second reason, he said, was because "North Vietnam used the bombing pause of 37 days to increase the flow of North Vietnamese troops across the border" into South Vietnam. "Obviously," Mr. Drummond adds, "the diplomatic reasons for continuing the pause were exhausted."

While believing that to resume the bombing was not a "welcome or agreeable choice," he stated that the alternative "of yielding South Vietnam and southeast Asia to the aggressor—would be far worse for the United States and the whole free world."

The column is one which many of my colleagues will want to ponder and I include it in the Appendix of the Record:

The Lull Ends—The United States Shows Its Mettle

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The instant results of President Johnson's resumption of bombing North Vietnam—because Hanoi rejected all U.S. and all other efforts, to negotiate—will be these:

It will effectively unify the Congress behind whatever is needed to defend South Vietnam.

It will effectively unify the country behind the hard decisions the President will have to make in the near future.

It will mean that the United States will increase its military actions at every level in order to remove Hanoi's belief it can win because we will become hopelessly divided, grow weary, and don't really mean to stick it out.

It will leave open the door to peace talks anytime Hanoi so chooses—as the action in taking the issue to the U.N. Security Council shows.

There are conclusive reasons why the bombing pause could not be continued indefinitely without some constructive response from Hanoi. The decision was never in doubt. It was a painful decision but not a difficult one because it rested on two facts:

The fact that Ho Chi Minh confirmed publicly that he would not negotiate until after unconditional surrender by South Vietnam and removal of all U.S. forces.

The fact that North Vietnam used the bombing pause of 37 days to increase the flow of North Vietnamese troops across the border and to increase the level of Vietcong attacks and terror in South Vietnam to a point greater in number than ever.

Obviously, the diplomatic reasons for continuing the pause were exhausted.

There will of course be some dissident and fear-laden voices in Congress. A democracy is never unanimous. Only 3 months before Pearl Harbor, Congress came within one vote of killing the draft. But now the leading advocates of continuing the bombing pause—Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield and the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, William Fulbright—affirm their support of the President.

And how will the American people respond? Here, too, there will be honest differences which the Communists see, not as a source of a democracy's strength, but as a weakness on which they continue to count. But just before the President announced his decision, Louis Harris sampled public opinion and found that if Hanoi refused to talk peace, the American people would support the resumption of bombing by more than 2 to 1. His survey showed that 60 percent of the country would back a U.S. force of 500,000 troops in South Vietnam.

To have to resume the bombing is not a welcome nor agreeable choice. But the alternative—of yielding South Vietnam and southeast Asia to the aggressor—would be far worse for the United States and the whole free world.

Pittsburgh Youth Corps Fights Despair and Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of young people in my home city of Pittsburgh have found a bright new hope for their futures through their work since last August in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The attention and help given them has paid off not only in turning them away from lives of bleak despair and crime and toward education and profitable endeavor, it has also provided services to the entire city and its population that would not otherwise have been available.

I fervently hope that this program can continue another year in Pittsburgh and in other cities where it is a similar proven success.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a progress report by Pittsburgh Mayor, Joseph M. Barr, at this point in the Record:

Pittsburgh Neighborhood Youth Corps Progress Report

(By Mayor Joseph M. Barr)

Since its inception August 16, 1965, the Neighborhood Youth Corps has been a two-way boon to Pittsburgh. Youngsters, who otherwise may not have been employed, have benefited from new-found work experience and on-the-job training. At the same time, the city and its residents have benefited from new projects and increased services which could not have been done without Youth Corps personnel.

The success of the program is pointed up by the many requests from city departments and Federal agencies for additional Youth Corps workers.

In reporting on the Youth Corps, I would be remiss if I did not commend the program coordinator, Mrs. Marion Finkelhor. The program's success is largely a result of her ability to work with young people and to understand their problems. Under her skillful direction, the City's Youth Corps has gained recognition as one of the best in the Nation.

Youngsters enrolling in the Youth Corps have received the following services:

1. Intensive job and personal counselling.
2. Comprehensive medical examinations by the Allegheny County Health Department.
3. Aptitude testing by the Bureau of Employment Security.
4. Work-training courses in various city departments.
5. Special services by the Bureau of Rehabilitation and medical clinics.
6. Job placement services by the Bureau of Employment Security.
7. Educational assistance through programs by the Pittsburgh Board of Education.

Through the counseling service, youngsters who have not finished high school are encouraged to return to school in the evening and earn their diploma.

We are particularly heartened by the results of this counseling effort so far. Of the 639 youngsters working with the city, more than 125 of them have been persuaded to return to night school to expand their education. This is an encouraging example of what can happen when youngsters receive some attention and help.

Youth Corps workers have also benefited from our initial medical examinations, which disclosed previously undetected medical problems among one-half of the youngsters. The Allegheny County Health Department referred these people to neighborhood clinics for treatment.

Most importantly, the Youth Corps has brought new hope and new opportunity to youngsters whose prospects, until now, were dimmed by economic, social and educational disadvantages.

They are doing useful work that otherwise would not be done and at the same time gaining the experience and dignity of working for a living. For most of them, this is their first job, their first paycheck, and the first time that anyone has paid attention to them and tried to help them.

I want to make it clear that our Youth Corps program was not started to provide permanent employment for any youngster. On the contrary, these youngsters must register with the Bureau of Employment Security for placement in regular jobs in private industry or for placement in manpower retraining programs.

In the meantime, however, Youth Corps boys and girls are carrying out a wide variety of meaningful projects for the city. These projects include the following:

1. Youth Corps boys, working under supervision of the department of lands and buildings, have cleared refuse from more than 30 lots in the Hill District. Their work has enabled the city to earmark some of these lots for eventual improvement as small neighborhood parklets.

2. Youngsters assigned to the department of public works have cleared old growth from hillsides throughout the city, and have cleaned bridge foundations, rain gutters and catch basins wherever this work was needed. A total of 28 boys have worked on the city's asphalt repaving program. All in all, Youth Corps boys have made minor improvements to more than 500 city streets.

3. During the winter months, Youth Corps boys will be at work cleaning the interiors of all city buildings. Some boys will also assist in minor but necessary snow removal work, particularly on bridges and crosswalks.

4. About 60 youngsters are working as aids in recreation centers throughout the city. Boys working with the bureau of parks have undertaken an extensive park-improvement program, including the clearing of walks and trails, a tree maintenance program, and the cleaning of park buildings. Other boys are assigned to duties in the zoo, the Aviary, and Phipps Conservatory.

5. Youngsters assigned to the bureau of traffic planning have been responsible for the painting of more than 200 crosswalks, a 20-percent increase in sign installations, and greater efficiency in the repair of parking meters. Other Youth Corps projects in this bureau have included 71 traffic counts, 56 pedestrian counts, and an intensive traffic study of the Brookline area.

6. Eight youngsters are working on highly skilled jobs in the department of city planning. One boy of potential college caliber has worked closely with the department's architect on drafting and planning.

7. Youngsters with clerical skills are working in various city offices and have helped reduce or eliminate filing backlogs, thereby enabling these offices to operate with greater efficiency.

8. Since the contract with the Federal Government permits assignment of Youth Corps youngsters to Federal offices, about 20 young people are now working with the Bureau of Internal Revenue to help process the seasonal load of income tax returns.

9. Arrangements have been made with the Leech Farm Veterans Hospital for an intensive work-training program for potential hospital personnel. This program will provide opportunities for girls who do not have the necessary skills for clerical work.

To sum up, the city's Neighborhood Youth Corps program has provided hundreds of young adults, whose futures seemed blighted and bleak, with new hope for a chance to hold a job and to further their education.

By taking these youngsters off the streets, we are also reducing the likelihood of their lapsing into the delinquency that idleness can bring.

We are encouraged by the response of these youngsters to the program, and by the tangible results of their work.

I, for one, am convinced that the Neighborhood Youth Corps has proven itself to be a vital link in Pittsburgh's antipoverty effort.

For Bombing Resumption the Need Was Obvious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD FULTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the recent resumption of bombing of North Vietnamese personnel and installations came after a concerted effort over many weeks by President Johnson to seek a means whereby this tragic conflict could be removed from the fields of battle and be pursued at the conference table in the hopes of a peaceful settlement.

It was with great regret that President Johnson ordered the resumption of the bombings. Nonetheless the decision was his to make and it was made, doubtlessly with reluctance and heavy heart.

Mr. Speaker, the President's decision has drawn significant approval. Among those who have joined in approval is the Nashville Banner. The views of this paper were published in an editorial dated February 1, 1966, and entitled "Right, Mr. President: For Bombing Resumption, the Need Was Obvious."

I would like to insert this editorial in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

RIGHT, MR. PRESIDENT—FOR BOMBING RESUMPTION, THE NEED WAS OBVIOUS

It was not an impromptu decision, contrived in the dark and spurred by impulse, that sent U.S. bombers back into action over North Vietnam yesterday—ending in its 38th day the bombing suspension that began on Christmas eve. It was a military necessity; the logical and only effective answer to that enemy's contemptuous disregard of America's sustained effort for peaceful settlement at a conference table.

President Johnson spelled it out clearly in his calm mesage of formal announcement and reasoned explanation. He assuredly has the majority of America with him in that decision; for to the bulk of this constituency it was—and is—obvious that the avenue to peace does not lie in the direction of overtures to Hanoi. These have failed; construed by that enemy as a sign of weakness and indecision.

It now is clear that the Vietcong wants no peace, save on its own terms, amounting to total conquest. That would be U.S. surrender—a repudiation of its commitments, and the turning over, ultimately, of all Asia to Communist aggression.

There was no timidity and indecision in the President's statement. He laid it on the line, exercising again a prerogative given in the congressional resolution of August 1964—and with the action recommended by competent advisers including, notably, the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

With that decision there can be no quarrel on the part of any security-minded American, sensitive to the facts in the case as restated. One paragraph stands out by way of solemn warning:

"If continued immunity is given to all that supports North Vietnam aggression, the cost in lives—Vietnamese lives and American lives and allied lives—will be greatly increased."

That has been true throughout the one-sided 37-day cease-fire; it would be equally true of any settlement that installed a Vietcong Government over that land, to break out afresh across Asia when it had consolidated its strength with that of its Communist partners to push for wider conquest.

The Banner opposed that U.S. commitment from the outset—objecting to an adventure obviously not thought through at the time. But once involved in it, and engaged in the war that followed, this newspaper has emphasized that we must win it. Nothing less than victory will justify the sacrifice that already has been made.

President Johnson was not repudiating the concept of honorable peace—arrived at by any avenue of reason. He went to great length to assure contemporary powers of America's willingness to present the Vietnamese issue to world judgment. He authorized Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to submit it to a review by the U.N. Security Council. He gave respectful acknowledgment to Pope Paul's urgent suggestion for arbitration by neutral powers. As reiterated in the course of his text, top U.S. diplomats have made the rounds of the world in these Christmas and post-Christmas weeks, expressing America's willingness to negotiate.

America wants an honorable peace, with guarantees of freedom as the only objective that can make it that. That is the U.S. purpose; it wants not a square inch of real estate, or captive status for any people on earth.

The whole world knows that, and charges to the contrary are infamous.

The United States suspended those bombings in the hope that—sparing North Vietnam the punishment that was occurring—the enemy would come to the conference table. The hope was in vain.

That is why the bombings have resumed—a foretaste of the power this Nation has to crush that enemy on whom peace overtures have been wasted.

The President has made his decision, and it was the right one. He presented the case with courage and candor; with due respect for the opinions of mankind, but with a primary concern where it belongs, on the interest of the United States. With any failure to meet this challenge, that very default would compound the ultimate sacrifice.

America has the resources to win this war, and must use them to that end.

It is a time-honored maxim, now understood surely by thinking men everywhere, that once you are engaged in war there is no substitute for victory.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (*U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937*).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Mr. Pearson's disclosure contrasted with Resources Minister Laing's recent speeches which were critical of American proposals to divert Canadian water, but did not rule out such arrangements.

The United States should not seek a solution to its water sources by looking "suddenly at Canada as a potential source of unlimited quantities of fresh water which can be tapped at any time," Northern Affairs Minister Laing said in Ketchikan, Alaska, Saturday, the flooding of extensive areas of Canada "in itself, is undesirable."

"Even if some return accrued to Canada from this scheme, it may not be as beneficial to the nation as the establishment of local industries and a local population to use the same water in Canada."

Conservative Leader Diefenbaker said in a speech earlier this week that the Liberals appeared willing to "pull the plug on one of our most vital resources."

However, another Conservative, former agriculture minister Alvin Hamilton came out strongly for water exports in an interview in British Columbia Friday.

Increasing U.S. shortages of water have led the Americans to cast covetous eyes on Canada's immense supplies for some time. But one specific proposal seems to have drawn the most attention.

In Red Deer, Robert Thompson, national social credit leader, said plans to discuss water exports to the United States are out of order at this time.

He said in an interview Canada must first guarantee an ample supply of water for its own needs. An extensive study of demand and resources should come before any talk of exporting water.

The Ralph M. Parsons Co., of Los Angeles and New York, proposes a $100 billion scheme involving collection of water from rivers in British Columbia, the Yukon and Alaska that is now draining into the Pacific and Arctic.

Trapped in giant reservoirs, it would be channelled through a series of lifts, and tunnels into the Rocky Mountain Trench. It would form a 500-mile lake from Prince George to Libby, Mont.

Last August a resolution was introduced in the U.S. Senate calling on President Johnson to urge Canada to join the United States in referring the Parson's plan to the International Joint Commission for a report on its technical and economic feasibility.

[From the Western Producer, Saskatoon, Sask., Oct. 15, 1965]

Major Topic in Campaign: Should Canada Sell Water?

One of the big subjects in the Federal election campaign is the question of Canada's water resources and whether to sell them to the United States as proposed in a hundred-billion-dollar scheme by a private American engineering company.

(Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, perhaps Canada's greatest authority on water resources, recently asked Federal political parties to make their stand known on the subject.)

Prime Minister Pearson on October 15 announced that his Government is planning to discuss with the United States arrangements to export water south of the border.

"This," he said, "can be as important as exporting wheat or oil or anything else—exporting water—and one day we'll find out how important this resource is."

But he added that Canada would have to be "awfully careful" to meet its own water needs before exporting any.

He said the Americans are finding that water is one of their most valuable and becoming one of their scarcest resources. Canada had "lots of water."

"We will be discussing this with the United States who are very anxious to work out arrangements by which some of our water resources are moved down south," he said. "This can be one of the most important developments in our history."

The Prime Minister, in a free-time CBC telecast, did not refer to recent charges by opposition parties that the Government plans to surrender Canada's water resources to the United States.

Conservative Leader Diefenbaker said earlier in the week that the Liberals appear willing to "pull the plug on one of our most vital resources." And he pledged that a Conservative Government would oppose water exports or diversions to the United States.

New Democratic Party speakers have been charging that U.S. interests are threatening to swindle Canada of her water and power resources.

Mr. Pearson's remarks drew fire from Social Credit Leader Robert Thompson. He said the plans to discuss water exports with Washington are "out of order" at this time.

Canada must first guarantee an ample supply of water for its own needs, he said. An extensive study of demand and resources should come before any talk of exporting water.

He added that if Canada had sufficient water to meet her own needs then it would be wrong to refuse to channel some to the United States. But he didn't think anyone can talk about exporting it "until we can guarantee enough for Canada, not just for the next 10 years, but for all years."

General McNaughton, former chairman of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission recently referred to NAWAPA as "a monstrous corporation * * * which would be formed to drain our resources from the Rocky Mountain Trench and distribute the benefits across the continent."

NAWAPA stands for the North American Water and Power Alliance, the brainchild of the Ralph M. Parsons Co. of Los Angeles and New York. The scheme involves collection of water from rivers in British Columbia, the Yukon, and Alaska.

[From the Albertan, Calgary, Alberta, Oct. 18, 1965]

The Election: Water for a Continent

Prime Minister Pearson has announced he plans talks with the United States on the feasibility of carrying out a huge water export program exporting water from northern Canada. Three seems to be disagreement in the Liberal as well as in the Conservative camp about the advisability of such a scheme. Now under study is a gigantic river diversion project which is claimed to supply the dwindling Great Lakes, create a cross-continent navigable waterway and irrigate arid parts of southern United States.

[From Electrical World, Oct. 18, 1965]

Canadian Spokesman Tells Politicians: Don't Give United States Water

A warning not to ship clean Canadian water to the United States was made by Gen. A. L. McNaughton, former chairman of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission.

In a recent address at the Canadian Club of Montreal, McNaughton referred to the recent Heeny-Merchant report, which suggested Canada and the United States work out energy and resource problems behind closed doors. Commenting on it, he said his country should permit technical discussions only after a firm Canadian water policy had been formed, by way of public discussion.

He termed the North American Water and Power Alliance, an organization proposed by a Los Angeles engineering firm, as a "monstrous corporation * * * which would be formed to drain our resources from the Rocky Mountain Trench and distribute the benefits across the continent at a cost of some hundred billion dollars."

The supply of clean water in the United States can be increased, he commented, by a concerted attack on the problem of pollution. "If our friends to the south have a hundred billion dollars to spend on the problem, let them apply it where a permanent solution would result for a fraction of the cost of the extravagant scheme now being touted under the name NAWAPA, which would disposses Canada of her water."

A no-export policy on Canadian water would be no hardship on the United States, he said. "The United States does not need clean Canadian water."

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) News Miner, Oct. 18, 1965]

Minister Hits Power Alliance

KETCHIKAN.—The United States should not seek a solution to its water sources by looking "suddenly at Canada as a potential source of unlimited quantities of fresh water which can be tapped at any time," Northern Affairs Minister Arthur Laing wrote in a speech delivered here Saturday.

Laing was unable to appear in person as scheduled because of travel problems.

Laing said he was referring to the North American Water and Power Alliance, a $100 billion project to provide the western United States with Canadian water.

The huge scheme, brainchild of the Ralph M. Parsons Co. of Los Angeles and New York, involves the collection of water from rivers in British Columbia, the Yukon and Alaska which now drain into the Pacific and Arctic Oceans.

Trapped in giant reservoirs, water would be channeled through a series of lifts and tunnels into the Rocky Mountain Trench. It would form a 500-mile lake from Prince George, B.C., to Libby, Mont.

Laing, who wrote the speech delivered at the meeting of the Alaska State Chamber of Commerce, said the flooding of extensive areas of Canada "in itself, is undesirable."

"Even if some return accrued to Canada from this scheme, it may not be as beneficial to the Nation as the establishment of local industries and a local population to use the same water in Canada.

"We are becoming more and more aware of the potential value of this tremendous resource and it is certainly not our intention to dispose of it without first investigating all alternative uses and assessing which may be of most benefit."

Much of the water shortage problem in the more densely populated parts of North America could be solved by adequate planning and control.

"In particular I am hopeful that the densely populated regions will realize how valuable fresh water can be."

Friday Prime Minister Lester Pearson said in a television broadcast that Canada must be careful "not to alienate this great resource without taking care of our own needs."

Exporting water to the United States "can be one of the most important developments in our history; this can be as important as exporting wheat, or oil, or anything else * * * and one day we'll find out how important this resource is.

"We will be discussing this with the United States who are very anxious to work out arrangements by which some of our water resources are moved down south," Pearson said.

Laing's remarks were contained in a text of his speech released in advance of delivery.

RECESS TO MONDAY NEXT AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock Monday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) under the previous order, the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 7, 1966, at 11 a.m.

Appendix

CIA Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, among the many things that occupied my attention on my recent trip to southeast Asia was the caliber of CIA personnel who briefed me there. Prior to my departure from Washington, I had received detailed briefings from the CIA to give me a better grasp of the problems I would see in the area. The briefings were conducted by men who were obviously expert in their professions. The Agency men in the field to whom I talked were fully knowledgeable on their subject and impressed me as truly very competent representatives of this Government and of their profession.

Officers of U.S. Embassies to whom I spoke and military commanders alike assured me that the work of the CIA in that part of the world was fully integrated into the overall U.S. effort. The Agency is shouldering a full share of the load as a member of the team. I have watched them work for a number of years. It is an Agency which has a tremendous responsibility and I for one certainly wonder at anyone who would by word or written article leave the inference that this Agency was less than living up to their duty and responsibility unless they had sufficient proof to do so.

There have been a number of articles written on the quality and performance of the CIA and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include these articles:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 9, 1966]

CIA MORALE DROPS—CRACK INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONAL QUITS A TOP JOB AND DIRECTOR IS CRITICIZED

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Certain to impair declining morale in the Central Intelligence Agency is the unannounced, unprecedented decision of a topflight professional intelligence man to resign as Deputy Director for Intelligence to take a lesser job.

Ray Cline has privately informed CIA Chief William F. (Red) Raborn that he wants to relinquish the Agency's fourth-highest post and take a field job in Europe. His decision comes as Raborn is under increasing internal CIA criticism for letting morale slip.

Although Cline disclaims unhappiness with Raborn as a factor in his unusual departure, colleagues think otherwise.

More important, the departure of the crack intelligence professional will leave a gaping hole in the Agency at the very time that internal dissatisfaction with Raborn is highest.

The question asked in Washington is this: If Raborn (justly famed as the father of the Polaris missile) can't prevent the flight of a professional like Cline, how can he restore to his Agency the high morale it enjoyed under former Directors Allen Dulles and John McCone?

Another factor lies behind Cline's decision: his intimate ties to McGeorge Bundy, who is quitting as President Johnson's top national security aid effective February 28.

With Bundy as the chief White House link to CIA, he and Cline were in the thick of supersecret operations during the Cuban missile crisis. It was Cline who rushed the first U-2 pictures of Soviet missiles in Cuba to Bundy at the White House in October 1962. Bundy ran them upstairs to President Kennedy.

CIA DEFENDED

I write in answer to Richard Brightson's letter "Without the CIA" (December 23). Having commenced a career as a professional intelligence officer some 30 years ago and served subsequently in ONI, OSS, Battle Force Pacific, and finally more than a decade as an official of the CIA, I feel strongly that Mr. Brightson's attack on the competency of CIA's intelligence analysis and estimative staff must be answered by someone not bemused by the tongue-in-cheek whimsies of James Bond and "Uncle" and who has not only read more than a short serialization of "The Penkovsky Papers," but actually worked with the original material.

As to "suspicious-looking sources" and Mr. Brightson's assumption that the estimators do not have access to the sources:

The information that flows into the analytical and estimative process comes from a wide range of sources—all varieties of published materials and foreign broadcasts (65 foreign languages in daily use), photography, travel reports, items of equipment, etc., and, of course, clandestine agent reports.

The evaluation of these sources and the material supplied is performed by experts, and in the case of agent reports by those case officers who are closest to the agent net in question. All reports are accurately rated as to reliability of the source and as to the credibility of the material. If the need arises, there are not many cases where the intelligence analyst cannot be put directly in touch with the source.

As to the competence of the analyst and estimators—those "individuals without an immediate and intimate working knowledge of the subject matter":

Within the Board of National Estimates and its staff are prepared the periodic and ad hoc estimates which go to the senior policy level in State and Defense, to the National Security Council, and to the President. Many of the men on the Board and its staff date their intelligence experience from the early days of OSS, almost a quarter century ago, others have come to the CIA from the military intelligence services and from the senior level of the academic community. Better than 90 percent have advanced academic degrees in fields of history, political science, or economics, directly pertinent to their work.

About 75 percent have enhanced their area and subject knowledge by residence overseas. In addition, the CIA for years has had in operation a program of sending analysts overseas on familiarization tours to compensate for lack of foreign residence. These all are men of dedication and highest competence, who have individually devoted the major portion of their mature lives to the study of the area or subject with which they now deal.

What new "more legitimate information-gathering operation," as suggested by Mr. Brightson, could possibly acquire such a wealth of talent and how long would it take? Decades certainly.

Finally, perhaps I might suggest to Mr. Brightson (and to others of like thinking) that instead of James Bond, they read with some attenion such authoritative books as Allen Dulles "Craft of Intelligence" and Sherman Kent's "Strategic Intelligence," before recommending abolition of the present order and a possible return to the intelligence chaos of the pre-World War II era.

PHILLIP G. STRONG.

HARTLAND, VT.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Dec. 19, 1965]

REPLY TO CRITICISM OF CIA

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Pity the poor old Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). It is the perennial whipping boy of columnists and Congressmen and of just about every foreign dictator seeking to divert attention from his own crookedness or ineptitude.

As one who knows a bit about CIA (which most of its critics decidedly do not), I get a little sick of seeing it badgered and abused by just about everybody capable of scratching out a sentence or calling a press conference.

Now this may be interpreted as my being in favor of sin (which most people are), but put me on record as saying CIA does a pretty darned good job of protecting not only U.S. security but that of many weaker countries all over the world as well.

True, it makes mistakes. Big ones. But only at about the same rate that the State Department, the Defense Department, the White House or my old agency, the U.S. Information Agency makes booboos.

And you'd be hard pressed to convince me that CIA's ratio of incompetents is any higher than that of the U.S. Senate.

Those who leap to the firing line when they discover it's always open season on CIA seem to ignore one inescapable fact: A good intelligence system has become as crucial to national security as an army, or air force, or an arsenal of powerful weapons.

The foreigners criticizing CIA most (the Russians, President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, etc.) know this and nobody expends more effort than they do trying to perfect their cloak-and-dagger operations.

What we ought not forget is that in many critical situations these last few years, the United States has been able to make the correct decision to guarantee our security because CIA had secured information that our enemies thought we could not possibly possess. The Cuban missiles crisis is an example.

Having said all this, I must concede that CIA is at a critical point in its history. Not only is it scorned the world over, but the standard device for discrediting the Peace Corps, USIA and other American agencies is to link them to the CIA.

During a recent tour of East Africa and southeast Asia, it was made clear to me that suspicion and fear of the CIA has become a sort of Achilles heel of American foreign policy.

This may seem to justify the attacks on CIA in Congress and elsewhere but the truth is just the opposite. The homegrown critics are 100 times more to blame for the wild and irrational foreign fear of CIA than is the Agency itself.

A Ghana official recently was lamenting the fact that the United States denied a food request because Nkrumah published a book attacking CIA and labeling just about every American who ever put foot in Ghana as a CIA spy.

"Are you surprised that Americans would react unfavorably to this kind of attack?" I asked.

"We are surprised that you would direct your anger at us," said the Ghana envoy. "Our President took practically everything he wrote out of American books and other publications."

At a dinner in Lusaka, the Vice President of Zambia began conversation by asking me to give him an appraisal of "The Invisible Government," a book by two of my journalistic colleagues about so-called CIA cloak-and-dagger operations abroad.

I ducked the question by commenting: "I only wish CIA were capable of half the things for which it is blamed or praised."

Several Zambian cabinet members refused to let me duck, however, and I soon found myself caught in a wild discussion with people who believe fervently that CIA is in the business of overthrowing and installing governments all over the world—without the approval or knowledge of the Secretary of State or the President.

I later learned that every top- and middle-level Zambian official had been instructed to read "The Invisible Government," Andrew Tully's book "The CIA," and Morris West's new book, "The Ambassador."

I'm not naive enough to suggest that newsmen and authors stop writing about CIA. Our society is naturally intolerant of secrecy (which any good intelligence operation requires), so the questioning and criticism will go on.

But it would sure help if some of the critics conceded that, whether we like clandestine intelligence operations or not, they are indispensable in this crazy, crooked, bellicose world in which we live.

Cleon Throckmorton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 4, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, there is a saying to the effect that a man can best be judged by his contribution to society—the heritage he leaves to the culture. At the close of the session last year, a great man died and left a record of 30 years of artistic creations to the theater world. This man who contributed so substantially to the theater arts was Cleon Throckmorton, whose nephew is one of my staff members.

His mother, Roberta Cowing, who was for some years an artist with the Department of Agriculture, gave him the spark he needed to go on to the greatness which has been chronicled in theater history. Cleon Throckmorton was born in Absecon, N.J. His early years were spent in Atlantic City and Washington, D.C. After his formal education, he became part of the experimental theater group in the Provincetown Playhouse, where he designed such outstanding sets for DuBose Heyward's, "Porgy," and Eugene O'Neill's, "Emperor Jones." In Hoboken, N.J., Throckmorton and Christopher Morley produced satirical revivals of the early gaslight era—complete with peanuts—and hisses for the villain and cheers for the heroes.

After spending much of this creative life at his studio in Greenwich Village and the Bahamas, he finally came back home to New Jersey some years ago, where he and his wife lived in semiretirement until his death last October. The theater world will sadly mourn the loss of this genius of design, who was known to his friends as Throck. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks and the news stories of his death printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 25, 1965]

CLEON THROCKMORTON, 68, DEAD; DESIGNED O'NEILL STAGE SETTINGS

ATLANTIC CITY, October 24.—Cleon Throckmorton, a stage designer who worked closely with Eugene O'Neill, and played an important role in advancing the art of scenic design, died last night at the Atlantic City Hospital. He was 68 years old and lived in recent years at 33 South North Carolina Avenue.

When "Emperor Jones" opened at New York's Macdougal Street Theater on November 1, 1920, it unveiled the work not only of a major new American playwright, Eugene O'Neill, but also of a new and important stage designer, Cleon Throckmorton.

From that opening until recent years, Mr. Throckmorton was one of a handful of men who dominated stage design in American theater. His designs contributed to the construction of a theater in which stage settings were instrumental, even essential, to the work of interpreting the play.

In the 1920's, Mr. Throckmorton became so busy and so prominent that his name, it was said, appeared on Broadway playbills with a frequency exceeded chiefly by the fire commissioner.

His Greenwich Village studio became a gathering spot for theater celebrities, and Mr. Throckmorton's parties—and his imitation of Queen Victoria—delighted Noel Coward, Normal Bel Geddes and others.

FLOWERING OF HOBOKEN

In the late 1920's and through the depression, Mr. Throckmorton—"Throck" to his friends—joined Christopher Morley in producing revivals of American plays of the gaslight era.

Enacted in Hoboken, N.J., the revivals—especially the musical "The Black Crook,"—attracted the world of society and other celebrities across the Hudson River and led to a brief cultural flowering for Hoboken.

The depression, however, forced Mr. Throckmorton to sell his relics. In 1930, he parted with numerous personal stage properties from his Theater Guild shows and his Arthur Hopkins productions.

As the props were sold, Mr. Throckmorton looked back on a period in the theater that had given rise to because of O'Neill, something of a revolution in the American drama.

"I hate to part with all these props," he said at the time "but they're really not good to eat, and with the depression and all ——" he broke off.

GREW UP IN SOUTH

Over the stairs of his West Third Street studio in New York, hung the crucifix and the image that had hung on the walls of the set for O'Neill's "The Fountain." Nearby was the drum from "Emperor Jones," whose strident notes were heard throughout the drama. There were many other props and memorabilia from the O'Neill dramas.

Mr. Throckmorton was born October 18, 1897, the son of Ernest Upton and Roberta Cowing Throckmorton. He spent much of his early life in the South, and there acquired a knowledge of life and customs that helped him in later years when he designed the sets for such plays as Dorothy and Du Bose Heyward's "Porgy" and O'Neill's "All God's Chillun Got Wings."

As a young man, Mr. Throckmorton studied engineering at the Carnegie Institute of Technology and then continued his studies at George Washington University.

After his graduation from college, however, he met George Cram (Jig) Cook of the Provincetown Players. The young Throckmorton was offered a role in the forthcoming "Emperor Jones," but before he began acting, the Provincetown group changed their minds and asked him to design the sets. Mr. Throckmorton accepted.

During his career Mr. Throckmorton designed the sets for about 600 plays. His scenic designs for "Emperor Jones" were on exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art. And some of his highly acclaimed designs were in the plays "The Hairy Ape," "The Bride of the Lamb," "Burlesque," "Criminal at Large" and "Alien Corn."

Mr. Morley's and Mr. Throckmorton's efforts as the Hoboken Theatrical Company, Inc., delighted many theater goers and critics. Their long-run hits at the Old Rialto and Lyric Theaters included Dion Boucicault's "After Dark."

"BLESS ITS ANCIENT BOARDS"

"Even if the Old Rialto does not succeed," wrote Brooks Atkinson in the New York Times, "it is apparent that its managers are not overwhelmed by the gravity of their task.

"The Hofbrau is nearby, dwarfed by steamship spars at the foot of the street. The Continental Hotel is across the way. Round the corner is the Travelers Rest. The program declares, 'You are always sure of good entertainment at the Old Rialto, bless its ancient boards.' Or across the streets, bless its stained tables."

After Hoboken, Mr. Throckmorton and Mr. Morley, the author, playwright, and lecturer, produced plays in the Millpond Playhouse at Roslyn, Long Island, including a critically acclaimed production of the "Trojan Horse."

In the 1941–42 season, Mr. Throckmorton also did the settings for "The Russian People," "Mr. Sycamore," and Saroyan's "Across the Board on Tomorrow Morning" and "Talking to You."

While living in Greenwich Village, Mr. Throckmorton was active in outdoor community parties. One, complete with hog-calling and country dances, raised money for the Spanish Loyalist cause. Another, during World War II, aided United States servicemen.

Mr. Throckmorton is survived by his widow, the former Juliet St. John Brenon.

[From the New York Herald-Tribune, Oct. 25, 1965]

CLEON THROCKMORTON, DESIGNED 600 SETS

ATLANTIC CITY.—Cleon Throckmorton, 69, the impish-looking, roly-poly scenic designer who did original sets for nearly 600 Broadway plays, including "The Emperor Jones," "The Hairy Ape," "In Abraham's Bosom" and "Porgy," died Saturday night in Atlantic City Hospital, six days after suffering a stroke.

In the 1920's and 1930's during the peak of his career, he designed sets for 12 or 13 productions a season.

His spectacular rise as a designer dated from 1920, when he was almost yanked bodily from Washington, D.C., by Eugene O'Neill, George Cram Cook and other guiding lights of the famed Provincetown Theater, after they had discovered him there.

Mr. Throckmorton, in the Capital, fresh out of Carnegie Tech with a degree in engineering, had engaged in a dalliance with painting, which led him to "the perfect marriage of the two professions—set designing."

His work in a production of Ridgely Torrence's "Simon the Cyrenian" for players at Howard University won the admiration of the Provincetown group.

His first New York production, the sketches and set for which he finished in three days, opened November 1, 1920—O'Neill's "Emperor Jones."

At Provincetown, he went on to do O'Neill's "All God's Chillun Got Wings" (1924) and Paul Green's Pulitzer Prize-winning "In Abraham's Bosom" (1926). DuBose Heyward's "Porgy" appeared in 1927 at the Guild.

His other productions included "The Makropolous Secret," "Rendezvous," "Is Life Worth Living?" "The Dark Hours," "Springtime for Henry," "Noah," "Curtain Call," "Eldorado," "Penny Arcade," and "Three's a Crowd," the latter starring Fred Allen, Libby Holman, and Clifton Webb.

As an artist, Mr. Throckmorton's reputation was that of a designer who worked with incredible speed, amazing facility and an instinct for making his sets capture the intent of the playwright.

"He knew immediately what a playwright was driving at and possessed a great gift for summing it up quickly in a sketch," said a theater personality who knew his work well.

Until the onset of World War II, the designer maintained a huge studio on Third Avenue staffed with assistants to help him turn out his sets.

He also designed and built the Westport (Conn.) Country Playhouse.

Mr. Throckmorton's Broadway output began to decrease in the 1940's, and he later went into virtual retirement.

At the time of his death he was artist in residence for a hotel in Atlantic City. He lived with his wife, the former Juliet St. John Brenon, his only survivor.

[From the New York Journal-American, Oct. 25, 1965]

CLEON THROCKMORTON, 68: NOTED STAGE DESIGNER

When the final tally was made, Cleon Throckmorton, one of America's leading stage designers, had done the sets for some 600 plays, including much of Eugene O'Neill's work.

It all reportedly began with a $50 bet that he made one night in a Washington restaurant—and won. Mr. Throckmorton, who had been trained as an engineer, made the bet with some artists, after an argument about the relative difficulties of succeeding in art and engineering.

USE OF PAINTS

"I bet I could become an artist within a year," Mr. Throckmorton said impulsively at the height of the heated discussion.

The bet was set at the $50 figure, with the stipulation that, by the end of the year, he must have a painting on exhibition in the Biennial Exposition of Contemporary Artists which was to take place in Washington.

The engineer went at his task, with engineering thoroughness, by drawing everything within sight each day for 8 hours. Later, he learned all he could about using paints. Toward the end of the year, two of Mr. Throckmorton's paintings were accepted by the Exposition.

From painting, it was only one step to scenic designing.

HARD TASKS

Mr. Throckmorton, 68, died Saturday night in Atlantic City Hospital, and his friends recalled that he also had made good use of his engineering training in his theatrical career.

When he opened a studio, he advertised himself as "specializing in difficult tasks for the theater that require the combination of the artist and the engineer."

Mr. Throckmorton's scenic designs for O'Neill's "Emperor Jones," which launched his new career in 1920, were exhibited at the museum of modern art. Other particularly noted designs of his were in "The Hairy Ape," "The Bride of the Lamb," "Burlesque," "Criminal at Large," and "Alien Corn."

GATHERING PLACE

His Greenwich Village studio became a gathering place for celebrities of the theater. In recent years he lived in retirement in Atlantic City.

In the late 1920's and through the depression, he also had collaborated with Christopher Morley to produce revivals of American plays at the Old Rialto Theater in Hoboken. Later, they produced plays at the Millpond Playhouse in Roslyn, L.I.

Mr. Throckmorton's wife, Juliet, survives.

CLEON THROCKMORTON, NOTED STAGE DESIGNER

Cleon Throckmorton, 69, noted stage designer, died in Atlantic City Hospital Saturday after a short illness.

He was born in Absecon, grew up in Washington, D.C., and attended George Washington University. He received a degree in engineering in 1922 from Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh.

He came into prominence in the theater when he was associated with Eugene O'Neill in the Provincetown Playhouse. He designed all the sets for the early O'Neill plays at Provincetown and continued the association for O'Neill plays produced by the Theater Guild in New York, including "The Emperor Jones," "The Hairy Ape," and "Beyond the Horizon."

His most famous design was for "Porgy" and the original designs were used for the Gershwin musical version, "Porgy and Bess."

Trockmorton also did sets for the first Tennessee Williams play, "Battle of Angles," and created or executed the sets for more than 600 Broadway plays and musicals. He designed four editions of the Greenwich Village Follies. For Flo Ziegfeld, he designed one of the Follies sets.

Throckmorton designed and built the Westport Theater in Connecticut; Cape Playhouse at Dennis on Cape Cod, and Cherry Lane Theater in New York.

In the 1920's, with his intimate friend Christopher Morley, he produced "The Black Crook," at the theater they founded in Hoboken.

Throckmorton was also the first art director of the Columbia Broadcasting System in the early days of television.

As an artist, he exhibited paintings in many of the leading art galleries of the world.

In 1950 Throckmorton was called back from Bermuda, where he had been directing a theater for 5 years, to do the sets for the Caribbean Carnival at Chalfonte-Haddon Hall in Atlantic City. Since that time he had been artist-in-residence at Chalfonte-Haddon Hall, creating the elaborate sets for the French and South Seas weekends.

Throckmorton is survived by his wife, Juliet St. John Branon Throckmorton.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25, 1965]

Cleon Throckmorton, 69, who gained prominence as a set designer for Playwright Eugene O'Neill, whom he joined at the Provincetown Playhouse in Massachusetts and prepared the sets for "Emperor Jones." "The Hairy Ape," and "Beyond the Fringe," which were later produced by the Theater Guild in New York, in early days of television became the Columbia Broadcasting System's first art director; in Atlantic City.

Defense Act Review Should Be Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the present military organization of the United States was fixed by the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958. Events during the tenure of the present Secretary of Defense have given rise to suggestions that it is time for Congress to review the act to determine the wisdom or unwisdom of many of its provisions. This matter is intelligently discussed in the following item which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on January 14:

SENATOR STENNIS FAVORS REVIEW OF DEFENSE ACT

(By Virginia W. Kelly)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat of Mississippi, is favorably inclined to a review of the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958, which gives great powers to the Defense Secretary.

He said that the years since enactment have provided a broad spectrum of data but that a meticulous analysis would be necessary before Congress could determine whether the law should be amended.

Second-ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, Senator STENNIS, in 1965, acted as Defense Appropriations Subcommittee chairman.

A few days ago, Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican of California, senior House Republican on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, asked House Armed Services Committee chairman, Representative L. MENDELL RIVERS, Democrat of South Carolina, to hold hearings on the 1958 law.

Mr. RIVERS is sympathetic to the idea and the House Armed Services Committee is thinking along these lines.

Representative RIVERS, Senator STENNIS, and Representative HOSMER are among the legislators who, at times, have been severely critical of Defense Secretary McNamara.

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, when he was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made the proposals to President Eisenhower which resulted in the 1958 law.

The admiral's critics charged that he wanted power centralized in the Defense Secretary as an administrative weapon over the military services.

This week, Admiral Radford told this reporter that the services would not cooperate voluntarily and that a statute was necessary to compel them to do so.

He does not think the law needs amending to water down the Defense Secretary's power.

Admiral Radford said the Defense Secretary's arbitrary policies are reminiscent of those of former Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, in the Truman administration, who boasted that he would "knock heads together."

After Secretary Johnson left Government, he realized he had been mistaken in his approach, Admiral Radford said.

The admiral recalled that Thomas Gates, Deputy Defense Secretary in 1958, bitterly opposed the Reorganization Act. But when

Mr. Gates became Defense Secretary in 1959, he thought the additional power was necessary.

Admiral Radford said, "Tom Gates never misused the power. The responsibility rests with each President to choose carefully a Defense Secretary.

A Memorial Tribute to the Late President William McKinley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 4, 1966

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on Saturday, January 29, the Kiwanis Club of Canton, Ohio, held a wreath-laying ceremony at the McKinley National Monument in honor of the 123d anniversary of the birth of President McKinley.

I ask unanimous consent that the outline of the program, together with the memorial tribute, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the program outline and tribute were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Canton Kiwanis Club Wreath-Laying Ceremony at McKinley National Memorial, January 29, 1966

The Kiwanis Club of Canton, Ohio, held a wreath laying ceremony at the tomb of the late President William McKinley on Saturday, January 29, 1966, in honor of the 123d anniversary of the birth of this great American.

The program opened with a prayer. This was followed by the chronology of William McKinley. The final portion of the program consisted of a memorial tribute for William McKinley. It was in the conclusion of this tribute that the wreath was duly placed at the tomb.

A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM MC KINLEY

Let us pause from the pace of modern living for a few moments devotion in honor of our famous citizen, William McKinley, 25th President of the United States of America, from March 4, 1897, to September 14, 1901.

The honorable McKinley was born on January 29, 1843, and died September 14, 1901.

The greatness of a man is not determined by his rank of office, but rather by his kindness. William wore this greatness from boyhood on, as exemplified by his love of parent and family. Later as he served in the Civil War, he risked his life that his fellow comrades might have hot coffee and food in the front lines. After his wife became a semi-invalid, she knew that his arm was always there to guide her.

It was shortly after his first inauguration that his sister, Anna, sent him word that his mother was dying. McKinley, laying all state matters aside wired back the following reply: "Tell mother I'll be there."

And later, on September 6, 1901, at the Temple of Music in the Pan-American Exposition, Buffalo, N.Y., after the fatal shots were fired, he said of his assassin: "Unhand him and let him have a fair trial." Then turning to Secretary Cortelyou, he said, "Be careful in telling my wife."

So, thus you see, McKinley was not only great in power, but great in character. He was loved by all who knew him.

May we close with this thought, the honorable McKinley's last words: "It is God's will, His will, not ours, be done."

North Cascades Federal Lands Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on February 11 and 12 the Senate Interior Committee, with Senator Henry M. Jackson as chairman, will hold hearings in Seattle on the proposed new plan for a North Cascades National Park and various boundary adjustments and readjustments included in the proposal of a Federal study team. I think the junior Senator from the State of Washington and his committee will render a great service by holding these hearings and allowing interested citizens to express their views.

Mr. Speaker, ever since the release of the North Cascades study report in December 1965 with its recommendation for creation of a new national park in my State of Washington I have been receiving views from interested constituents and I wish to make my position clear.

The joint study under the sponsorship of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture had my full support; in fact, I requested a study of the North Cascades in order to ascertain if a new national park was justified. I have been frank in saying that I believe the unique geographic beauties of the area north of Lake Chelan should be preserved, but I have never felt qualified to decide as to the exact boundaries of such a park.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I shall review in due course the testimony taken by the Senate committee in Seattle, and other expressions of opinion and testimony relating to this proposal. Until the reports of these hearings are completed and printed I do not intend to make a snap judgment as to where the various boundaries for a park and other recreational areas should be established. Especially, I think it important to assure the skiing public, hunters, and other sportsmen that adequate provisions will be made for them. But, in principle, I think it is essential to set aside certain unique areas for future generations and keep them intact without allowing the lumbering industry or development of recreational projects to destroy their natural charm.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I think it important to thoroughly investigate the recent proposal to withdraw some 59,000 acres from the Olympic National Park. Personally, I have always felt that there could be some modest withdrawals in this area in the interest of jobs and the economy of the area, where lumbering could be allowed but I am not qualified to say if these 59,000 acres are justified. So I am especially pleased that the Senate committee is looking into this aspect of the controversial issue.

In time, I trust a recommendation will be forthcoming that will be satisfactory to the conservationists and at the same time provide national forests for maximum public benefit such as controlled lumbering, hunting, and fishing and likewise camping and skiing. I am sure that the various interested agencies of Washington State's government will give their views in the public interest and provide some guidelines. I am looking to the Senate committee to provide light and disperse the heat that always comes with differing viewpoints.

Meanwhile, I think the entire Washington State delegation will join me in expressing our gratitude to the Senate for holding these hearings. I am only sorry that I cannot be present to sit with the committee as I was invited to do.

Conference on American Indian Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 4, 1966

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Journal of the American Medical Association of December 6, 1965, printed an important article entitled "The Third National Conference on American Indian Health." Ably written by Agnes Fahy and Carl Muschenheim, M.D., it explores problems in the field of mental health particularly as they relate to alcoholism and trachoma, an eye disease extremely rare among the non-Indian population of the United States.

As a member of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I found this article of great interest. It is my thought that other Senators might have a parallel interest and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

American Indian Affairs—Third National Conference on American Indian Health

(By Agnes Fahy and Carl Muschenheim, M.D.)

Mental health and trachoma are emerging as major health problems among American Indians, as intensive prevention and treatment programs are improving the outlook for the conquest of such systemic infectious diseases as tuberculosis.

To focus attention on the increase in mental disorders and the recurrence of trachoma, once almost completely controlled on the reservations, and to consider approaches of their solution, the National Committee on Indian Health of the Association on American Indian Affairs, last fall, called its third conference on Indian health. The first conference had been held in 1953 to consider whether to recommend the transfer of Indian health services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, to the Public Health Service, a transfer which was subsequently effected. The second conference, in 1955, was concerned with questions related to the administrative change.

The third conference was held in New York on November 19, 1964. There were two half-day sessions.

MENTAL HEALTH

The morning session was devoted to a discussion of mental illness on the reservations. Alexander H. Leighton, M.D., professor of social psychiatry, Cornell University Medical College, New York, was the discussion leader.

The prevalence of mental disturbance among Indians can be estimated only on the basis of known prevalence among certain other segments of the population. Possibly 20 to 25 percent of a population of 400,000 Indians are affected by some type of mental illness, ranging from major psychoses down the scale to personality disorders. This is the range of prevalence observed in surveys of other population groups in which the social handicaps are not dissimilar. However, it was emphasized that preventive programs are nonexistent on the reservations and the true figure may be higher. Of this potentially large number only a small fraction is currently identified as needing psychiatric care, and a yet smaller fraction receives care.

Causes of mental illness among Indians: Factors cited as having a bearing on the development of mental illness among the Indians included the disintegration of their culture, the generally poor level of education, poverty, disturbing childhood experiences, and the ambivalent position of the Federal Government, the trustee of the Indian's land in relation to the Indian.

The conferees were aware that the disturbing effect of a people caught between two cultures is not peculiar to the Indian. It is well known that the stress of adaptation to a strange way of life is an emotional ordeal for people low in the economic scale, who are unequipped by education or training to stand on equal terms with those already established in the new social order.

The Indian is in such a transitional period at present. Expected to adapt to the industrialized urban life of the Western World, he is pulled by tradition and regilious concepts toward the tribally oriented society of his ancestors. Torn between two extremes, he gropes in vain for help in making his adjustment.

A parallel was drawn between the apathy and dependency of some Indian groups and that of the people of the povetry-stricken communities of Appalachia. The problems of both were described as spiral—their lives circumscribed by poverty, the people become emotionally disturbed, and in their disturbed state they fail to take advantage of opportunities to raise themselves to a higher rung on the economic ladder.

This is a situation which, it was agreed, calls for direct attack on both the psychiatric and economic fronts.

The question of whether alcoholism is casually related to mental disturbance on the reservations was debated at some length. Some of the conferees indicted alcoholism as a major cause of mental illness, but others contended that alcohol serves the Indian primarily as a safety valve—an outlet without which he might develop serious psychiatric problems.

Annie Wauneka, a member of the Navajo Tribal Council, expressed concern not only over the drinking among her people, but also over the use of peyote. In her opinion, both alcoholism and peyotism are major contributors to mental illness among the Navajos.

Others pointed out this misuse of peyote may be largely a regional problem, and that its ritual use in religious services has not been shown to be harmful. Alfreda Janis, of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, defended such ritual use of peyote by members of the Native American Church in her area.

Carruth J. Wagner, M.D., Assistant Surgeon General and Chief of the Division of Indian Health, U.S. Public Health Service, questioned that there is much true alcoholism on the reservation. Chronic alcoholism, according to Dr. Wagner, occurs among Indians for the most part only when they have lost identity as members of an Indian community and have passed culturally into another environment. What occurs on the reservation, he contended, is binge drinking which, in effect, affords an escape from the trauma brought on by the struggle to survive without loss of mental balance.

The consensus was that many mental disorders of Indians are traceable to childhood experiences, frequently having their roots in the educational system. In the absence of sufficient schools on many reservations, one of two substitute procedures has been followed. The children may be transported to towns bordering the reservation where they live in dormitories and attend the public school in the town, or they may attend a boarding school operated by the Federal Government, perhaps far distant from home. Separated from his family and thrust into an alien environment where even language intensifies the sense of isolation, too often, but understandably, the child becomes bewildered, and the seeds of serious future illness are sown.

Solutions suggested. No simple solution to the total problem was advanced. Discussion revolved around the need for a two-pronged approach: (1) more adequate services than now exist for the care of immediate acute situations, and (2) a long-range preventive program.

There was general agreement that before long-range plans could be mapped certain basic information must be obtained. Answers to such questions as the following are needed: What are the most prevalent types of mental illness among the Indians? In what areas are they principally to be found? Are there facilities to care for the acute cases? Are existing facilities accessible to those in greatest need of them? What kinds of services can be expected to contribute most significantly to a program to help the Indian overcome problems affecting his mental health?

Pending such time as an in-depth reservation-by-reservation survey can be made, utilizing modern techniques of psychiatric epidemiology, it was recommended that pilot studies be undertaken to pinpoint the most acute needs of those with psychiatric disorders.

Information gained from such studies, it was brought out, would not only serve to identify the various aspects of the problem and indicate the type of service needed to meet each specific problem, but would also be of major importance in establishing baselines against which the effectiveness of the preventive program adopted could later be gaged.

The chief stumbling block to the conduct of a meaningful survey is lack of trained personnel, according to Dr. Wagner, who expressed the opinion that the interviewing should be done by medical social workers, preferably Indians. Dr. Wagner maintained that if he had one medical social worker on each reservation the amount and quality of services to the Indians could be increased by several hundred percent with little increase in the gross expenditure. This could be accomplished, he said, by eliminating existing inefficiencies of services due to lack of personnel capable of making maximal use of available resources.

Dr. Wagner emphasized, too, that mental health services should be an integral part of a total health program for the Indians, a concept that was endorsed by the conference as a whole.

Several areas for immediate action were suggested. One of these was to seek correction of State regulations which discriminate against Indians in regard to commitment to mental hospitals and to care in existing facilities.

Other steps proposed were the provision of consultative services to the Indians (1) on the emotional effect of certain physical illnesses and how these illnesses may be prevented, (2) in the first years at boarding school, and (3) on the health care of children to young married couples and to young people planning to be married.

A fifth point considered of prime importance was that each tribal council be invited and urged to participate in conferences to plan mental health programs. Many Indians are known to be deeply concerned by the lack of services to the emotionally disturbed and can make valuable contributions to the formulation of programs to meet needs which they undoubtedly understand better than the non-Indian.

The conferees envisioned a mental health program that would not only provide for the needs of individuals as isolated beings, but also of the individual in relation to his community. Thus, an effective plan, one which would have a salutary effect on the entire community, should be developed and supported by all agencies and groups within the community—psychiatrists and other doctors, social workers, clergy, teachers, health educators, and tribal leaders.

TRACHOMA

Trachoma, an eye disease extremely rare among the non-Indian population of the United States, is staging a comeback on Indian reservations in the Southwest after apparently having been controlled. It was the subject of the afternoon session, with Phillips Thygeson, M.D., director of the Francis I. Proctor Foundation for Research in Ophthalmology, University of California, San Francisco, as the discussion leader.

A form of keratoconjunctivitis, trachoma is characterized by follicles, scarring, and the vascularization of the cornea with formation of pannus. It often leads to blindness, although there are instances of benign cases which heal spontaneously. Some 4 million people in the world are believed to be afflicted with the disease, principally in Asia and Africa.

The etiological agent is a virus classified with the psittacosislymphogranuloma group. It is atypical in that it is larger than the usual virus, can be seen under a microscope, and is susceptible to chemotherapy. In many respects it resembles a bacterium but is considered a virus because it requires a system of living cells to propagate. Only within the last few years have methods of growing it in the laboratory been developed. Some strains are difficult to distinguish from the virus of inclusion conjunctivitis, a fact that at times complicates diagnosis.

Trachoma is believed to be one of the first diseases described in medicine. Regardless, it was widespread in the ancient world and references to it appear in old Egyptian papyri. It is likely that it was brought to this country by the Spanish conquistadors.

Why trachoma did not establish itself among segments of the population other than the Indians is not known. By the 1930's approximately a fourth of the Indian population was infected. Fortunately, the sulfonamides, introduced in the late 1930's, were found to be effective against the infection and an intensive control campaign, based on antimicrobial treatment, brought excellent results. Unfortunately, under the pressure of World War II, attention was diverted to other health needs and by 1956 trachoma had returned to its presulfonamide level among Indians in some sections of the West.

Undoubtedly, a major factor in the spread of this highly infectious disease is the scarcity of water on the reservations in the warm, dry climate of the Southwest. The highest prevalence of trachoma is on the Arizona reservations of the Apache, the Navajo, the Pima, and the Papago. Trachoma is not a serious problem on the reservation in the North.

Participants in the conference who have made a study of the situation pointed out that the difficulty in obtaining water on many reservations has made the Indian chary of using it. Furthermore, his lack of knowledge concerning the transmission of disease leads to his repeatedly violating the simplest rules of hygiene. Not only is one towel for all accepted as adequate in the family, but one pan of water may be used for the ablutions of the entire family.

In recent years the tendency of the young Indian girls to imitate the habits of their pale-faced sisters has also promoted the spread of the disease. The Indian girls have taken to using mascara and eyebrow pencils. They do not hesitate to pass one mascara brush from girl to girl and, along with the brush, they often pass the virus of trachoma.

This, then, is the situation. Trachoma has reappeared following a letup in the control program, aided and abetted by lack of sanitation plus inadequate education in hygiene. Now, with the availability of chemotherapy, the conferees considered that delays in reinstituting an effective control program were inexcusable. The tetracyclines have largely replaced the sulfonamides in treatment.

Recent control efforts: Within recent years a control program was initiated on the San Carlos Reservation in Arizona. The program was concentrated on schoolchildren and considerable progress appeared to have been made. After an interval, the children who had been treated were resurveyed and, surprisingly, as much trachoma was found as there had been prior to treatment. The question arose of whether overdiagnosis had played a role in the picture—that cases of eye disease had been diagnosed as trachoma that really were not trachoma. Another survey, using the most precise diagnostic techniques available, was obviously in order. The schoolchildren were resurveyed, a biomicroscope, or slit-lamp, being used to examine the eyes. To the astonishment of the investigators, instead of finding fewer children with trachoma, they found more, and a larger percentage of trachoma with the grave pannus which, when total, causes blindness. In the original survey, the incidence of pannus was 12.9 percent. Within a year, using the sliplamp in casefinding, the incidence jumped to 25 percent.

There could be no question that the slitlamp was an indispensable diagnostic tool, but still unanswered was the question of the sources of infection. The next step was a mass survey of a segment of the population consisting of all age groups. The survey was conducted among approximately 900 Apaches in the Bylas area of the San Carlos Reservation. The incidence of active trachoma by age group was found to be as follows: 0 through 4 years, 35 percent; 5 through 18 years, 61 percent; 19 and older, 43 percent.

These figures revealed a tremendous reservoir of trachoma which was not reached by the school program. Thus, children successfully treated at school were being reinfected at home.

Other interesting facts learned from this survey were that the more acute form of the disease occurred in the younger age groups and that there was a rapid increase in scars and pannus (trachoma III) with age. After 10 years of age 35 percent of the people had the disease in this stage. Healed trachoma (stage IV) began at 6 years of age and progressed to 100 percent at 90 years. Over 15 years of age all persons had either active or healed trachoma.

This study served to lend emphasis to the importance of health education and cooperative action in attacking an infectious disease among the Indians.

The question was asked at the conference whether viral resistance to the drugs in use might affect the response to therapy, a question which could not be answered with certainty because methodology has not yet been developed to test the viral agent for resistance.

Possibilities for future control.—The possibility of vaccines against the disease was also discussed. Studies in this direction are underway in four laboratories—at the Schools of Public Health at the University of Washington, Seattle; at Harvard; at the University of Rome; and at the Lister Institute in Great Britain.

Since natural immunity is of a low order and seemingly insufficient to prevent reinfection, the likelihood of a vaccine at present does not offer great hope. There is some inconclusive evidence that artificial immunity may reinforce natural immunity and that a vaccine may enhance therapy. The difficulty in growing the agent in the laboratory and the fact that the monkey is the only experimental animal in which trachoma can be produced impede progress in the field of immunology.

The inescapable conclusion was that treatment alone is not the answer to the solution of the problem. Treatment must be reinforced by (1) the availability of safe water in adequate amounts, and at accessible points, on all the reservations; and (2) a sound health education program so planned and carried out that the Indians will understand the role of hygienic practices in the prevention of disease.

In fact, Dr. Thygeson made the point that trachoma will die out in a population without treatment if the economic level is raised and personal hygiene attains normal standards. This has happened in some areas of the world and in some sections of this country, he said.

Dr. Wagner pointed out that 80 percent of the Indians still have to haul their water a mile or more, often over difficult terrain, and that about 70 percent of the water comes from potentially contaminated sources. A water supply and waste disposal construction program initiated several years ago with Federal funds has not yet caught up with the known needs. Construction work in the amount of approximately $51 million is still needed to provide the known needs of Indians for necessary sanitary facilities, the conferees were told. Lagging, too, are educational efforts on the use and maintenance of facilities.

As with mental health, trachoma is linked to the economic plight of the people, for the visual impairment and blindness caused by the disease are an impediment to the acquisition of skills required to improve their economic lot.

Since trachoma is a preventable disease, the conferees agreed that the immediate situation calls for the treatment of all known cases with antimicrobial drugs, as was done so effectively in 1938. Such an undertaking would not only help those already infected, but would also break the chain of infection. It was emphasized, however, that a "crash" program would fail to eradicate the disease unless backed by sound health education and accompanied by the provision of an adequate supply of readily accessible uncontaminated water.

There was unanimous agreement also that the attack on trachoma, like the attack on mental illness, must be planned and executed with the advice and active participation of representatives of the tribal councils.

Such participation was an important factor in the initiation of a stepped-up tuberculosis control program when the health services to the Indians were assigned to the Public Health Service in 1955. Since then, tuberculosis mortality among the Indians has declined 55 percent. Yet, even with this decline, the tuberculosis mortality rate is five times as high among Indians as among the population as a whole and the morbidity is seven times as great; these facts serve to emphasize the neglect of the past and the great need for expanded health services for the Indian in the immediate future.

Armed Services Personnel Now Fighting in Vietnam Praised by Sam Huff—Outstanding American Athlete

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 4, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginians hold in high esteem Sam Huff, one of the alltime greats in the National Football League.

We respect Sam not only for his athletic abilities but also for his role as a fine father and outstanding citizen.

He is from Farmington, W. Va., and played college football at West Virginia University, where he was all-American. Sam has been a conspicuous player in professional football for the past 11 years, as a linebacker with the New York Giants and now with our Washington Redskins.

For 12 days, Huff, along with NFL stars Johnny Unitas, Willie Davis, and Frank Gifford, toured Vietnam. These men, sponsored by the State Department and the National Football League, obviously were helpful in the entertainment and morale-boosting activities in the Vietnam area.

Steve Guback, staff writer for the Evening Star, wrote an excellent account of his interview with Sam Huff and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 3, 1966]

THEY KNOW THEY'VE GOT JOB TO DO—HUFF PROUD OF GUYS IN VIETNAM

(By Steve Guback, Star staff writer)

"There were 190,000 guys who would like to have come back with us," said Sam Huff, "but they've got a job to do and they know it."

The Redskins' linebacker eased back in his chair, the lines of weariness etched across his face. He arrived back in Washington yesterday morning after a 23-hour flight from the battlefields of Vietnam where he saw the war and the "courageous guys" who fight it.

"When you go to a hospital and see an 18-year-old who's been hit by a machine gun above and below the knee. * * * When you see a sergeant who got it from a land mine and is bandaged from head to toe. * * * That's when you know it's a vicious war," said Huff.

"But there wasn't a kid in the hospital who didn't want to go back and join his unit," Huff added firmly. "That's the kind of kids they are."

For 12 days, Huff toured Vietnam with Johnny Unitas, Willie Davis, and Frank Gifford.

"I don't really know how they selected us," Huff said, referring to the State Department and the National Football League.

"But when you're asked, you feel you've got an obligation to go. We put on a show as we'd do at a men's club. We'd give a little talk, answer questions and show films—like the Packers' sudden-death victory over the Colts, the Bears' victory over San Francisco the day Gale Sayers scored six touchdowns, and one on the NFL's rookies.

"We really didn't know how we would be accepted," Huff said. "We're football players and not all the guys may have heard of us. But what a reception. They treated us like we were the greatest entertainers in the world."

There were the serious moments—the Sunday church service on the aircraft carrier *Hornet*, the day after one of its planes had been lost. Huff said that touched him deeply.

And there were the lighter moments—like when Willie Davis, the Packers' defensive end, was questioned about Don Chandler's late-game fieldgoal that brought the Packers even in their playoff affair with the Colts. The films make it appear that the fieldgoal was wide.

"I've got $7,200 that says the man was right," Davis wisecracked, and the troops roared with delight.

The trip, said Huff, gave him an immense sense of satisfaction.

"Was it worthwhile? It's the greatest thing I've ever done," Huff said. "You get a great feeling on the football field when you win a championship, but in no way can it compare with this feeling.

"I told all the kids in the hospital from the Washington area that I'd contact their folks and I did, all except one which I couldn't reach.

"The hospital was right in town, but the night before we got there a sniper shot at it," Huff said. "One kid stepped outside the gate and got shot in the stomach.

"We'd joke with the kids," Huff said. "We'd tell them that we didn't know whether it was better to go outside and get shot or stay in the building and get blown up. They'd laugh, but that's the feeling you get, seriously.

"This is a war with no front and no back," Huff said. "You don't know who you're fighting. We'd tell them that in football at least they wear different colored jerseys.

"We own the country in the daytime, but the Viet Cong owns it at night. I don't think we ever actually were shot at," Huff said, "but there always was the feeling of danger.

"The people who say we shouldn't be there, well—," said Huff, a trace of bitterness showing in his voice, "they haven't seen the picture. The kids out there constantly questioned us about the draft card burning and the demonstrations back home.

"We're doing the right thing," Huff insisted, "and doing it the only way it can be done. It's got to be a long, drawn-out process. We're trying to build a nation there, and the only way it can be done is to build it within the people.

"With pride," Huff said.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Italian-American War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Philadelphia was delighted recently that the Italian-American War Veterans of the U.S., Inc., held a testimonial dinner for Anthony V. Lo Popolo, national commander, at the Sheraton Hotel. This fine organization makes an important contribution to our society and provides a gathering place for American veterans who are of Italian extraction.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the address by Col. Saul Fromkes, president of City Title Insurance Co. and the address of Anthony V. Lo Popolo, national commander of the Italian-American War Veterans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY COL. SAUL FROMKES, PRESIDENT OF CITY TITLE INSURANCE CO., AT THE TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR ANTHONY V. LO POPOLO, NATIONAL COMMANDER, ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE U.S., INC., SHERATON HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1965

Mr. Toastmaster, Reverend Father Positano, Judge Cercone, other distinguished guests at the dias, officers of this great organization, veterans, friends, ladies, and gentlemen, I am happy to be here—that is the sort of statement that is expected from a speaker when he arises on an occasion such as this, but I am really truly happy to be here for I was invited, but not drafted. I really volunteered to come here, I have come from the heart of New York City this evening to do homage to your national commander and to your great organization of 60,000 members of Italian heritage.

Tony, as he is affectionately known by the officers of our company has all of the essential ingredients and cardinal virtues for this high office to which you have elected him. In my 10 years of close association with him I and my associates have found him always to respond far beyond the call of duty. He is industrious, he is efficient, he is reliable, he is honest, humble, and courageous. He is temperate and loyal and beyond all, he is a leader. Some men are born followers. He is a born high-principled leader.

Permit me to tell you a trifle about his background as revealed by our company personnel records. A man of 46, he graduated from St. John the Baptist High School at the head of his class, from St. Joseph's College, cum laude, from Georgetown Law School amongst the first 10 in the class. A member of the bar for over 18 years, having served as attorney adviser on the Federal Trade Commission Act in Washington where he was admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court and today, he is a distinguished specialist in the field of real property law and title insurance and presently is our company's resident State manager in full charge of our Pennsylvania operations. Illustrative of his capabilities is the fact that since he has assumed his duties I have only on rare occasions had the necessity to visit his office, which is one of our most productive.

And right here, let me say that I am sure, somewhere, somehow, his lovely wife Martha and his daughter Deborrah, must have been most indulgent and understanding for the extra hours that he has spent in behalf of our company. For without their understanding it would have made his task impossible.

And how far beyond all that I have said about Tony, he is a man of justice, which, ladies and gentlemen, is the great interest of man on earth. It is the ligament which holds civilized beings and civilized nations together. Wherever her temple stands and so long as it is duly honored there is a foundation for social security, general happiness, and the improvement of progress of our race. And whoever labors on this edifice with usefullness and distinction, whoever clears its foundation, strengthens its pillars, adorns its entablatures, or contributes to raise its august dome still higher in the skies, connects himself in name and fame and character with that which is and must be as durable as the frame of human society, such a man is a man of justice, and such a man is Anthony V. L. Lo Popolo.

Tony, all of the other officers and distinguished members of the board of directors of your company have asked me to extend their best wishes to you.

Therefore, on this occasion it affords me much personal pride and pleasure to salute you on your selection of Anthony V. Lo Popolo as your national commander, with the trust and knowledge that we have been blessed with the devoted leadership of the man we honor here tonight and wish him a most enjoyable and most productive term of office.

ADDRESS OF ANTHONY V. LO POPOLO, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE U.S., INC., AT THE TESTIMONIAL DINNER IN HIS HONOR AT THE SHERATON HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1965

Mr. Louis DiGiovanni, toastmaster, Reverend Father Positano, Mae Benenati, national president, Mr. Nicholas Vassallo, chairman, Judge William F. Cercone, Councilman Paul D'Ortano, Senator William J. McLaughlin, Col. Saul Fromkes, Louis Rickino, State commander, Jan Vassallo, department president, Anthony Esposito, Angelo Benenati, other distinguished guests at the head table, fellow national officers, officers of the ladies' auxiliary, veterans, friends, ladies and gentlemen, first I wish to thank the chairman and his committee for making this affair possible.

Second, I wish to thank all the guests at the head tables as well as you my friends in attendance who are here tonight. For without you there would be no affair. The honor that you have bestowed upon me here tonight I shall ever cherish. I wish to thank my wife for her understanding, assistance, patience, cooperation and self sacrifice as I pursue the many and arduous tasks of my office. I wish to thank my boss, Col. Saul Fromkes, for his support which I surely need if I am to carry out the many out-of-town duties of my office.

Tonight as we are gathered here in joyful festivities we must be ever thankful for our Armed Forces who are manning the ramparts of peace throughout the world. While our Armed Forces are thus engaged other American citizens are doing everything to disrupt and disorganize the orderly processes of the local, State and National Government. There are defiant demonstrations in the streets of of our land against all authority, Freedom in America has never meant a license to do what one wants without regard to the rights of others. If this were so we would be nothing more than barbarians and savages. Freedom in America is a respect for law and order.

Freedom in America is a respect for the rights of others. An abuse of a right or a deprivation of a right guaranteed to us as freemen is an injury to another. This trend in license constitutes a deterioration of our moral fiber and discipline. Morality and discipline must be taught in the home and in the church or synagogue if extremism is not to prevail. Extremists who violate the laws should be punished to the fullest extent of the law if we are to remain as freemen in a free society. To do otherwise is to condone the breaking down of law and order and promote anarchy. The Italian-American War Veterans owes its origin to fighting extremism and injustice, and we know only too well the aims and purposes of extremists. We can and must never be indifferent to the God-given rights of others.

The Italian-American veteran today has moved considerably since its foundation years ago. Today we are militant. We aim to diffuse our aims and ideas throughout all areas of our country so that our strength will continue to increase. In unity there is strength. A person who speaks for himself stands alone. An organization speaks for a group. This then is our strength, organization and unity. We as a group are a potent factor in American life, and to remain so we must never be dormant but active. To do this we must have new energetic men and leaders.

Again I wish to thank you one and all for honoring me here tonight. I shall endeavor to live up to the expectations required of me with yours and God's help. God bless you all.

Private Pension Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include a report on private pension plans by Mr. John Corey, John N. Corey Co., Birmingham, Ala. Mr. Corey's report was made to the annual Washington meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama:

PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

(Statement in the tax field presented before the Alabama congressional delegation, January 24, 1966, by John Corey, John N. Corey, Birmingham, Ala.)

Associated Industries of Alabama does not concur with the recommendations made by the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds in its report entitled "Public Policy and Private Pension Programs." AIA, in stating its position on this report, does not summarily reject all recommendations as being without merit. It does, however, take the position that the implementation of these recommendations in toto, or to any major degree, results in a further encroachment of Federal controls on the private sector of business, and that the adoption into law of these recommendations would serve as a disruptive force in the private pension movement and severely thwart the future growth of this important element in our present economy.

We stand on the thesis that regulation leads to standardization, and a movement based upon the individual needs of a business and its ability to provide such needs in the retirement field cannot flourish under excessive regulation. Be assured that the private corporate pension plan is not without regulation today. Any plan, to receive qualification from the Treasury Department, must be construced within the framework of sections 401 and 404 of the Internal Revenue Code. The regulations presently governing retirement plans are continuously becoming more restrictive, not by any change in the law but through an increasingly narrowing interpretation of these regulations by the Internal Revenue Service. Nevertheless, plans may still achieve individuality and be designed to meet specific needs and situations.

The recommendations of the President's Committee carry the undertone that the right to benefits under private pensions and the phenomenal growth of the pension movement is created by the tax concessions granted to private pension funds and to prevent abuses in this field further regulation is required for the public good.

We disagree with this implication. The immense growth of the private pension movement cannot be accredited primarily to the tax treatment afforded such plans. It is more the result of agreements reached at the bargaining table, the desire of the employer to provide for his long service employees and that retirement benefits are a growing necessity for any corporation competing in the labor and talent market of today. These, we believe, are the factors providing the true impetus for the rapid growth of the private pension movement. Tax consequences, to be certain, are not to be dismissed, but it is our belief that the prime motivation of the movement does not stem from this source.

Many recommendations of this committee, as previously mentioned, have merit, and we feel in time will become fact. But, let the facts result from the evolutionary process within the movement which has already created so many profound changes such as disability benefits, widows benefits, earlier retirement benefits, and final average plans.

The committee has recommended that all plans have a vesting of benefit provision and that this vesting period be not longer than 20 years. The inclusion of such a provision, if forced by legislation, into many plans would make the cost prohibitive and cause a reduction of retirement benefits for those plans unable to bear the cost. It would result also in many plans not being established because of the excessively high initial cost requirement, as most plans are begun at a level of benefit that the company can afford at that time. Benefit increases, vesting provisions and other contingent benefits are added as the ability of the company to do so permits. Vesting provisions in retirement plans are increasing but let them evolve from the natural pressures arising from the bargaining table, the demands of the employee market and the desires of the employers to reward their employees.

To emphasize this point and the evolutionary processes taking place in the private pension field, in 1950 a vesting provision in a pension plan was a rarity, today more than two-thirds of the existing plans have a vesting provision of some kind. Many have a more rapid vesting period than the 20 years recommended. This has been the result of natural pressures exerted on the movement and not from governmental regulation.

It is the opinion of AIA that the increasing developments which will strengthen the pension moment will evolve through these natural processes, and that the public good can better be served through this means than by increased regulations.

AIA does specifically reject as unsound and detrimental to the private pension movement further legislation encompassing the following recommendations submitted by the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds and Other Private Retirement and Welfare Funds:

1. Early vesting because of the cost involved and the fact that in many instances it can work counter to sound business principles.

2. Set funding requirements as they eliminate the flexibility to meet the changing exigencies of business. This does not mean that AIA opposes adequate funding procedures, only that each plan be funded in the manner best suited to the conditions of the sponsoring company.

3. Insuring plan benefits against terminations and bankruptcy as impractical at this time.

4. Eliminations of plans covering only salaried and clerical employees as an inequity and definite detriment to future growth.

5. Reduction of employee eligibility requirement from 5 to 3 years as causing serious cost increases for companies with high employee turnover.

6. Limitation of amount that can be contributed to a plan or limitation of benefits derived. This, more than any other recommendation, would stifle the private pension movement. It would relegate the corporate pension plan to the position of the self-employed pension plan which has been spectacularly unsuccessful because of such limitations.

7. A change in the percentages allowed for integrating private benefits with those created under social security will be the cause of drastic changes in benefit formulas and resulting benefits.

8. Elimination of capital gains treatment on lump sum distributions and present estate and gift tax treatment as creating a serious hardship for many thousands now covered by private pension plans.

9. Requirement of a fixed contribution formula for profit-sharing plans, as elimininating the flexibility required in changing business conditions.

10. Immediate vesting for profit-sharing plans, as defeating the purpose of many plans whose aim is to hold its employee members in the company organization.

In summation, it is our opinion, that the private pension movement will respond to changing conditions, as it has in the past, and that much of what the President's Committee has recommended will become fact. We feel strongly however that these developments be allowed to result from the mentioned evolutionary force within the pension movement which will continue to permit the flexibility required to meet changing conditions. This movement, we firmly believe, cannot continue to flourish and be the force which it now is in our economy if forced to work within the realm of ever-increasing regulation.

Hardy County, W. Va., Public Library Wins National Recognition for Excellence of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is undeniably true that as the levels of educational excellence and opportunity are raised in the United States, the role of the library will become an increasingly demanding one. For this reason it is gratifying to note that the Congress, and citizens generally, are taking a more positive interest in strengthening our public and private libraries so that the world of books will be available to every inquiring mind.

It has been said that the library should be the most important intellectual resource of the academic community. Its services, given by a competent staff of adequate size, should be geared to implement the purposes of the college's general program and to meet the specific educational objectives of the institution.

Beyond supporting the instructional program to the fullest extent, the library should endeavor to meet the legitimate demands of all its patrons, from the senior professor engaged in advanced reseach to the freshman just entering upon the threshold of higher learning.

Just as vital is the role of the public library in providing a source of knowledge, new ideas, and intellectual stimuli to the community at large. Millions of men, women, and children make regular use of library facilities in their city or town. We must make every effort to insure that these opportunities for study and enlightenment are safeguarded and augmented so that our society will reap the benefits which come with learning.

Mr. President, it is an honor to report that the Hardy County Public Library in Moorefield, W. Va., has just received a national award for excellence of service. This effectively administered facility is one of six in the entire United States to receive the 1966 Book-of-the-Month Club Library Award of $2,500 which goes to outstanding libraries in communities of less than 25,000 population. The funds will be used for the purchase of new books, and will be presented formally in ceremonies during National Library Week.

Commendations are certainly due the Hardy County Public Library, its library board, and especially, Librarian Helen Collins, for this meaningful recognition. I congratulate also the West Virginia Library Commission which is so ably headed by Executive Secretary Dora Ruth Parks.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the following material relative to the 1966 Book-of-the-Month Club Library Award won by the Hardy County Public Library be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed.

Hardy County Public Library Wins Book-of-the-Month Club Award

New York, N.Y., February 2, 1966.—Harry Scherman, chairman of the board of the Book-of-the-Month Club, today announced that the Hardy County Public Library, Moorefield, W. Va., is one of six winners of the 1966 Book-of-the-Month Club Library Awards.

Given in memory of Dorothy Canfield Fisher, a member of the club's original board of judges, the awards of $2,500 each are made to libraries in towns of 25,000 population or less for excellence of service.

Other 1966 winners include: Okefenokee Regional Library, Waycross, Ga.; Northeast Regional Library, Corinth, Miss.; Gale Free Library, Holden, Mass.; the public library, Holdrege, Nebr.; and Chetoo Community Public Library, Brookings, Oreg.

This year's awards bring the total amount given by the Book-of-the-Month Club during the past 8 years of the award program to $185,000. As in past years, the cash awards may be used only for the purchase of new books. The awards will be made during National Library Week.

The 1966 award program represents a basic change in the previous award structure. The 1965 program provided for a main award of $5,000 and secondary awards of $1,000 each. "By eliminating the main award and raising the basic award from $1,000 to $2,500," Mr. Scherman said, "we have acknowledged the fact that the cost of new books is rising. We feel that this year's award-winning libraries will all be able to make significant purchases of much-needed books."

Past experience indicates that the award program has helped bring many additional benefits to the winners. Local organizations have contributed substantial sums for improvements and for new services, and the morale of the libraries, and indeed of the communities themselves, has been given a big boost. In some cases the circulation of books has doubled and trebled.

Judge Damns U.S. Drift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Millard K. Caldwell has written an article which rather interestingly depicts the position of the administration in their utopia of the Great Society. This article, published in the Orlando Sentinal of January 29, follows:

Utopian Promises Prove False—Judge Damns U.S. Drift

Jacksonville.—The American people are trading in their old and tried constitutional Republic for the welfare state. Justice Millard K. Caldwell warned in an address here Friday before the Civitan Club.

The Florida Supreme Court judge said that if examples of the past mean anything, it must be agreed that history demonstrates the fact that the "something-for-nothing" theory has never worked.

"The fact is that everytime the calculating confidence men have promised utopia on earth in exchange for political support, the people have been taken to the cleaners," he said. "However, people generally, like sheep, decline to learn from history. P. T. Barnum grew rich on his circus tricks because he said a fool is born each minute."

The justice charged the Federal Government "is cuddling up to Cuba and spending billions of dollars on Tito and his ilk."

He referred to Cicero's words, "Though liberty is established by law, we must be vigilant, for liberty to enslave us is always present under that very liberty."

"That language must remind us of the incursions upon established law by the Supreme Court in the name of 'general welfare,'" he said.

"I am not sure just where this country is going nor what life in America will be like 5, 10, or 50 years from now," the justice continued, "but it's clear that the old ideas of obedience to law, public thrift, and common honesty, the old laws of supply and demand, and the old concepts of local self-government and individual responsibility have been discarded."

"It staggers the imagination to contemplate the changes which have occurred in the last 30 years," he continued. "Our manner of government and our way of life are, for the United States, new and novel with little common that has gone before. Our forefathers would be astounded by the insidious encroachments of centralized government in our everyday life."

Caldwell said Government was now in the business of housing the people, prescribing the hours a person can work and with whom people can work, the salaries paid, and the taxes to be withheld from salaries, the highways driven upon, the schools children can go to, and with whom they sit and play, and how food is grown and processed.

The speaker added that the Government concerns itself with the products the people buy; the condition under which products are manufactured; the manner in which they are advertised; the kind, shape, and size of the package in which they are placed, and how they are labeled.

"It is meddling with your health, your general welfare, your old age, and your retirement, and your security after retirement, your savings and the bank in which you place your savings, the conduct of your city, its police department, and its department of health, the conduct of the affairs of your State, its law enforcement, its elections, the composition of its legislature, and every other facet of your life, private and public," he continued.

"The people of this country may like all this," he said, "but to say the least, they've asked for it. They have elected the public officials who brought it about, and they sit around with their tin cups waiting for more.

'If that's what a majority of the people of this Nation want, those of us who disagree can't complain. The majority has the right to change our form of government if it wishes."

"One unfortunate aspect is that, once the die is finally cast, it will be too late to change our minds," he continued. "It's altogether unlikely we could ever reestablish the kind of government, the kind of independence and individuality our forefather conceived and anticipated for posterity," he said. "We will have come too far and given up too much."

Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on February 12, our Nation will observe the anniversary of the birth of two great men, Abraham Lincoln, perhaps the most indelible figure in American history, and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, hero of the War of Independence. Here in Washington, wreaths are placed at the inspiring statue of Thaddeus Kosciusko in Lafayette Park across from the White House in memory of that great son of Poland and of liberty.

This occasion gives us a moment to reflect upon this great man. Like Lincoln, Illinois' "Man for the Ages," he fought courageously in his own way and in his own time for the liberty of man and for each nation's right of self determination.

Kosciusko came to America on borrowed money. He stayed for 7 years of service, sacrifice, and danger. An engineering genius and one of the greatest masters of artillery tactics in his day, no officer serving under Washington was more vital to the success of our Revolutionary War than this son of Poland who so well exemplifies the contribution of the men and women of Polish blood to the history of our Nation.

It was he who directed the building of the defenses of Philadelphia and at West Point. To him is attributed the winning of the Battle of Saratoga, the turning point in the long and painful struggle of the Colonies. Thomas Jefferson said of him; "He is as pure a son of liberty as I have known and of that liberty which is to go to all, and not to the few and rich alone."

It is well that the world is reminded of patriots like Kosciusko, a man who fought for the independence of our Nation and his native land with dedicated zeal. The struggle for liberty is endless. Each period of history has its challenges, its own dictators, and its own despots, but this should not discourage us or lead us to despair. Instead we should draw courage and inspiration from the example of valient men such as General Kosciusko and rededicate ourselves again to the unfinished task to which they devoted their lives.

Congressman Kirwan Addresses Mississippi Valley Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today the Mississippi Valley Association heard in its morning business session one of the outstanding Members of this body, our beloved colleague, the Honorable Michael Kirwan, of Ohio.

No Member of this House has played as significant a role in the development of our Nation's water resources as has Mike Kirwan, who has led the fight for full river development for many years.

It is entirely appropriate that the Mississippi Valley Association should invite this great American to speak during its annual meeting, and I regret very much that business with one of the departments made it impossible for me to attend the session and hear MIKE KIRWAN'S remarks.

The text of the speech which he prepared for the meeting is a rich source of information and inspiration for all who are interested in water resource development, and is being placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of its significance. The text follows:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, BEFORE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 7, 1966

Throughout my years of service in the Congress of the United States, my thoughts and efforts have been devoted to the preservation and development of our natural resources—air, land, and water. History shows that any nation neglecting these resources will perish. I pledge to you that I will do, as I have been doing, all in my power to see that in this vital endeavor we will proceed not with complacency but with vision, and not with apathy but with action.

In my years in the Congress I have seen great progress resulting from wise capital investment of Federal funds in developing our water resources. In the field of flood control we have spent about $5 billion constructing projects which have, in their brief life, prevented over $12.5 billion in direct property damage, to say nothing of the loss of life and the physical and mental suffering which would have been experienced without them. Let me illustrate this by the examples of two small dams in my own congressional district. These dams, Berlin and Mosquito Creek, were built during World War II. They were the only dams built during that war, and were built by direction of President Roosevelt as a war emergency measure to permit the Youngstown steel industry to function at its urgently needed capacity. The Berlin Dam cost $7,312,000 and by June 30, 1964, had prevented flood damages totalling $76,501,000.

Think of that, my friends—only 21 years after its completion this dam had paid for itself 10 times over. There are innumerable other examples of flood control projects which have already far more than paid for themselves in the few years they have been in existence, and they will remain to give protection for generations to come. And yet irresponsible and ignorant individuals still label them as "pork barrel."

As to navigation, the record shows that the direct annual monetary benefits exceed the annual costs by over 3 to 1. But this is only part—and I think a small part—of the story. All but one of our major ports and harbors were created by pork-barrel projects of the Army Corps of Engineers. Think for a minute what this country would be if it had no harbors to handle our oceangoing trade. I asked you to think of it, but it is of course unthinkable. Again, where would our steel industry have been without the Soo Locks and the improved channels and harbors on the Great Lakes? And yet they tell us that this is pork barrel. Our 19,000 miles of improved inland waterways—even though they are incomplete and vital links remain to be provided—have made possible the industrialization of vast areas of the interior of our country. From 1962 through 1964, 5,370 new plant construction projects were completed along these navigable waterways. As one example, about $22 billion was invested in industrial expansion between 1950 and 1964 in the counties bordering the canalized Ohio River. Low-cost water transportation was an important factor in making possible this expansion. Because of our inland waterway system, most of our industry is widely dispersed throughout the Nation instead of being clustered around our seaports. Think of the tremendous value of this dispersion in the event of a nuclear war.

Many millions of acres of productive land have been brought into use through reclamation projects. As of June 30, 1964, the total investment in Federal reclamation projects was $5,064,744,097, most of which is reimbursable. The facilities provided by this investment were available in 1965 to provide full, supplementary, and temporary water service to over 9 million irrigable acres, of which 7,523,000 acres were actually irrigated. More than 150 different crops were grown on these lands with a gross crop value of $1.5 billion. Cumulative gross crop value on all Federal reclamation projects from 1906 through 1964 totals $21.7 billion; nearly 70 percent of this value was recorded in the last 15 years.

Small watershed projects of the Soil Conservation Service, under Public Law 566, are making a definite contribution to the overall problem. Six hundred and thirty-five projects are now authorized. Of these, 134 projects are essentially completed and another 324 are under construction with some benefits already in evidence. When all 635 projects are in operation benefits are expected to reach more than $60 million annually. The Federal investment is estimated at about $650 million.

What used to be considered as incidental benefits of water resource development projects—water supply, low flow augmentation, and recreation—are gaining daily in importance. The water supply crisis in the Northeastern States is only one example of the need to conserve and develop our water. In the drought of August 1963, over half the flow of the Ohio River at Cincinnati came from upstream flood control reservoirs. Dilution of water in our streams and rivers through low flow augmentation, according to U.S. Public Health Service experts, is essential to insure adequate water quality even though full treatment of collectible wastes is achieved.

It is written in Proverbs that "where there is no vision, the people perish." We need people of vision now, and that need will increase. I have discussed briefly some of our accomplishments so far in developing our water resources. If we are to meet the needs of our exploding population and our expanding economy we must accomplish far more in the immediate—not just the foreseeable—future. Our flood control program is far from complete. In spite of the progress which has been made, we still see hardly a year pass without devastating floods ravaging some areas of the country. The shadow of threat of floods hanging over many of our people and many of our industrial production facilities must be removed, insofar as practicable, in the interest of the entire Nation.

The waterway transportation system of the Nation, in spite of its already great contribution to our economy, is far from being either complete or adequate. Many of our channels and harbors need to be dredged to increase depths to accommodate modern, economic vessels. Much of our inland waterway system is obsolescent and needs to be modernized, and several vital links in that system are not even in existence.

The report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, published January 30, 1961, showed that by the year 2000 over 10,000 miles of previously improved waterways would need further improvement, and that over 3,000 miles of new waterways would be needed. The most vital of the missing links in our inland waterway system which has not reached the construction stage in connection of the Great Lakes with the Ohio-Mississippi River system and the Gulf of Mexico by means of putting only two links in the chain. Nearly 80 percent of this connecting waterway already exists, leaving only 120 miles of the Lake Erie-Ohio Canal and 253 miles of the Tennessee-Tombigbee.

These great projects, making possible the interchange by water of bulk commodities between the great industrial complexes, and tremendous quantities of bulk materials, of the Great Lakes region, the Ohio Valley, and the gulf would be vital to the basic industries fundamental to economic growth. With the forecast of a 350 million population and a gross national product of $2 trillion by the year 2000, construction of this great connecting waterway is most urgent. It should be started now. The days lost cannot be regained.

The reclamation program should be expedited. With United States and world population skyrocketing, our present embarrassment of riches in surplus food may well dwindle to a tragic shortage. Even today, when opponents of reclamation point to our surplus stocks of certain food and fiber they conveniently overlook the fact that irrigated lands for the most part produce crops not in surplus, and that irrigation in fact reduces surpluses by permitting land to be used for more valuable crops which are in no way surplus.

The menace of pollution is increasing, in spite of valiant and in many cases successful efforts to combat it. Pollution renders water unfit for human and industrial use. It destroys our fish and wildlife resources, and ruins the recreational value of our streams. Efforts must be doubled and redoubled to overcome this threat to our people.

The continuation and intensification of planning for multiple-purpose river basin projects is essential. For example, we must continue the present trend of assigning more and more importance to increasing the opportunities for outdoor recreation, which grows increasingly important to our physical and mental health as the tensions of our complex industrial society multiply. We must also continue to strive for the preservation of our fish and wildlife resources, and for the beautification of our country. Sound judgment, aided by enlightened public opinion, must be depended upon to make the best and most fruitful allocation of our water resources among the many purposes which they must serve.

I have tried to present a brief outline of our accomplishments in the past, and our needs for the future. I am confident that those needs can and will be met. I would not be frank with you, however, if I failed to mention certain proposed legislative and executive action which in my firm opinion would endanger meeting those needs.

The first, which I will discuss only briefly since I know that your association is alert to its menace, is the ever-recurring and now imminent threat of tolls on our inland waterways. The recommendation for imposition of a 2-cent-a-gallon fuel tax on shallow-draft vessels is again before the Congress. Its proponents claim that this is a small and reasonable charge. Actually, it would increase fuel costs by 20 percent or more, which to me is not a negligible amount. Of even more importance, however, is the fact that its imposition, in the words of the Secretary of the Treasury in 1964, is "the first step toward the recovery of all waterway costs." It is the camel's nose under the tent. It could, and in all probability would, ultimately result in the imposition of tolls high enough to destroy our inland navigation system.

Further, if this 2-cent tax is enacted, industry in its awareness that the traditional free waterway policy had been breached and that ever-increasing charges could be expected, would be most unlikely to make long range investments in riverside plants. I could go on at length but you are so familiar with the problem that I shall only state my conviction that the imposition of this or any other tax, toll, or user charge would reverse a sound policy dating from the earliest days of the Nation, would hamper and in some cases prevent the sound development of our water resources, would put the brakes on industrial expansion and rehabilitation of depressed areas, and last but not least would create unnecessary and hazardous inflationary pressures. I pledge to you my unalterable opposition to any such proposals.

The second problem which concerns me arises from the new criteria for evaluation of navigation benefits published by the Chief of Engineers in a letter of November 20, 1964. Much of this letter was sound and constructive. However, it provided that in estimating the amount of traffic which would move over a considered waterway improvement there would be deducted from the total potential traffic the amount which would move by rail after the railroads adopted low, water-compelled rates. This, to me, is extremely serious.

From a practical standpoint, I do not see how anyone could guess how much the railroads would cut their rates if the waterway were constructed. Secondly, if through some crystal-ball gazing the traffic, left over after this theoretical rate was guessed at, were not enough for justification the project might never be built, the railroads would of course not lower their rates, and the people of the area and the country would be denied the opportunity for industrial development. There are of course many other factors involved, including the possibility that under these new criteria a much-needed multiple-purpose development depending on navigation benefits for a significant part of its justification would never be built.

I think that the Corps of Engineers' traditionally conservative estimates are commendable. For example, the corps justified canalization of the upper Mississippi in the 1930's on a traffic projection of 9 million tons a year as compared with actual traffic of 34 million tons in 1964, for the Illinois River the corps' projection had been 7.5 million tons as compared to an actual 26.0 million tons in 1964, and for the Ohio River a projected 13 million tons as compared to over 100 million in 1965. Their conscientious and possibly overconservative estimates have happily resulted in the fact that practically all navigation projects built by them since 1824 have been successful. However, I fear that application of the new criteria for estimating traffic would have a seriously reactionary and possibly even crippling effect on the construction of the new waterways which the Nation needs.

This fear is unhappily strengthened by the fact that under the provisions of the November 20, 1964 letter not one navigation project has been favorably reported by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. It is my earnest hope that the corps will reconsider this critical problem and will at least defer its application until it has been able to solve the problem of the appropriate analysis of secondary benefits and other benefits properly considered under the provisions of Senate Document 97 and has developed acceptable data for consistent application of the cost basis in the evaluation of waterway transportation benefits.

Another threat to sound development of our water resources, in cooperation with local interest, lies in the bill (S. 2345) introduced in the last session of the Congress to change the name of the Department of the Interior to the Department of Natural Resources and to transfer to it all matters pertaining to water resources, including the water resource functions of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Power Commission, the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the water pollution control activities of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Passage of this act would create an all-powerful water czar. The agencies concerned have developed their programs over many years. They know and understand the problems of the people interested in those programs, and they are quite properly responsive to their wishes and aspirations. In one instance, that of the Army Corps of Engineers, the national defense would be weakened by the loss of what proved in World War II to have been an invaluable training ground for the Engineer officers whose great accomplishments were the envy of our allies and the despair of our enemies. I do not know if a serious effort will be made to enact this legislation. I do know that I shall exert my most serious efforts to prevent its enactment.

I have attempted to give you a résumé of our past accomplishments and our future needs, and to point out some potentially serious obstacles in the way of our meeting those needs. I am proud of our accomplishments; I am confident that we will (as we must) meet those needs; and I promise you my best and hardest efforts to overcome any and all obstacles. I assure you again of my firm support of the aims and objectives of your great organization.

Clean Up Washington First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which I submit here came to me in a rather roundabout fashion. It was first published in the Cincinnati Enquirer, and I first read it when it appeared as a guest editorial in the Chicago Tribune.

I do not agree with all of it. For example, it says Washington's slums are among the worst in America. I believe they are neither the worst nor the best. I have seen many cities whose slums would make Washington's slums look like pretty fair residential districts. The point of the editorial, however, is well taken:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 4, 1966]

GUEST EDITORIAL: CLEAN UP WASHINGTON FIRST

President Johnson has recommended to Congress a sweeping new program whose goal is rebuilding—both physically and socially—the American city. What Mr. Johnson asks specifically is the expenditure of between $2 and $3 billion during the next 6 years on what he calls a demonstration cities program.

The gist of the program is the selection of some 60 or 70 cities of various sizes for conversion into "masterpieces of our civilization." To qualify for participation, cities would have to meet a series of rigorous Federal standards; the rebuilding would unfold under the direction of a Federal administrator, and the costs would be shared by the city itself and the Federal Government.

The obvious goal is to show what can be done to rebuild and revitalize the burgeoning American city.

It seems to us that what Mr. Johnson has overlooked is that the Federal Government already has a demonstration city in its lap. The city, of course, is Washington.

The Constitution gives Congress "exclusive legislation in in all cases whatsoever" over the Nation's Capital. Congress, in effect, functions as Washington's city council, and the President is responsible for appointing two of the city's three District Commissioners (the third is detailed by the Army's Corps of Engineers.)

If the Federal Government is, as Mr. Johnson suggests, a fountainhead of wisdom on how our metropolises should be governed, one should expect Washington to be a veritable garden spot—both physically and socially.

But in reality it is a national disgrace.

Its slums are among the worst in America, and its streets are safe at no hour.

It would seem logical, in these circumstances, that the Federal Government devote itself to converting Washington into America's No. 1 demonstration city. If it does for Washington—for which it has undisputed authority—all of the things Mr. Johnson is talking about, if it succeeds in making Washington a "masterpiece of our civilization," the other cities of the United States will be beating a path to Mr. Johnson's door.

Components of the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard Wilson, in his article in the Washington Star, of February 4, gave a very good analysis of what the Great Society might cost in the future and what it means. His article is well worth the consideration of all of the Members of Congress.

COMPONENTS OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

(By Richard Wilson)

Most of President Johnson's fellow Texans don't have the faintest idea what his Great Society is intended to be.

On general principle, about half of them are against it or indifferent to it without knowing too much about it.

These conclusions of the Texas poll conducted on behalf of a number of Texas newspapers by Belden Associates of Dallas are received in Washington with atonishment.

Only about one-fourth of the adults questioned in the poll were able to give meaningful replies when asked what Johnson means when he speaks of the Great Society.

According to the poll, 48 percent professed to agree with the President, 41 percent confessed they disagreed with him, and 11 percent thought it better to declare that they were undecided. As might be expected, most of the Republicans said they disagreed with the President and most of the Democrats said they agreed with him.

The Great Society emerges as a great blob of impressions ranging from improving economic well-being to equality for all in the minds of Texans.

In this respect, if not in others, it may reasonably be assumed that Texans are about the same as other people in other sections of the country. The Great Society has probably not gotten over as a very well defined idea for the simple reason that it is not a very well defined idea.

All right, what is the Great Society? It is, of course, a public relations tag for a very large expansion of the functions of the Federal Government. Its main components are these—expanded Federal social benefits in the range of many billions, expanded Federal educational support at the multi-billion-dollar level, expanded housing and urban development again in the multi-billion-dollar range, assumption of local welfare responsibility in the name of the war on poverty on the multi-billion-dollar scale, plus a lot of fringe benefits such as beautifying the highways, planning the remaking of the countryside, maintaining job corps camps, purifying the rivers.

War may not always be with us, but the Great Society will be. Who knows what it will cost a few years from now—$30 billion, $50 billion?

Now does this mean that the cost of local and State governments will decline correspondingly with their responsibility? It does not. State and local governments have been growing faster than the Federal Government.

Local and State governments in 1965 employed 7,659,000 people. This was more than double the number working for these governments in 1942. Federal employment was 2,496,000. This was not much more than 10 years ago, and less than in some earlier years.

But the Great Society is not just money lavishly spent. It is much more because it involves the assumption that the Washington Government will accept and seek responsibility for moral and ethical leadership. It will accept and seek responsibility for general direction and indirect control of the main factors in national economic life—and hopes to extend its influence and methods throughout the world.

The scheme is grandiose, and what Texans and many others do not seem to realize is that it is being carried out on an ascending scale whether they want it or not.

In every respect, whether it is the war in Vietnam or the range of social security benefits, everything is much bigger in the Great Society than it was before. Bigness and expansiveness are characteristic, as is the extension of Executive authority and the scope of governmental power.

On the international side a reaction has set in, largely within the Democratic senatorial leadership. The idea that we are overextended and overcommitted has grown in the last year. The "neoisolationists" say that we must draw back.

It is conceivable, though not yet evident, that a similar reaction may develop respecting the domestic side of the Great Society.

Some new crop of "neoliberals" may decide that the commitments on social reform are not realizable in practical terms and that the Federal Government must draw back from them in favor of less centralized responsibility.

Remarks of L. B. Worthington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Remarks of L. B. Worthington, Chairman, American Iron & Steel Institute, President, United States Steel Corp., at Congressional Breakfast, February 1, 1966, Washington, D.C.

Thank you, Tom, and good morning everyone.

It's a real pleasure to welcome all of you to this first event of its kind for the steel industry. And the fact that we chose 8:30 a.m. as the hour of our get-together makes us all the more grateful that you are here.

As we look at the momentous challenges facing you Members of Congress during this 2d session of the 89th, we in the steel industry realize that we are deeply involved in many of them—Vietnam, inflation, the balance of payments, unemployment compensation, air and water pollution abatement, foreign competition—just to mention a few. The thing that strikes me about all of these issues is that they have one common denominator. That common denominator is people. People are your major concern, and they are ours, too.

Let me put it this way. It is people who elected you to the important offices you hold. It is people who work in the steel industry, who produce the goods and services the steel industry uses, who invest in the steel industry, and who buy our products.

How many people? Over 700,000 men and women are employed by the 225 iron ore mining and steel producing and finishing companies of this country in 36 States. The income of over 1,200,000 steel company share owners is affected by the financial and economic health of the steel industry. We are deeply conscious that people—hundreds of thousands of Americans—are at the base of our responsibilities, as they are at the base of your responsibilities.

When we talk of economics, of profits, of costs, or of Government restrictions—when we talk of balance of payments or foreign competition, we recognize, as you of course do, that all of these impersonal things vitally affect people, their welfare, their jobs, the quality of their environment, and their income.

We know that steel is not the central pivot on which the economy of the United States turns. The strength of our country is limited to no one industry. Variety and versatility are the hallmarks of our economy. But in every industrial country in the world, steel forms a base for many other industries. A healthy steel industry is and should be the concern not only of those in the industry, but those like you, involved in nurturing America's general welfare and defense potential. A healthy steel industry can also assure other industries that their favorite raw material—steel—will be available when they need it, in the amount that is needed.

It has been pointed out that the country that stands foremost in iron and steel production is the industrial leader of the world. We are glad to be able to report to you that the United States is still foremost in the production of iron and steel. In 1965 we produced over 131 million ingot-tons which was a new record. This was 26 percent of the world's production.

Although we started steel century II in 1964, the steel industry is no decrepit, aging crone. It is young in outlook, inventive in its research and development, heavily involved in expansion and modernization, initiating dozens of new types of steels every year, converting many of its processes to new and more efficient forms—and making higher quality steels.

Let me be specific: In the last 10 years, at least eight steel companies have built new or greatly enlarged research laboratories manned by the finest scientific brains to be found. In the last 5 years, two entirely new steel mills have been built in the Midwest, and a third is in the building stage. In the last 2 years my company alone has introduced over a hundred new or improved products, including steels for functions ranging from bedsprings to space capsules. In the past year, oxygen steelmaking, a recently developed process, accounted for 23 million tons of our Nation's steel production. In 1966, the industry expects to spend over $2 billion on new and improved production facilities—a new record after having spent over $13 billion in the previous decade.

The steel industry and its people are dynamic, imaginative, courageous and on the move. Despite high costs for labor and materials, we have confidence in our capacity to compete with any country, regardless of size or labor costs—provided the rules of the game are the same for all.

But there's the rub. The rules are not the same.

Last year 10½ million tons of finished steel mill products—about one-ninth of the total domestic market—were shipped in from abroad. So far as stainless steel is concerned, for 11 months of 1965, imported stainless steel cold-rolled sheets accounted for 19.2 percent of the U.S. market; and stainless wire rod for 57.8 percent of the U.S. market. Much of this steel was sold at prices well below the prices of domestically produced steel mill products. If lower costs were the only reason our foreign competitors were underselling us in our home market, we might not like it, but we couldn't complain too much.

The fact is that a foreign steel producer, under normal circumstances, can enter the U.S. market only by offering steel products at prices substantially below our current domestic level. He functions under an economic system in which he is virtually compelled to maintain the highest practical operating level regardless of his home market conditions. Then he must dispose of excess tons in the export market at whatever prices he can obtain regardless of costs. Pressures from his own government for dollar exchange or other reasons may also influence his entry into our markets.

In many cases, he is assisted in these disruptive practices by the availability of Government tax rebates and other forms of export incentives. To us, such business conduct is clearly an unfair trade practice and we believe that, if the existing GATT rules are unable to deal with this situation, the time has come to press for appropriate changes in GATT. Needless to say, we receive no corresponding stimulus enabling us to invade the protected foreign markets.

When I say "protected foreign markets," I refer not to tariffs alone—although, within the past 2 years, we note steel tariffs have been substantially increased in the Common Market countries and in the United Kingdom, bringing them closer to the already high Japanese tariffs. I refer more particularly to the highly imaginative—and highly effective—nontariff barriers which bar the entry of American steel to many foreign markets. Again, let me be specific: A net ton of standard 2-inch butt-welded steel pipe shipped from the United States to France, in addition to French duties, accumulates stamp taxes and transactions taxes all of which amount to $101.97; a similar shipment from France to the United States is assessed only $6—the U.S. duty.

What is the people impact of these heavy imports of steel in the United States? If we take the employment in the steel industry alone, our best estimate is that, had those 10½ million tons of steel been made in the United States, it would have meant over 70,000 additional high-paying steel jobs.

And if we take into account the employment impact in the steel supporting industries—industries such as mining, manufacturers supplying the steel industry, transportation, trade and a variety of services—the job total amounts to over 130,000.

Now it may be that some manpower analysts may take issue with our experts who developed these estimates. But whether the figure be 130,000 or more or less, there is no doubt that the importation of 10½ million tons of steel in 1 year has a decided impact on American employment.

This job impact is of concern not only to the industry but also to the union which represents the great majority of steel employees, the United Steelworkers of America. We believe the union feels as we do that the great and growing deficit in the balance of steel trade is a threat to the industry and therefore to the job security of union members.

But in addition to jobs, there is a further national interest at stake here. I refer to the impact of foreign steel imports upon our balance of payments—or perhaps I should say, more correctly, our imbalance of payments.

In a January 3 press release, Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, said:

"Overall steel imports in the first 11 months of 1965 were up to 9.7 million tons, worth $1,096 million. The value of steel exports was down to $460 million, producing an 11-month steel deficit of $636 million, perhaps $700 million for the full year. In 1955–57 we had an average steel export surplus of $645 million. Thus the deterioration of our balance of payments due to steel over the last decade is $1.3 billion, probably as large as our entire balance-of-payments deficit in 1965."

Considering the importance of the people impact combined with the national economic impact, we believe that the importance of equalizing the rules becomes manifest. We are prepared to play ball—and our $2 billion being invested this year alone is clear evidence of that—but if we're allowed three strikes while the other side is allowed five or more the outcome is obvious—we can't win.

For many years, the great majority of the steel industry have been proponents of maximizing foreign trade. But our devotion to continued liberalization of international trade is changing and there are those in our industry who have concluded that the situation is serious enough to warrant drastic action.

After all, as a nation, we believe in freedom to invest across national boundaries. But in the past 2 years our Nation has undertaken a temporary more-or-less voluntary restriction on investments abroad, because of our imbalance of payments. Perhaps some similar temporary arrangement to prevent unfair and unrestricted imports of steel may be desirable—and for the same reasons—while we seek a more permanent solution.

Two measures are pending in the Congress which have a direct bearing on the problem. In the Senate, the Hartke resolution contemplates a thorough study of the steel import problem, to be made by appropriate Government agencies. Through American Iron and Steel Institute, we have advised Senator HARTKE of our interest in and endorsement of the sense of his resolution, and will be prepared to testify on it when hearings are called.

The other measure is the Herlong-Hartke 1965 Antidumping Act Amedments, which is helpful as far as it goes. It is quite possible, however, that mare effective measures will be required to make the Antidumping Act a practical deterrent to dumping.

We do not now have all the answers, but we hope that, as proposals are made and hearings are held in this critical area of foreign trade rules, you will let us come back to you later in the legislative year, as individual companies and through the Institute, to suggest ways in which these problems can be solved in a manner consistent with the national interest. We are mindful of the fact that the Congress must, by mid-1967, review the entire field of foreign trade policy in connection with an possible renewal of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and we hope to be able to contribute to the development of that policy as it affects our industry.

In addition to foreign imports, there are other issues—people issues and economic issues that concern us. And let us bear in mind that economic issues and people issues are one and the same.

It was both a people issue and an economic issue when, in 1965, steel companies and the United Steelworkers of America were unable to arrive at a settlement. You may recall that the settlement was ultimately arrived at in the White House on the basis of heavy cost increases which the Council of Economic Advisers said were at the guidepost figure of 3.2 percent per year, but which our figures show to be substantially higher. We needn't to go into a debate as to the arithmetic at this point, but we would like to draw your attention to an additional cost factor: As a result of amendments to the Social Security Act, including medicare, social security taxes on both employees and employers were increased substantially last month—almost 5 cents an hour for the steel companies. This is on top of the negotiated increase.

We are certainly not debating the merits of the 1965 Social Security Amendments. But it is important to recognize that, no matter how desirable the objectives, a necessary byproduct is the addition of substantial costs to high wage industries such as steel, thereby further handicapping the industry in its international trade competition.

A pending measure before the Congress carried over from last year is H.R. 8282, a bill that would virtually federalize the State unemployment insurance programs. I could make many criticisms of this bill, but this is hardly the forum for a full discussion of it. I will point out, however, that this bill would greatly increase employer unemployment compensation taxes. Again our costs would be increased, our competitive position further worsened.

Another pressing problem is that increased steel production in the past 3 years has resulted in critical shortages of alloying metals such as molybdenum and of coating metals such as zinc. Congress authorized releases of these badly needed metals from stockpile surpluses from time to time, for which the industry is grateful. Currently, bills have been introduced by Representative DENT to alleviate the critically short supply of moly through additional stockpile release, suspension of tariff duties to encourage the flow of more Canadian moly into this country, and through the temporary curtailment of moly exports. It is hoped that these bills will receive sympathetic and prompt consideration from the Congress.

Another item on the legislative horizon (which may not come up for action this year) is a proposal, made to the President by a Cabinet-level committee to provide extensive and rigorous Federal regulation over private pension programs. Practically all steel industry employees are covered by private pension programs, some of which go back over 50 years. Pension costs are an important part of steel company employment costs. The proposals, according to our pension experts, would introduce undesirable rigidities into pension programs, which certainly will not serve to encourage the development of private pension plans. In fact, many of the proposals would have a contrary effect.

A subject close to your hearts and ours is the tough problem of enhancing our environment through air and water pollution abatement. We know the magnitude of the problem and share your concern about the impact of pollution on people and on resources. In the new steel mills, we believe the problem has been solved as thoroughly as modern-day science knows how. In our own Fairless Works, for example, I am assured that the water we return to the Delaware River is purer than the water we take from it. The same can be said, I am sure, of the newer mills built by other steel companies at Portage and Burns Harbor, Ind. Similarly, air pollution abatement facilities in the newer mills are the finest we can obtain.

It is in the older mills that the real problem exists, for the enormity of the costs is breathtaking. As Representative RICHARD McCARTHY, of New York, pointed out, it has been estimated that it would cost $25 billion just to halt the present pollution of the Great Lakes from all sources. Bringing it down to our own industry, a single steel plant of a medium-sized company is currently spending $11 million over a 3-year period for water pollution control facilities. It is generally known that an electrostatic precipitator for a single open hearth furnace stack costs upward of $1 million. These expenditures produce not a single ton of steel, nor a single dollar of profit.

Nevertheless I am happy to report that progress is being made. For example, in the Public Health Service hearings on the Mahoning River last year, an impressive picture was presented on behalf of seven steel companies of progress in water pollution abatement. Blast furnace effluent was then being 75 percent treated, and was to be 100 percent treated before this year is out. Similar heartening progress was reported on other aspects of water pollution abatement.

Continued progress can be greatly facilitated by appropriate tax measures for investments required for aid and water pollution abatement—investments required for environmental rather than production reasons. A combination of rapid amortization and adequate investment credits for such investments is clearly called for. Bills to this effect have already been introduced.

In our judgment these remarks about costs represent no disparity with my earlier expressed concern about people. When costs rise, profits fall. When profits are in jeopardy, jobs are in jeopardy, and people are in jeopardy. In fact, the most dangerous demagoguery is that which attempts to set property rights against human rights. For all of us recognize that the right to own property, whether it be one's own home or a share of stock saved for retirement, is one of the most precious human rights.

Steel industry profits loom large when stated in dollars, since production and revenues are stated in millions of tons and billions of dollars. In 1964, steel industry profits, in terms of percentage of net worth, were, however, among the seven lowest of 41 industries analyzed by the First National City Bank of New York. The 1965 figures are not in yet, but despite a record-breaking production year, we doubt that our industry will show much change in our relative standing on that list.

Gentlemen, you have been patient. We hope you may recognize the strength and dynamism which our private competitive enterprise has made possible in the steel industry of the United States. And we also hope that you will recognize that we share a number of problems which, with your sympathetic consideration, we may be able to resolve in the interest of a strong, dynamic, competitive America from which people—your constituents and ours—will be the first to benefit.

I thank you.

Matching Skills to Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Human Investment Act continues to gain support across the Nation.

An editorial in the January 24, 1966, edition of the Chicago Daily News discusses the importance of matching current job openings with those who are unemployed. Developing skills and then matching them with job opportunities is a positive way to fight a war on unemployment. The Human Investment Act proposes a way to accomplish this matching process.

The Daily News editorial follows:

MATCHING SKILLS TO JOBS

The U.S. Department of Labor estimates that there are some 100,000 job openings in the Chicago-Gary area. Yet 90,000 persons are without work, and some have remained unemployed for weeks and even months.

John D. de Butts, president of the Illinois Bell Telephone Co., and chairman of the Chicago Merit Employment Committee, has pointed to a principal cause of this poverty amid plenty. The low skills of the unemployed do not match the requirements of the available jobs.

The national unemployment rate is now 4.1 percent, the lowest in almost 9 years. Most of the 2,900,000 without jobs are in specific economic backwaters, particularly Negro areas of the big cities, where education is poor and skills low. Unemployment in such areas run upward of 25 percent.

De Butts urged local businesses to adopt a hire-first, train-later policy to get the unskilled off the relief rolls and onto the productive payrolls as soon as possible.

This policy, too, formed part of the GOP state of the Union message, of House leader Representative GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan. He urged enactment of the Republican-sponsored human investment bill that would grant a 7 percent tax credit to encourage businesses to employ and train persons with limited education and skills.

Such a tax credit parallels a 7-percent allowance enacted more than 3 years ago to spur investment in machinery, plant, and equipment.

The GOP bill stipulates that a successful trainee must be offered a job. It applies only to persons at the bottom of the skills and income ladder. Industry could not use the tax credit, for instance, in the training of professional, management, or advanced scientific personnel.

This approach is more promising than many now used in the war on poverty. It combines, in FORD's words, "compassion with competence"—compassion for the needy with the competence of American business to train men economically.

The bill requires no increased Federal control, and avoids the waste of collecting tax money and then disbursing it.

Developing skills and matching them to available jobs is a key to clearing out stubborn pockets of unemployment and poverty. Congress should pass the human investment bill.

Depreciation: Its Effect on Business, the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, depreciation is probably one of the most little understood subjects by the general public. Yet, depreciation for Federal income tax purposes for business is of grave concern to business, the consumer, the manufacturer, labor, and all the rest of us.

This vital but not very glamorous subject was ably discussed before the annual Washington meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama by Mr. A. Wendall Simmons, Ernest & Ernest, Birmingham, Ala. I include it in the RECORD in the hope it will make depreciation more understandable for those who read this fine report:

STATEMENT IN THE TAX FIELD, PRESENTED BEFORE THE ALABAMA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, JANUARY 24, 1966

(By A. Wendall Simmons)

Subject: Depreciation.

Gentlemen, you may recall the association last year presented to you a statement on the inadequacy of depreciation for Federal income tax purposes. The date of that meeting was February 15. On February 19 the Treasury Department announced new liberalized depreciation guideline rules. Such a prompt followup greatly exceeded our expectations, but now that the standard has been set we are confidently looking forward to January 28 for another announcement.

Depreciation is not a subject which causes men to perform noble deeds, create a fervor of patriotism, or otherwise become excited. But to business, and therefore to the economy of this country, the adequacy of depreciation allowances is most important.

Now you may ask, "What is so important about depreciation?" You may say that a business eventually obtains an income tax deduction for depreciable property; that although an inadequate deduction may be taken in 1966, a more than adequate deduction will be taken in later years.

It is true in most cases that the full cost of a business asset is eventually deducted from taxable income. This is not the complete story, however, and the problem cannot be so easily dismissed. As we said last year in our statement before this group, Federal income taxes drain the cash of a business each year, and thereby create great financing problems for business. Cash that should be used for the purchase of more efficient plant or for expansion must be used instead to pay Federal income taxes. Not only must the taxes for the preceding year be paid, but those for the current year must be partially prepaid. And often the prepayment is made before the cash has been collected from the customers of the business. The business must either go into debt or postpone buying the machinery which will make its plant more efficient and capable of meeting the demands of the market for the product of the business. A deduction for depreciation in 1975 when it should have been taken in 1965 certainly creates a cash problem for the business in 1965, even though eventually a full deduction is obtained. One of the key factors considered by businessmen in the purchase of equipment and expansion of operations is the cash flow arising from the purchase. If the cash flow is slow, the decision may be to not make the purchase. Certainly if the cash flow is rapid and favorable, the decision to purchase is made easier. A major reason for the emphasis on cash flow is the necessity to amortize debt that is often created by the new acquisition.

The Treasury Department has attempted in 1962 and again in 1965 to provide guidelines for determining depreciation. These procedures had the objectives of reducing controversy over depreciation between taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service, and to provide more liberal lives. As someone has observed, the number of engineer Internal Revenue agents who are responsible for making depreciation determinations has nearly doubled within the past 5 years, and I believe those fellows are going to cause problems for taxpayers. And although the lives for personal property were generally reduced by the Treasury Department, the Treasury's requirement that a businessman must add or replace property within the time limits dictated by national averages is going to serve as a drag on the beneficial effects of the ruling. The Treasury has pointed to the tremendous increase of the cash flow of corporations, over $1 billion annually, as proof of the soundness of the guidelines. The proponents of the guidelines however overlook the fact that there was a moratorium for 3 years on the replacement or addition test, and that therefore this cash flow may be sharply reduced after 1965. To the contrary, the increase in cash flow during the past 3 years points to the wisdom of completely eliminating the replacement and addition test. You may recall that Senator HARTKE has introduced a bill which would remove the test.

The Internal Revenue Code provides for the deduction of a reasonable allowance for depreciation. For years now a tug of war has been going on between taxpayers and revenue agents over the point of reasonable allowance. The question tends to be resolved on the basis of goods accounting for depreciation, or in other words, so-called realistic depreciation determined by using the factors of useful lives and estimated salvage value. Many corporations deduct for tax purposes the amount of depreciation shown in the financial statements issued to stockholders, and where required, to the Securities and Exchange Commission. Thus, we have become accustomed to the trend toward computing depreciation for Federal income tax purposes in accordance with good accounting principles.

The income upon which a tax is imposed is, however, determined by a tax statute and not by the use of accounting principles. The principles of accounting have been applied in the statute in order to obtain uniformity among taxpayers, and consistency from year to year by each taxpayer, but the determination of taxable income must be made according to the rules set forth in the statute which imposes the tax. Taxable income is a term that must be elastic. Our economic life is constantly changing; the demands of our taxing system change, and the concept of taxable income must therefore change, evolve, develop. The allowance for the depletion of a natural resource based on a percentage of income is not an accounting concept, but instead is statutory, with the objectives of attempting to allow relief for the exhaustion of unreplaceable minerals, and to encourage mineral development. The claim of right doctrine which requires the inclusion in income in the year of the receipt of cash even though services for which the cash was paid will be rendered in a subsequent year violates good accounting principles, but it is a court made rule for determining taxable income, and it must be followed. The Revenue Act of 1958 added a provision to the Internal Revenue Code which would permit taxpayers to write off 20 percent of the total cost of an asset, limited to $10,000, in the year it was acquired. The objective of this additional depreciation allowance, as recited in the House committee report, was to make it possible for small business to use depreciation reserves for expansion.

Furthermore, the committee stated that "this will make less critical the determination of the useful lives of assets in the hands of the taxpayer and the estimation of salvage value." This provision has nothing at all to do with good, sound accounting principles, but instead is a section primarily aimed at stimulating the expansion of business, and secondarily to reducing controversy.

The idea that depreciation for tax purposes should be determined by good accounting principles should be dismissed forever. Based on the premise that faster tax depreciation will increase cash flow and help to stimulate investment in plant facilities resulting in a healthier economy, either the term "reasonable allowance" should be eliminated from the section of the code permitting a deduction for depreciation, or a taxpayer should be allowed to elect to obtain additional depreciation. Precedent for such an election lies in section 179 which permits additional first year depreciation. For instance, why not allow a business to elect to deduct, for each of 5 years, 20 percent of any portion of the cost of a year's acquisitions with an annual limit of $1 million, and 10 percent of any portion of acquisitions over $1 million for 10 years? Where a taxpayer would not want to elect such a rapid write off, the Internal Revenue Code, as suggested by Senator HARTKE, would provide ranges of depreciable lives. This is only an illustration of the mechanics by which the additional depreciation may be obtained. There may be better ways, but the basic objective is to remove obstacles from the taxpayer's plans to improve his business. The recovery of the cost of a new machine, or a new plant against taxable income in, for instance 5 years as compared to 15 or 20 years, may be the factor which causes the new machine to be bought, or the new plant to be built.

The thought of computing depreciation based on factors other than useful life is a considerable departure from traditional concepts, and understandably it must be given careful consideration. But as we have noted, the concept of taxable income changes as economic and social changes occur, and the association believes the country's economy now requires changes in the methods of determining depreciation. In 1958, the House committee report gave these reasons for enacting section 179, permitting additional first-year depreciation:

"Small businesses have traditionally obtained funds for expansion and development through the reinvestment of the earnings of the business. Moreover, depreciation reserves have been a major source of funds used by small business for internal financing. Nevertheless, the regular depreciation reserves only make it possible for business to maintain its current status. A writeoff of one-fifth of the total cost of an asset in the year of its acquisition, in addition to regular depreciation on the balance, will in the opinion of your committee make it possible for small business to use depreciation reserves for expansion."

Such reasons are applicable today, but with respect to all business. There, the emphasis was placed on the needs of small business, as well it should have been. The association believes, however, that the needs of small, medium, and large business should be met.

The association urges the enactment of amendments to the Internal Revenue Code, with respect to depreciation which will assist the businesses of this country to meet their problems of plant expansion and modernization, and the competition of foreign industry. Although you are not members of the committees which initiate action on such measures, and you are unable, therefore, to directly cause consideration of the association's position, we ask you to take whatever indirect means may be available to you to obtain action on this problem.

Nuclear Nonproliferation Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have issued the following communication to the House GOP conference today which may be of interest to others:

From: Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Chairman, Committee on Nuclear Affairs.
To: House GOP conference.
Subject: Senate Resolution 179, urging negotiation of a nonproliferation treaty.

Tomorrow the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will take testimony from Secretary of State Dean Rusk on Senate Resolution 179 and the United Arab Republic. The Rusurge the negotiation of a treaty banning the spread of nuclear weapons. Negotiations toward this end currently are going on in Geneva at the 17-Nation Disarmament Conference.

Present members of the "Nuclear Club" in order of seniority are the United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., France and Red China. Sidewalk estimators claim 10 to 20 more countries could achieve nuclear weapons if they want to spend the money to do so. The most frequently mentioned candidates for membership are India, Israel and the United Arab Republic. The Russians also talk much about their dread of West Germany getting "the bomb" even though it does not appear to be doing anything about it.

Senate Resolution 179 undoubtedly will pass. It is doubtful the JCAE can find any persuasive witnesses favoring the spread of A-bombs and H-bombs. Politically being pro-proliferation is about the same as being pro-sin and antimotherhood. Therefore passing the resolution will be something of a pious platitude.

It could achieve significance, however, if it is amended as follows:

1. To recommend that the non-proliferation agreement to be accomplished by amendment of the existing Limited Test Ban Treaty; and

2. To recommend that the Limited Test Ban Treaty be further amended at the same time to permit the peaceful use of nuclear explosives.

Present terms of the Limited Test Ban Treaty make these uses practically impossible. The United States has a real need to dig a second "Panama Canal" and using nuclear excavating techniques will make the second canal economically feasible. We will have other projects requiring these techniques, so will many other countries even including the U.S.S.R.

For mankind's benefit it is time the peaceful nuclear explosives' locker be unlocked. This is a way to do it.

Iowa Southern Utilities Co. Promotes Industrial Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERT BANDSTRA
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, many areas of the Nation are today vitally interested in promoting industrial development and the Congress, in response to this interest, has enacted a number of programs to aid local citizens in obtaining new industries.

However, I think it is important to remember that Federal assistance alone will not produce a successful industrial development program. This requires, in addition to the support of State and local governmental units, the constructive cooperation of private enterprise.

In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members an article from the January 30, 1966, issue of the Des Moines, Iowa, Sunday Register, which points out the contribution made by Iowa Southern Utilities Co. to industrial development in south-central Iowa.

As the article notes, Iowa Southern Utilities has undertaken a farsighted and successful program to aid local community groups in bringing new industry to the area, and I think the firm is to be commended for this effort.

I might add that south-central Iowa's prospects for economic growth will be further enhanced upon completion of the Rathbun Dam and Reservoir, a project now under construction by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on the Chariton River north of Centerville.

The 11,000-acre reservoir, which will cover portions of Appanoose, Monroe, Lucas, and Wayne Counties, will become a major recreational center in the State. This, in turn, will provide the basis for the growth of new businesses.

The Rathbun project, of course, is financed by Federal funds. But economic growth in the area will still require the support of private enterprise, and in this regard the efforts of Iowa Southern Utilities should serve as a model for other business leaders.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the article from the Sunday Register:

IOWA BUSINESS PERSONALITIES—IOWA SOUTHERN UTILITIES DEVELOPMENT DRIVE PAYS

CENTERVILLE, IOWA.—Utility companies, probably more than any other single group of firms, have the biggest stake in Iowa's expanding industrial development.

New factories mean additional demand for electric, gas and telephone service for the plants themselves as well as for the homes of workers. Thus, it's only logical that one of the finest private industrial development efforts in Iowa would be done by a utility. And the Iowa Southern Utilities' development effort has a special motivation.

C. E. Parks, vice president in charge of rates, personnel, and industrial development said:

"Our very life in southern Iowa depends on industrial development. The outmigration of our people here is a well-known fact. Other areas have new industry fall into their laps. But, in our area, industrial development takes work. Yet, new industry is the only thing that we can promote to hold the people we have."

Much of Iowa Southern Utilities' distribution area is in a section of the State hardest hit by the rural outmigration. In addition, the decline of the area's coal production has compounded the problem of keeping residents gainfully employed at productive jobs.

DECLINE OF 18.6 PERCENT

For example, Appanoose County, of which Centerville is the county seat, had an 18.6-percent decline in population during the 1950–60 period. Several counties in the area had more population in the mid-1800's than they do now.

Despite this decline in general economic activity in the area, Iowa Southern Utilities has maintained a strong company with a good operating record. The firm's net per-share income advanced 9 of the 10 years bebetween 1955 and 1964.

The firm's attitude was reflected in 1964 when it was the first Iowa utility to announce it would pass on to the consumer, through lower rates, the benefits of its Federal income tax reduction.

The firm's industrial development program has been underway for about 10 years. In the first years, the emphasis was on rallying local community groups to the task of searching for new industry.

In the last 2 years, under the direction of David Swanson, the firm's industrial development director, the company has turned more to basic industrial development research.

For instance, the company publishes a "Directory of Manufacturers and Processors" and a "Directory of Industrial Buildings and Sites," cataloging the existing firms as well as the available buildings and sites for new plants. The directories are updated each year.

Its first report was on the opportunities for apparel manufacturing in southern Iowa.

LARGE LABOR FORCE

Swanson said, "We looked over our area and found we had a large available labor force but little in the way of marketable natural resources. So, we decided to try to get industries that used a lot of labor. The apparel industry seemed a natural."

The company has also published bulletins on State laws which affect industry. Its special report on industrial revenue bonding in Iowa came out within days after the Iowa Legislature passed the law.

The firm was able to get a jump on other areas by roughing out the bulletin's content on the basis of the proposed legislation. Only minor proofreading changes were needed when the bill finally became law.

The efforts by Iowa Southern, as well as the many community development groups in southern Iowa, are beginning to pay off. Mount Pleasant, in Iowa Southern's trade area, has been especially aggressive, while Centerville has recently obtained two major industries, a division of Union Carbide Corp. and a branch plant of McGraw-Edison Co.

In these and other communities, the local operating personnel also have a hand in industrial development. In Leon, for instance, Charles Eliot, the firm's resident commercial representative, is head of the community industrial development group and president of the Leon Chamber of Commerce.

IT'S PART OF JOB

Swanson said, "All personnel know that part of their job is area development."

President Robert W. Greenleaf summed up the company's attitude toward the progress made so far:

"We can't help but believe that the economic decline in southern Iowa is beginning to bottom out. We can't say there is any particular rise in population but we are keeping some who would leave, and the attitude of the people seems to be up-looking rather than defeatist."

A Lawyer's View of Professional Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, last year's president of the Tennessee Bar Association, Olin White, delivered an excellent address before the University of Tennessee's College of Law last April 23, entitled "A Lawyer's View of Professional Responsibility." Mr. White pointed to some of the salient problems facing the legal profession and urges his colleagues to speak out on major issues facing our community, State, and Nation. Believing the speech worthy of study by Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A LAWYER'S VIEW OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

(Address of Olin White, president of the Tennessee Bar Association, on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the College of Law, University of Tennessee, given at 4 p.m., Apr. 23, 1965)

I am glad that the program gives my topic as "A Lawyer's View" rather than "The Lawyer's View." This is a subject of importance not only to our profession but to liberty, justice, and to good government. It has not been discussed enough and as a result the views of the local lawyers and bar leaders have been submerged by an avalanche of talk on the subject from lawyers in government and in governmental staff, and their dramatic presentation daily by television.

I think the most important thing for the profession to remember is that:

"A lawyer must never assume that reason will eventually prevail."

The very basis of our profession and our duty must be to insure that reason and justice will eventually prevail.

Some may think my statement on this subject is a strong one, and I refer you to a warning made by the late Judge Learned Hand:

"That community is already in the process of dissolution—where faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists, to win or lose."

Whenever we assume that reason will eventually prevail the effect on the profession is complacency and the neglect of their duty and responsibility.

I would, therefore, like to discuss one very important subject on which I believe our profession has so far failed to make its thoughts and criticisms known:

The question: Is the Federal Government destroying the confidence of the people in local law enforcement and local government?

My answer is that it is doing so at an alarming rate.

Florence E. Allen, the senior U.S. circuit judge, has in the Women Lawyers Journal recently stated concisely the beginning of this journey which can only end in misgovernment.

Judge Allen says: "A controlling principle in the United States is that the Supreme Court of the United States has assumed the right to rule on State criminal cases and has reversed a number of important State convictions, thus creating distrust of our local procedures, greatly increasing the time spent in deciding cases, and often completely releasing the criminal found by State juries to be guilty of the offense charged," (Women Lawyers Journal, vol. 51, No. 1, winter, 1965).

The local government is, at all levels, being greatly damaged and if the trend continues local government as such will ultimately be substantially destroyed.

The Federal courts have assumed and taken such power over all State courts that each day we see examples of Federal trial courts or of Federal appellate courts removing cases from the State courts, dismissing and releasing hundreds of prisoners charged in State courts, without a trial on the facts in the case.

Many others are released in the epidemic of habeas corpus proceedings. Some are terrible crimes and some of the grounds on which the Federal courts base their actions appear to be less a reason than an excuse.

Most of us in this profession believe that the constitutional rights of the individual must be protected, but many of us do not believe that steps taken to accomplish the social theories of certain members of the judiciary, under the guise of constitutional rights, is in fact anything less than destruction or ignoring of certain provisions of the Constitution.

Recently the Supreme Court of the United States decided three cases before it and dismissed 3,000 cases pending in the State courts that were not before it.

At this point I might say that there are some who assert that the lawyer's responsibility does not include the right to criticize the courts. In support of my right, or indeed my duty, I quote from the late Chief Justice Stone as follows:

"I have no patience with the complaint that criticism of judicial action involves any lack of respect for the courts. When the courts deal, as ours do, with great public questions, the only protection against unwise decisions, and even judicial usurpation, is careful scrutiny of their action and fearless comment upon it."

Now let us return to the case in which the Supreme Court of the United States decided 3 cases that were before it, and decided 3,000 cases in the State courts not before it. They dismissed and released the 3,000 State court cases. They said they were carrying out "the legislative purpose of Congress." "I do not find one paragraph, one sentence, one clause, or one word, in the 1964 act on which the most strained efforts of the most fertile imagination could support such a conclusion" (*Hamm* v. *Rock Hill*, 1964.)

This is not the statement of an obscure State bar president. I have just read to you part of the strong criticism of the Supreme Court's action by Mr. Justice Black.

"I further say that the remarkable conclusion of the Supreme Court finds no support in reason or authority—I know of no case which suggests that the doctrine of abatement can be applied to effect the existing legislation of another jurisdiction. Until today the doctrine has always been applied only with respect to legislation of the same sovereignty * * * there is not a scintilla of evidence which remotely suggests that Congress had any such revolutionary course in mind" (*Hamm* v. *Rock Hill*, 1964.)

This is not the statement of some Alabama lawyer, but is only a part of the strong criticism made of the Supreme Court by Mr. Justice Harlan.

I further say to you that: "The truth is that it is only judicial rhetoric to blame this result upon Congress" (*Hamm* v. *Rock Hill*, 1964.)

This is not the statement of a Tennessee lawyer, but is a part of the criticism of the Supreme Court's action made by Mr. Justice Byron White.

Dean Pound, in an article on the responsibility of the profession, has said of lawyers that: "They are the engineers of social progress."

I might add that lawyers are the engineers of social progress under law, and I repeat under law, and the Court's duty is to interpret that law as applied to the facts of the particular case.

I am aware that Dean Pound was referring to a planning engineer, but to paraphrase I refer you to a railway engineer and to this I would say that on such a trip the brakeman and the switchman contribute as much or more to the safety of the life in passage than does the engineer.

When the college of law at this great university was founded 75 years ago, and for many years thereafter, prominent local lawyers and prominent judges wrote papers and spoke on such subjects in their local commmunities. Sometimes these were in the form of debates and in most instances they were carried in the local newspapers. In this manner the professional responsibility of the lawyer was discharged and the accumulated views thus received by the local citizens throughout the country were reflected in government.

The great scientific advances in modern communications have probably shadowed and for the present rendered the voices of prominent members of the bar in their locality of little force and effect.

Now before I go further, I want to be fully understood that I favor and will protect freedom of expression, freedom of the press, and of all news media, including television. I point out, in this modern time, that national press services and the daily dramatic television news programs are more apt to present the views of government, since persons in high places are ever ready and available to express these. Therefore, the citizen not trained in the law no longer hears local lawyers or judges express their views about the law governing these issues, or if they do so such views are submerged by the drama of television.

In television each afternoon from 5:30 to 6 the citizens gather in front of their sets and are given the news. This is very important and I always turn on such a news program.

However, when you watch these daily programs please consider whether or not they are indeed in part a dramatic presentation of the views of high officials in Washington. Therefore, when they are viewed day after day by the average citizen untrained in the law they are apt to be accepted without question.

The appearance of people of high office in Washington on television, or the quotes of such persons day after day on a particular issue must now have an overpowering influence upon the average citizen, not educated in the law, and who now has little opportunity to hear or consider the expression of local lawyers on both sides of the particular subject.

It is, of course, easy and certainly more newsworthy to present high officials in Washington on these programs in person or to quote from them. I am compelled to suspect that there is a line waiting for every television studio by such officials who, in addition to their duty as they consider it, further have the idea of the political appeal of such a dramatic appearance.

The answer that sometimes panels are shown on television, with each side being represented, hardly covers the subject for the reason that they do not get the audience that is given by the so-called daily news reports.

Furthermore, many suspect that the views of those who dissent on an issue are generally expressed by one person, whereas on a number of programs two or more favoring or inclined to favor the other side of the issue are presented. Of course, it is always easy to have the spokesman of government appear on television. He is willing, ready, and able. Whereas those who dissent have to be brought from distances and many have no appetite to travel these distances and to appear on what is sometimes an unpopular subject.

I do not say that the intentions and motives of the speakers or of those who transmit the programs are bad, I am sure they have the best of intentions. The question is, that the citizens thus informed take little time to read such criticisms of the issue as sometimes appear, and certainly see little or no need to discuss it with their local lawyer.

I might point out to you that within the last 90 days a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States was designated to mediate between one of the largest industries in the world and one of the largest unions in the world. This Justice temporarily left the bench and became a mediator. The force of his office on mediation cannot be denied.

Furthermore, here is a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States mediating on a subject which, more than likely, will ultimately come before the Supreme Court for a decision on the law of the facts.

Recently we saw a very dramatic presentation on television of the President presenting to Congress a bill and giving his arguments and support of the same. In the front row of the audience and among the Congress were certain members of the Supreme Court who were seen to applaud vigorously.

Is this proper? Is this separation of the branches of Government?

The Supreme Court applauds a proposed law which everyone admits presents a complex and very questionable constitutional basis.

Not only this, but the television audience, untrained in the law, is bound to get the idea that it is not only urged by the President but that it is being given instant approval by the Supreme Court of the United States. This is something I do not believe can on reflection be approved or defended.

One of the most interesting articles on this subject is that of Prof. Phillip B. Kurland, Chicago University College of Law, in the Notre Dame Lawyer (symposium of 1964). Professor Kurland, for the purpose of his paper, refers to the Supreme Court as Caesar with the theme that he has not come to bury Caesar nor has he come to praise Caesar. I commend this excellent article to your attention.

If we have reached the point where the Constitution of the United States is outmoded and if we have reached the point where it is not to be amended as provided in the Constitution, then I think the frank statement of Prof. John Roche is in point. I quote in part from Professor Roche as follows:

"I am delighted when the Supreme Court takes action against bad policies on whatever constitutional basis it can establish or invent. * * * Had I been a member of the Court * * * I would unhesitantly have supported the constitutional death sentence on, etc. * * * even though it seems to me that in a properly ordered democratic society this should be a task for the Legislature. To paraphrase St. Augustine, in this world one must take his breaks where he finds them." (1963 Supreme Court Review, 325, 326, No. 4.)

I do not agree with Professor Roche, but I can say for him that he is certainly not a hypocrite and if some proceedings and opinions of the Supreme Court are not to be viewed from a constitutional background, it would be better to place them openly before the public for their reaction without attempting to say that many of these acts are constitutional.

If we did so, public reaction would be prompt. The erosion of the Constitution, otherwise, may not be completely understood by the citizens until it is too late.

Although I commend Professor Roche for not being a hypocrite, I hope that he will not accept an appointment to the United States Supreme Court or if he does so that he would not take the oath which includes the support of the Constitution.

The other side of the candle reflects some light and I quote from a Harvard Law Review issue of 1964 in which Professor Kurland says in speaking of the Supreme Court:

"This phantom invisible to those who so frequently speak in defense of the Court was described thus by Professors Bickel and Wellington some time ago (1958): 'The Court's product has shown an increasing incidence of the sweeping dogmatic statement, of the formulation of results accompanied by little or no effort to support them in reason, in sum, of opinions that do not opine and of per curiam orders that quite frankly fail to build the bridge between the authorities they cite and the results they decree.'" (Harvard Law Review, November 1964.)

I, therefore, urge lawyers to speak out and let their voices be heard in the hope that the citizens untrained in the law may at least realize the road we are taking.

I would close by quoting Professor Kurland in his excellent paper in the Notre Dame Lawyer as follows: "Nor can the Anthonys among us who would use Caesar (Supreme Court) for their own ends * * * rejoice at his ultimate fate. For Caesar himself I should borrow the advice given Cromwell by Wolsey: 'I charge thee, fling away ambition, for by that sin fell the angels.'" (Notre Dame Lawyer, Symposium 1964, vol. XXXIX No. 6.)

Who's Kidding Who?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said and written about the agricultural labor situation in California during the last harvest that I think it is well to insert an article by J. J. Miller, of the Growers Association. This article should be added to the wealth of material on the subject. The article, "Who's Kidding Who?" is not only thought provoking but I am sure it is statistically accurate. Mr. Miller's article follows:

AGRICULTURAL LABOR: WHO'S KIDDING WHO?

(The battle over agricultural labor during 1965 was fought in the public prints as well as in the fields, and the stories which appeared were bewildering to the informed as well as to the uninformed. In this presentation, made during the recent WGA convention, J. J. Miller, of the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee examines some of the official statements made on the subjects and puts them in perspective against what happened down on the farm.)

If all of the articles on the farm labor situation appearing this year in just the metropolitan press were placed end to end they would probably reach from the city of San Francisco to the front door of the Secretary of Labor and back again to the front door of Palmer Mendelson.

Some of these articles were factual, others were not quite so factual and still others reflected downright misinformation. There were claims and counterclaims and there were charges and countercharges; there was even the suggestion by one State official of a menu for the Thanksgiving dinner of another Federal official, and this is perhaps the reason why your executive vice president, Mr. Castiglione, suggested that the title of my presentation be "Labor—Who's Kidding 'Who'."

The problem of trying to get the impact of the agricultural labor problem over to the public might be compared to the story of 10-year-old Bobby who was asked what he had learned at Sunday school. He replied, "Well, our teacher told us about when God sent Moses behind the enemy lines to rescue the Israelites from the Egyptians. When they came to the Red Sea, Moses called for the engineers to build a pontoon bridge. After they had all crossed, they looked back and saw the Egyptian tanks coming. Quick as a flash, Moses radioed headquarters on his walkie-talkie to send bombers to blow up the bridge and save the Israelites."

"Bobby," exclaimed his startled mother, "is that really the way your teacher told that story?"

"Well, not exactly," Bobby replied, "but if I told it her way, you'd never believe it."

So, it seems to me that government policies in the field of agricultural labor have fallen so short of their intended goals, that if the story were told as it truly exists, you would never believe it.

For example, one Government official in a recent speech had this to say: "The big story, of course, is in California, where foreign workers were used in a dozen or more crops in 1964. That number has been cut in half in 1965 and through mid-August man-months of foreign worker employment for the year had dropped from over 176,200 in 1964 to 6,200 for 1965. And the total number of foreign workers in the State right now is only about a quarter of what it was at this time last year."

But what he didn't say is that there were probably 35,000 more green-card workers in the State of California than last year, which, in my book, is still a foreign labor program without the many safeguards we had under the expired law permitting orderly entry of foreign workers to do these jobs.

And what he didn't say was that which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on September 28, 1965, that, "Federal and State officials report more than 15,000 Mexican aliens working illegally have been picked up so far this year * * *," and this again is a foreign labor program without any safeguards whatsoever compared to the controlled conditions that were previously utilized under Public Law 78.

And he continues, "in August seven southeastern and southern labor supply States participated in planning meetings to assess the availability of workers for Florida's citrus harvest; and later that same month, nine States and Washington, D.C. cooperated in a recruitment effort to obtain apple pickers for Virginia and West Virginia. These are selected instances. There are many others. While success in recruitment varied, from the standpoint of experience gained, all can be labeled successful.

I'm wondering if the citrusgrower in one of our largest valencia producing areas, where for the past 4 straight weeks the entire area has been unable to meet 39 to 40 percent of their prorate due to labor shortages, would consider this successful.

I am wondering if it is to be considered successful that our export loss in lemon volume alone approximates $1 million f.o.b. and, added to that, $250,000 f.o.b. loss in August on valencia oranges because our packinghouses were unable to fill orders due to insufficient experienced workers to handle the volume of fruit required.

I am wondering if it is considered successful that our cost per pound in lemon picking shows a 47.7 percent increase over 1964, or is it considered to be successful that our recruiting costs for labor have increased over 1964 costs from 88.9 percent to 206 percent depending on the area?

It seems as though, like the story of Bobby, perhaps if these things were told we would never believe it. So I will turn the question back and ask, "Who's Kidding 'Who'?"

The question might also be asked of one of our State executives when recently he was quoted in the Los Angeles Times as saying, "We have produced a record or near record crop with a labor force that was about 98 percent American workers and only 2 percent Mexican and other foreign nations."

But what he didn't say was that there were 15,000 illegal workers in California this year with no protection of the provisions of the previous statutory act.

What he didn't say was that which his own representative reported to the State board of agriculture; i.e., "Agricultural employment in California was off by nearly 41,000 workers the week after Labor Day compared to last year."

And what he didn't say was that there were 30,000 to 35,000 more green-card workers introduced into the work force in the State of California. I submit that these still are not in the classic sense American workers.

What has not been said is that many carloads of lemons have had to be reconditioned before, as well as after, sale as a result of serious decay caused by late picking. Our field laboratories report the shippers, in the main, have done an excellent job with this fruit (referring to the lemons) that has been too long on the trees. But much of the fruit should have been picked 2 or 3 months earlier. Had this been possible it would have had storage life and not have shown the spoilage in the hands of the jobbers and retailers. This, I submit, results in losses to growers as well as increased cost to the consumers.

What has not been said, according to our field laboratories, is that the spoilage or naval oranges due to decay in 1965 amounted to 400 cars as compared to 241 cars in 1964. In 1964, up to and including September 13, only 92 cars of valencia oranges showing decay were sold. However, in 1965, in the same comparable period 248 carloads showed decay.

In researching this particular problem, our field laboratory manager had this to say: "I also note in Nelson Painter's report of an arrival in Hambury on the MS *Loch Loyal*, 39,000 cartons had to be reconditioned because of decay. Last year there were only 5,000 cartons in the entire season on this ship showing decay. This did not have to be reconditioned. The *Loch Loyal* is one of the better ships and has a very efficient operating crew."

Continuing he said, "the lemons of the old crop remaining on the trees were pretty poor. This fruit should have been picked months ago."

Further in this report it is indicated that the percentage of decay on tree ripe lemons this year amounted to 22.8 percent and, as Mr. MacRill reported to me, I will quote him: "this fruit was picked in July but should have been picked in April. You will note than even the dark green lemons had many times normal decay for green fruit. It is rare to see decay in green fruit within 37 days of storage."

On still another occasion, a high Government official in a speech in Los Angeles this year, among other things had this to say:

"In general, prices this year for fruits and vegetables have not risen or fluctuated any more for crops which braceros used to pick than they have for other food prices.

"If there should be any more of this tampering with the truth about fruit and vegetable prices, or evidence that prices are being raised unduly, the public is going to be fully and quickly advised. It has a right to know."

However, on Monday, October 25, 1965, the Wall Street Journal carried an article entitled "Costlier Meals." The article by John Barnett went on to say:

"Food prices head up as labor shortage, weather cut harvest. As supermarket shoppers are painfully discovering, food prices are going up fast these days.

"The trend started earlier this year with big boosts in the prices of meat. Now the cost of eating is being driven even higher by sharp jumps in the prices of canned and frozen fruits and vegetables—and the worst is yet to come * * *.

"It all adds up to quite a blow for the household budget * * *.

"The price hikes have become especially pronounced in the past few days. Some major packing companies have raised prices on canned fruits and vegetables more than 20 percent. The increases vary from item to item, but most increases are substantial. A packing company executive ticks off some of the changes from last year in cannery prices for canned goods: Yellow cling peaches up 12.2 percent, pears up 22 percent, pineapple up 77 percent, fruit cocktail up 18 percent, peas up 9 percent, corn up 10 percent, tomato juice up 7 percent, and lima beans up 13 percent.

"The price spurt already is apparent in the Government's wholesale price index for processed foods, which includes meats, dairy products and canned and frozen vegetables and fruit. In September, the index hit 106.7 percent of the 1957–59 average, down a bit from August's record 106.9 percent but up 3.4 percentage points from the May level and nearly 5 points from August 1964. * * *

"An early factor in the current price upswing was the Government's termination last December 31 of the bracero program."

This same Government official, not too long ago, in reply to statements that imports to the United States from Mexico have been on the increase, said that there was no appreciable increase in the import of agricultural commodities to the United States and no mass exodus of U.S. farmers to Mexico.

Assuming that this is true, the fact remains that the long-term effect of U.S. labor policies will be a serious and a continuing blow to the economy, not only of California, but of the United States.

For example, just recently I had occasion to check on this personally and a single nursery in the Coachella Valley has shipped in excess of 500,000 orange trees to the Hermosillo area of Mexico. These are enough trees for a planting of approximately 5,000 acres.

The same nursery is also shipping seed to Mexico in 100-pound lots. It is estimated that enough seed has been shipped to Mexico to plant 20,000 acres.

Citrus in Mexico is being planted with the aid of loans by the Mexican Government. One of the prime purposes is to export to the U.S. market.

Let me, if I may, bring out another example, which I think the public has a right to know. If you will bear with me, I should like to read from a memo I received in my office not too long ago.

" 'A Farming Contract Available in Mexico.' A large dam has been built and is now ready to serve the farming area known as the Fuerte Valley in the west coast state of Sinaloa, Mexico.

"The landowners have formed a farming co-op and are looking for a contractor to clear and put into cultivation some million acres of level farmland.

"What they have in mind is for the contractor to make lump-sum contracts to clear and plant parcels of 75,000 acres at a time. He is to receive his pay from the sale of the crop produced; the Government will guarantee a definite price for his crop, or he may sell it through private sources.

"As a sort of bonus, they will give the contractor 25,000 acres for himself to clear, plant, and sell his crops to either the Government subsidized farm-support program or to private buyers. On this 25,000 acres, he is to be reimbursed for all his capital and operating expenses first, and then he is to receive one-third of the profits on this venture for 5 years.

"They want someone who has the knowledge and ability to handle a project of this size, because as soon as he has finished the first 75,000-acre contract and his 25,000-acre bonus contract, he is to get another 75,000-acre contract until the entire valley is placed under cultivation. The contractor should have from $500,000 to $2,000,000 working capital to handle this venture.

"The contract will be fully supported by the co-op and the governor of the state of Sinaloa, who guarantees that they will give every needed clearance and legal help the contractor might require.

"If you are interested in a venture of this kind and size, you will receive proper evidence, detailed information, and entree to the principals handling this project in Mexico."

In conclusion, the question might be asked, What has been done and what is being done? Hundreds of thousands of pages in dozens of studies have been compiled—one of which seem to give the answers some people want—so they pile up and gather dust.

The most recent of these studies is a work by Harland Padfield and William E. Martin for the University of Arizona entitled—"Farmers, Workers, and Machines." This is, in my opinion, a well prepared document, and like some other, I am afraid, their conclusions might not be what some people want.

For example, on page 294, this report states:

"Public Law 78 and Its Administration.

"1. Public Law 78 should be extended or some similar law enacted. However, no increases in the total foreign farm labor supply should be allowed.

"Even with an extension of this law, the use of Mexican national workers would decrease rapidly without the aid of restricted legislation under technological and economic pressures already set in motion. The only restriction should be on greatly increasing the importation of Mexican nationals, thus avoiding formation of some new capital-saving, labor-using technology. Ending the program now will cause chaotic conditions within some crops and regions as adoption of new methods and technologies will be forced at too rapid a rate. During this period, consumer prices may rise precipitously.

"The removal of the braceros simply implies the elimination of jobs they were performing. At the same time, the lower occupational classes, now complementary to the braceros' tasks, will be also eliminated. New but fewer jobs will be created for a different (and higher) occupational class. Continuation of the bracero program would cause these changes to occur more gradually while economic, social, and technological processes eliminate the program within the next few years in a smooth and relatively nondisruptive manner."

On page 295, we find the following:

"OTHER FORMS OF ALIEN LABOR

"To attempt to alleviate farm labor shortages by a naturalization process, such as under Public Law 414, is most undesirable. The green card worker cannot be regulated precisely in accordance with labor demand. Once admitted to the United States he is free to move to any area and any industry. If he encounters social or economic difficulty he becomes a problem to society as a whole rather than being only a farm labor cost. He is a year-round problem imported to answer a seasonal labor demand."

And we quote from page 296 of this report as follows:

"Whose responsibility are these technologically obsolete workers? To use a specific example, whose responsibility are the Anglo-isolates described in chapter 17 or the Indians described in chapter 18? Certainly we cannot blame their impoverished condition on the farmers for whom they usually work. The farm provides them a job where no other sector of our economy can. The Anglo-isolates are on the farm because they have been rejected elsewhere. The Indians are on the farm because the farm allows them to continue to participate in reservation life."

And finally, may I go back to the front of the book under "Acknowledgments"—it says this:

"This study was financed by contract funds from the Bureau of Employment Security of the U.S. Department of Labor."

A World Leader Spoke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, those who watched the President of the United States deliver his state of the Union address, either in person or on television, saw an outstanding leader at his very best.

The Detroit News, in an editorial on January 13, declared that the President "was at his best—persuasive, nonevasive, rock firm without being belligerent, determinedly hopeful for peace but offering Americans no easy way out, at times quite eloquently moving, and throughout, utterly convincing."

The editorial added, "It was the true voice of America the world heard last night."

I share this editorial view of the Detroit News, and I am sure that few other editorials, columns, or news articles analyzed or interpreted the President's state of the Union message as thoughtfully or as clearly as did the News editorial writer.

I have permission, Mr. Speaker, to have this editorial made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATE OF THE UNION—A WORLD LEADER SPOKE

Bringing the Vietnam record up to date for the Nation, its foes and the whole world, President Johnson last night was at his best—persuasive, nonevasive, rock firm without being belligerent, determinedly hopeful for peace but offering Americans no easy way out, at times quite eloquently moving, and throughout utterly convincing.

He spoke of our military might without bragging. He underlined our decade-long commitment to the South Vietnamese people which some of his critics—but not President Johnson—would have us run out on. He warned that foe that their strategy was illusory; that the enemy was no longer close to victory and no longer had time on his side.

Mr. Johnson brought it home to the American people that not Americans alone are fighting and dying. Eight South Vietnamese died for every American who gave his life last year. And to those of his countrymen doing today in Vietnam what Americans had done before them in Flanders fields, against the forces of Hitler and Tojo and Mussolini, and in Korea, he pledged: "You will have everything you must have: every gun, every dollar, and every decision—whatever the cost and whatever the challenge."

Thankfully, he wasted no time or words on those who would snatch at peace at almost any price, that frenetic fringe ranging from professors to draft card-burning students. He had no time to waste on their state of mind in his state of the Union message.

Yet it was in this field, in his determination to seek an honorable peace that he spoke with the most warming conviction of all. Mr. Johnson said:

"We have made it clear, from Hanoi to New York, there are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will meet at any conference table, discuss any proposals—4 points, or 14, or 40—and consider the views of any group. We will work for a ceasefire now or once the discussions begin. We will respond if others reduce their use of force. We will withdraw our soldiers once South Vietnam is securely guaranteed the right to shape its own future."

It is all there. What more can a man do? What more can a foe expect? What else would the critics have him say? We stand by the terms that ended the first Vietnam war. We are prepared to stand by and for the neutrality of Laos spared 4 years ago from what its neighbors suffer today. "We will consider the views of any group." This is perhaps the most telling offer of all.

It means we now accept that we must talk to the Vietcong or its political arm, the National Liberation Front. Mr. Johnson didn't say we'd buy what they demand. He didn't promise them a seat in any future South Vietnam Government. That's up to the South Vietnamese when, safe from coercion and bullets, they can make a free choice.

He didn't contend the Reds' 4 points or his own 14 (like President Wilson's two generations ago) were the limit. The field is wide open. And, on this, he warned Americans, also, that, should a cease-fire come about, it will be only the start, not the end. There'll be a long, hard pull for all at any conference table.

He confirmed we have communicated privately wth our adversaries and he publicly offered them another choice: Either a ceasefire now even before negotiations begin—a tacit, unpoliced moratorium—or when talks are underway. He did not set a time limit on our bombing pause, which was wise. We have an obligation to our GI's on the ground, too. But he did say: "We will respond if others reduce their use of force."

There it is, clear and unequivocal—an open-ended offer to talk peace. So far there has been no definitive response. If there be none at all, then it may be days and months and years, but: "We shall stay as long as aggression commands us to battle." We shall not abandon Asia to conquest.

The mailed fist and the hand of friendship at the same time, the warning we'll see it through whatever the cost, yet the offer also of aid to all Vietnamese, North and South. Here was compassion and determination, resolve without riproaring threats. It was the true voice of America, the world heard last night.

War on Poverty Allocated $8 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a reporter, Margaret Josten, of the Cincinnati Enquirer, has written a seven-part series on the antipoverty program in Cincinnati. Today, I include the fourth part of her series to illustrate the kind of reporting that helps inform the public about the various antipoverty programs at work in our communities under the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

WAR ON POVERTY ALLOCATED $8 MILLION

(By Margaret Josten)

It costs about $8 million to buy a 707 jet or to build a significant stretch of expressway through an urban area.

Warring on poverty is expensive business too—if the approximately $8 million (90 percent Federal, 10 percent local) allocated in the Cincinnati area since January 1965 is any indication of what it will cost before the big job is done.

Explaining the reasons for the cost of the war on poverty has been and probably will remain a major chore of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, as well as for John E. Hansan, executive director of the Community Action Commission, local arm of the operation.

HOW MANY BENEFIT?

How many of the poor are actually getting benefits?

Can the cost (the current appropriation for the entire United States is $1.5 billion) be related to the effect?

The second question is the most difficult to answer at this stage of the war. Even in Cincinnati, far ahead of cities which have been plagued by political bickering, the effort is mostly in a stage of mobilization.

Dr. Joseph Kershaw, formerly of the Rand Corp., now OEO's director of planning and evaluation, currently is computing the cost-effect on nine major battlefronts.

This cannot be done overnight, he says, principally because the programs are so new they have yet to show output.

MUST FOLLOW UP

To compute the effectiveness of the Job Corps, for instance, he will have to follow graduates into jobs.

Did the teenagers in the Neighborhood Youth Corps actually finish high school or did they get jobs on the open market? Did the children in Operation Head Start really get enough help to overcome environments considered detrimental to learning?

Some of these questions, he adds, may not be answerable for a generation.

Bringing the cost-effect question to Cincinnati in connection with its $8 million in projects is just as difficult. Speculation is easier here, however.

It is no secret that Cincinnati's civil rights leaders and city officials had some uneasy moments in the wake of Los Angeles riots which cost 34 lives and millions in property damage.

Mr. Hansan observes that Los Angeles had no antipoverty program at the time, while Cincinnati did. Neither he nor anybody else can say this was the reason or even one of the reasons trouble never erupted here.

NYC WORKED 3,000

But he does point out that 3,000 young persons in the critical 16-to-21 age group, generally from slum families, were employed in the Neighborhood Youth Corps at the time. To have gotten into trouble would have cost them their $1.25-an-hour jobs.

Then, too, community centers were operating in the slum neighborhoods. Adults, teenagers, and children were getting aid ranging from remedial reading to recreation to job counseling. Mr. Hansan says they were at least being shown that somebody outside the ghetto cared—which was hardly the case in Los Angeles.

Of the $8 million allocated to Cincinnati, about $4 million has been spent.

Mr. Hansan points out that the bulk of that money is being paid out in wages to people who have many material needs. It is not setting in savings accounts, he says. Rather it is going to department stores, insurance agents, grocers, shoe repairmen, landlords.

"It is only reasonable to expect these expenditures have a rippling effect throughout the entire metropolitan community in the form of expanded business," he adds.

BENEFITING THE POOR

How many of the poor are really benefiting from the antipoverty program here?

First, unlike the custom in some cities, the poor of Cincinnati are given a voice in policymaking.

Each neighborhood project has a resident board of directors which sends a representative to the metropolitan community action board where, as Mr. Hansan says, "You've got to be poor to belong." At MCAB four persons are elected to serve on the governing body of the community action commission.

There, in practice as well as theory, the people from the poverty pockets have the same voice as the representatives from the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce or the AFL–CIO Labor Council of Cincinnati.

They have shown, too, that the social sophistication of the poor is sometimes underrated. Take as an example the little speech a new representative made when she introduced herself and the three others at a recent CAC session.

She pointed: "He has a black face. She has a white face. She has a brown face. And I have a freckled face."

WEST END PROJECT

The West End Special Services Project, operating under sponsorship of Seven Hills Neighborhood Houses, Inc., is a good example of the number of poor getting employment out of an antipoverty program.

Of 72 employees, 65 are residents of the West End. Eight are Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees receiving $1.25 an hour. The other residents on the payroll are older persons getting either $1.25 or $1.50 for their efforts as neighborhood organizers or program aids.

The project has directly or indirectly reached approximately 27,353 residents of an area still considered the prime example of deprivation in Cincinnati.

Mr. Hansan says essentially the same ratios of professional to nonprofessional employees exist in other neighborhood projects.

MORE THAN MONEY

"The poverty we're trying to eliminate is not just poverty of the purse," Mrs. Hansan reminds.

"It's poverty of opportunity to enjoy the recognition of status and respect that comes from serving on boards and committees working for the public good.

"Even though they are poor they have as much desire to give of themselves as businessmen or professional people.

"What we are trying to do is to open the doors to them—to let them share the same opportunities as others."

Increased Federal Control Sought in Unemployment Compensation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, members of the Alabama delegation were privileged to listen to a thoughtful report on H.R. 8282, unemployment compensation, at the recent meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama. I would like to share with all the Members the thoughts contained in this report by Mr. Hubert T. Sullivan, director of industrial relations, Opp Cotton Mills, Opp, Ala.

STATEMENT IN THE EMPLOYEE BENEFITS FIELD, PRESENTED BEFORE THE ALABAMA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, JANUARY 24, 1966

(By Hubert T. Sullivan)

Subject: H.R. 8282, unemployment compensation.

President Lem, member of the Alabama congressional delegation, and my fellow representatives of Alabama business and industry, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to say a few words in regard to the attempts that are being made by the administration to overhaul and completely modernize the so-called antiquated unemployment compensation systems of the various States.

You are familar with the administration bill, H.R. 8282, which has been introduced and on which hearings have been completed by the Ways and Means Committee. The administration with the full backing of labor, is attempting to sell this bill as a modernization program, claiming that the program has not been overhauled in a good many years.

This is simply not true—the unemployment program is constantly being modernized and overhauled. Nearly every session of the various State legislatures make some changes in their unemployment compensation laws to meet changing economic conditions or to solve some problem peculiar to their State. The overwhelming majority of the changes are in the nature of increased benefits or other liberalization of the program.

During the year 1965 alone, 30 States (including Alabama) increased their weekly benefit amount. All but two States provide for at least 26 weeks of coverage. During 1965, four States increased their tax base over the $3,000 floor provided in the Federal act. This brings to 18 the number of States with tax base in excess of $3,000. Maximum tax rates were increased in eight States during 1965. Thirty-seven States have UC taxes above the required 2.7-percent rate.

A fair test to measure Federal legislation affecting socioeconomic legislative programs of the various States should be whether the proposed Federal legislation is designed to preserve and foster an environment in which the States themselves determine how best to balance change with stability and how best to tailor the programs to meet the needs and situations of the people of the various States.

Instead of preserving the existing systems of State unemployment programs which have kept pace with economic and other changes, H.R. 8282 seeks to displace, if not demolish, the State systems by substituting a centralized Federal system operating out of Washington, under the Department of Labor, which superimposes its own predetermined blanket requirements upon all States alike, the richest, the poorest, the largest, and the smallest, the most industrial, and the most agricultural. Does this meet the "test'" outlined above? Absolutely not.

The present unemployment compensation program has furnished us one of the finest, if not the finest, example of Federal-State cooperation that we have.

In Alabama, our unemployment compensation program has operated most efficiently under the direction of the Alabama Department of Industrial Relations. Scarcely a session of the legislature passes without the enactment of improvements in the Alabama law. For the most part, these improvements are worked out between employer and labor groups in cooperation with the State agency and are presented to the legislature as "agreed" legislation. In this way, the law is kept up to date and meets the needs for which it was created. Several minor crises have threatened and have been overcome.

As an example, in 1961, the trust fund had declined from a high of $65 million to a low of $44 million. A bill was rushed through the legislature which not only increased benefits and made other liberalizations in the law, but which imposed a higher tax on employers—with the result that the trust fund has built up to approximately $90 million at the present time. This trust fund balance represents 5.23 percent of the total taxable wages for 1964. Even with these improvements, the average tax on Alabama employers for the year 1964 was 1.60 percent—the figure for 1965 is not available as of this date. "Agreed" legislation enacted in 1965 increased weekly benefits almost 20 percent, and made other improvements in the law.

Does this sound like the unemployment compensation programs of this Nation are outdated and the States are asleep as Rip Van Winkle in discharging their duty? Absolutely not.

The provision in H.R. 8282 which increases the taxable wage base from the $3,000 per year to $5,600 in 1967, and to $6,600 in 1971 and thereafter is totally unnecessary to finance Federal and State costs of unemployment compensation programs.

On several occasions during the past 16 years, the Secretary of Labor has asked a Federal Advisory Council on Unemployment Compensation matters, composed of 34 members, and created by the Secretary of Labor in 1949, to consider an increase in the unemployment compensation taxable wage base. On each occasion, this Council has advised against the Federal taxable wage base, and have stated that such an increase was not only unnecessary for benefit financing purposes, but was in fact undesirable.

Increasing the taxable wage base at the Federal level would tend to discourage wage increases for employees and bring about more automation—thus causing more unemployment and aggravating, rather than alleviating, the problem. The States finding it necessary to find more funds for benefit purposes have on their own initiative increased their taxable wage bases.

House Resolution 8282 undermines and destroys the concept of "experience rating," which offers employers tax advantages for maintaining employment at steady levels. The Senate Finance Committee's report on the 1935 social security bill stated:

"We propose, as a further amendment, a provision that the Federal Government shall recognize credits in the form of lower contribution rates which may be granted by the States to employers who have stabilized their employment * * * all unemployment cannot be prevented by employers, but many employers can do much more than they have done in the past to regularize employment. Everyone will agree that it is much better to prevent unemployment than to compensate it."

The "experience rating" system has largely been responsible for encouraging stabilized employment, elimination of fraud and has effectively engaged the employers' interest and active support in maintaining an adequate trust fund and a prudent unemployment compensation program.

Benefit increases and extending coverage: By tying average weekly benefits to average weekly gross wages, House Resolution 8282 would produce some stunning increases in the payment of unemployment compensation. The bill would extend coverage to every employer who employs even one person for as much as 20 weeks in a year. All told, an additioanl 4.6 million new workers would be brought under the program. The costs of extending coverage to this new group of workers could become astronomical in that it covers a group where the incidence of unemployment runs high.

Disqualification: H.R. 8282 permits payment of unemployment compensation to the undeserving, changing the present insurance system into a welfare giveaway—severance pay program. States would be prohibited from disqualifying an individual for more than 6 weeks even though he quit the job voluntarily without good cause, was fired for willful misconduct or refused suitable work while drawing benefits.

The purpose of unemployment compensation was, and we trust still is, to tide over during short-term but painful periods of joblessness those employees who lose their jobs through no fault of their own. The program should of necessity be geared to the economic conditions existing within the particular State. The Federal Government's role should be limited to supplementing benefits for unemployed workers who have exhausted their State benefit rights, to become effective during periods of national depression or other nationwide conditions warranting such supplemental benefits.

It is our considered opinion that the provisions of H.R. 8282 which prescribe certain predetermined blanket benefit standards for all States by limiting the Federal tax credit on one hand by completely eliminating such Federal tax credit on the other hand, thereby enforcing adherence by penalty, are unreasonable and constitute an unnecessary encroachment of Federal control into the socioeconomic area of unemployment compensation programs which have been and continue to be best served by remaining within the determination and control of those nearest the issue and most directly concerned; namely, the respective States.

Thank you.

GOP Sees Issue in Expanded War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I have permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Tom Wicker appearing in the New York Times, February 2, 1966, entitled "GOP Sees Issue in Expanded War."

Similar stories have appeared in other newspapers around the country as well as in other media.

I, for one, do not want to accuse the Republican Party of playing partisan politics with this Nation's very security. Certainly the major political parties of the country owe loyalty and allegiance to their Government and its security above all else. I want to be confident that neither of them would play cheap politics with such an important issue.

However, publicity on this matter has been so widespread that I am sure it creates doubt in the minds of those who love their country first and their party no better than second.

I do suppose, however, the Korean war and the irresponsible literature distributed during the 1952 presidential campaign remain fresh in many minds.

At any rate, I insert the article and I am sure the Republican Party will want to take every step to refute its inferences and further, will make sure such predictions as to its future action will prove to be false.

GOP SEES ISSUE IN EXPANDED WAR

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON.—Republican congressional strategists believe divisions within the Democratic Party and the prospect of an expanding land war in Vietnam may be giving them a winning political issue against President Johnson.

They believe the country may eventually turn against a President whose party does not fully support him and whose war policy may produce long casualty lists without military victory or a negotiated settlement.

To take political advantage of this, the Republican leaders are pulling back from direct criticism of the Johnson policy and are deemphasizing their former hard line on how the war should be conducted.

Since Mr. Johnson is Commander in Chief, they reason, they will not insist that he follow a particular course or attempt to impose a Republican strategy on him. The net effect, these leaders hope, will be to concentrate political as well as constitutional responsibility for the war squarely on the President.

By 1968, they believe, Mr. Johnson may be in political trouble as a result of bearing that responsibility and the country may be ready to turn to a Republican, just as it turned to General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952 during the Korean war.

In that event, some Republican strategists do not rule out the possibility that their party might run a presidential candidate who would promise to end the war by negotiations, as did General Eisenhower. They do not want to foreclose any possibility by insisting now on a Republican alternative policy on which they would have to campaign in the future.

For now, Republicans hope to exploit the division within the Democratic Party to win the House of Representatives, or to strengthen their delegation there, in the 1966 elections.

For instance, Republican leaders left almost entirely to the Democrats last week the congressional debate on resuming the bombing of North Vietnam. Some Republican Senators like GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, opposed the resumption, but Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the majority leader, carefully refrained from speaking out on what he said was a military decision that only the President could make.

In addition, Republican leaders plan to take little part in any effort to force a congressional debate on Vietnam or a limitation on the President's powers to conduct the war. Many believe dissident Democrats, who want a stronger diplomatic effort to end the war, will try to force such a debate. That would emphasize their differences, among themselves and with Mr. Johnson.

A NEW APPROACH

Republican congressional candidates next fall also will be advised to force Democratic incumbents on the defensive by making them either accept or reject President Johnson's policy. The idea would be to emphasize Democratic dissension rather than to try to win by stating a Republican policy for conducting the war.

This new approach to the politics of the Vietnamese war is in clear contrast to the earlier Republican approach of urging a stronger military policy and warning against a negotiated settlement.

It reflects the general political uncertainty about the depth of public support for the Vietnamese war, as well as a desire to maintain a flexible position of support for the Commander in Chief without being pinned to a fixed policy for winning the war.

It also reflects some Republicans' resentment at the President, who they believe has sought their support for tough measures like bombing the North but who has not attempted to associate them with more immediately popular developments like the pause in the bombing and the peace offensive.

The shift in Republican strategy can be clearly traced in statements by Representative GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, the House minority leader.

In January of 1965 he insisted on a change of policy in Vietnam and called bombing supply lines in North Vietnam a "highly desirable first step." Mr. Johnson ordered the bombing of these routes in February.

URGED WAR DECLARATION

In July Mr. Ford urged air attacks on Soviet-supplied missiles in North Vietnam, not long before the President ordered the missile sites bombed. In August the Republican leader called for a declaration of war.

Also in August, Republicans under Mr. Ford's leadership issued a "white paper" on the war charging that Mr. Johnson, in seeking a negotiated settlement, "seemed to discard the independence of South Vietnam as an objective" of the war.

But when Congress reconvened this year, Mr. Ford's first newsletter to his constituents took a different tone.

"We will support anything which Mr. Johnson does to obtain a prompt, just, and secure peace," he wrote. "If this can be accomplished by immediate negotiations through diplomatic, channels, we favor such negotiations. If the Commander of Chief finds that further military action is necessary to achieve freedom and independence for the Vietnamese, we will support such action. Knowing that there is no substitute for victory, we will back the President in his every effort to achieve military or diplomatic success."

The concluding word, "success," appeared to observers here to be the key to the statement. In effect, the Republican leader was backing Mr. Johnson fully, both diplomatically and militarily; but he was also insisting that the Johnson policy produce "freedom and independence for the Vietnamese."

Statements by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon also seem to reflect the developing Republican position. Mr. Nixon conferred with Republican Congressmen before appearing on "Issues and Answers" on American Broadcasting Co. television last Sunday.

In that appearance he attacked Democrats who took "the appeasement line" but refrained from direct criticism of Mr. Johnson.

Again, a New War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph Alsop has given a very good analysis of the Vietnam war and the changes which have taken place in his column published in the Washington Post. His column follows:

Again, a New War

Saigon.—Behind all the churning and wallowing and tergiversation of American policy in these last 6 weeks, there is one very simple, bleak fact. The war in Vietnam has been radically transformed, almost to the point of becoming a new war.

The last major transformation occurred last summer, with the commitment of U.S. ground forces on a big scale. The President's decision to make this commitment was extremely courageous, and the commitment paid off magnificently.

Largely as a result of Secretary McNamara's reform and modernization of the Armed Forces, every unit committed was hard trained and combat ready. Green troops fought like veterans. Brilliant victories were won against heavy odds—which will no doubt surprise a lot of people at home, for we in the United States for some strange reason, were only told about the casualties and not about the victories.

In consequence, by the beginning of November, "the Vietcong main forces were nearly on the ropes." This summary was given by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. His view is shared by just about every other American out here with experience to form a judgment. At this juncture, however, the next transformation of the war began to be evident.

Precisely because the American commitment threatened to break the fighting strength of the Vietcong main force, as well as the North Vietnamese units already in South Vietnam, a massive further invasion of South Vietnam by North Vietnamese regulars was ordered in Hanoi. The new units swiftly moving in quite naturally upset the whole balance of the war.

This led, in turn, to the exceedingly grim briefing given to Secretary McNamara when he was last here. The chances are, in truth, that it was much too grim. For example, the North Vietnamese were credited with the capability of laying down 138 tons a day on the South Vietnamese border, via the Ho Chi Minh Trail. This tonnage, of course, would sustain all too many North Vietnamese divisions.

In fact, however, if the enemy is currently laying down 60 tons a day on the border, he is now doing a lot better than the wisest analysts believe. Furthermore, distribution from the border forward to the fighting units of 138 tons a day would require an army of at least 80,000 coolies, who would in turn consume about 65 tons of rice day.

Thus there can be little doubt that Secretary McNamara was given an exaggerated picture of the number of additional North Vietnamese units that can be permanently supported in South Vietnam. "Permanently" is the key word, however, for the desperate decision to eat up all the stocks accumulated and cached in the jungles by the Vietcong would, of course, permit a good many additional units to be temporarily supported. And in any case, without regard to future capabilities; the stepped up North Vietnamese invasion of the South had already created a wholly new situation.

Secretary McNamara's report on the demands of the new situation thereupon touched off the churning and wallowing in U.S. policy, typified by the peace offensive and the bombing pause. But no amount of wallowing and churning can change the necessities, as the outcome has shown. Three additional divisions, either three American or two American and one South Korean, are needed to redress the balance and recapture the initiative enjoyed in October.

This increase in General Westmoreland's troop requirement, from six to nine division equivalents, in turn means a requirement for more U.S. troops than can be rapidly provided without calling up the Reserves. For the time being, the President may perhaps think he can escape from meeting General Westmoreland's requirement by one dodge or another. If so, the enemy will soon enough teach him his error.

It is far more likely, however, that the President thinks he can meet General Westmoreland's requirement without calling up the Reserves, by using a whole series of clever dodges. For example, all sorts of specialized troop units, easily obtainable by a callup, are desperately needed to break the logistical logjam here, without which larger forces cannot easily be supported.

But at the cost of some delay, private contractors can be hired to attack the logistical logjam. By the same token, the Army's authorized troop strength has been greatly increased. Ready divisions may therefore be borrowed from the United States, with skeleton divisions taking their place in the Strategic Reserve.

But such dodges are dangerous and unworthy. They mean delay when speed is vital. They mean a further show of irresolution when stern resolve is vital. They mean no margin for the future, when the conspicuous existence of a margin is vital. Thus Lyndon Johnson's fiber, as a leader of a nation at war, is now being put to a supreme test.

Where Were the Pickets? Nowhere To Be Seen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper in my congressional district has raised a very pertinent and interesting question. Where were the antiwar demonstrators last month when the United States undertook its worldwide peace offensive? It is now apparent that the Vietcong, Hanoi, and other members of the international Communist conspiracy have thumbed their collective noses at President Johnson's 37-day bombing pause and his peace missions throughout the world.

If the noisy pacifists in America were sincere in their desire for a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam conflict, it appears that demonstrations against the Hanoi regime would have been in order. But they are not sincere. As a matter of fact, this is added proof that they are simply disloyal persons intent on embarrassing America and giving aid, comfort, and political help to our enemies.

An editorial appearing in the February 1 edition of the Tifton, Ga., Daily Gazette, concludes that the Vietniks operate under a double standard.

I wholeheartedly concur with the editorial which follows:

Where Were the Pickets? Nowhere To Be Seen

Any time during the past month would have been an ideal time for a demonstration by the Vietnam war protesters—a demonstration not against the United States but against the Hanoi regime.

It was that long and more since this country first halted bombing raids over North Vietnam. For 4 days during the Vietnamese new year's celebrations our troops maintained a strictly defensive posture, although the Vietcong's unilateral cease-fire did not include Americans.

In the meantime, Presidential peace emissaries continued to scurry between Washington and a dozen world capitals seeking the diplomatic formula that could lead to an armistice.

Why did we not see a march on Washington, or at least a few pickets outside the White House, to dramatize support for these efforts of the Government? Why no mass meetings putting a bit of pressure on the North Vietnamese who, as they themselves said, have been heartened by the activities of peace-loving American students?

Why indeed?

The silence of the past weeks has done more than the noisiest demonstration to expose th double standard of the vietniks and to prove the shallowness, naivete, and essential futility of their cause.

This is not to charge them with the blame for the failure of the peace offensive. They are not that important, and in any event a demonstration in support of the Government at this stage would probably have counted for little in the international balance.

It would, however, have been a welcome gesture of moderation and conciliation at home and have gone far toward reversing the trend that seems to be driving Americans into two extreme camps.

Thomas M. O'Ryan: A Professional Profile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay homage to a distinguished citizen of Memphis, Tenn.—Thomas M. O'Ryan, chairman of the board of O'Ryan & Batchelder, Inc., largest transit advertising firm in the United States. Tom O'Ryan's story reads like a chapter from the saga of Horatio Alger. His amazing rise in our free enterprise system has been the subject of a United Press International success profile, and his career will be the subject of a chapter in a forthcoming book on outstanding American businessmen.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix to the RECORD a profile of this outstanding American and resident of the Ninth Congressional District of Tennessee:

PROFESSIONAL PROFILES THOMAS M. O'RYAN, CHAIRMAN, O'RYAN & BATCHELDER, INC.

A 19-year-old Irish immigrant named O'Ryan applied for work with a New York section gang in 1932.

The job, digging a subway tunnel through Manhattan's bedrock.

Thirty years later, a new advertising poster went up in New York subways: "An O'Ryan & Batchelder Operation."

It was the same O'Ryan.

In the years between, Thomas Michael O'Ryan had become chairman of the Nation's largest transit advertising firm. When he was awarded the New York subways advertising franchise in 1962, O'Ryan had progressed from subway laborer to subway advertising czar.

His story begins in Ireland.

A. PLUSH TIMES ON THE AULD SOD

Tom O'Ryan, second of six sons born (in 1912) to Edward O'Ryan and Mary Cusack O'Ryan in Limerick City, Ireland, didn't exactly begin life with a silver spoon in his mouth.

In 1928, a family financial crisis developed. The elder O'Ryan's business plunged downward. Mary O'Ryan decided to make extra money opening a small hotel. Edward O'Ryan's wrath was old fashioned and quite Irish.

"No matter what happens, a woman's place is in the home," he raged.

The rift grew. Living at home became untenable.

B. STREETS PAVED WITH GOLD

At 17, Tom O'Ryan booked passage for the United States.

With $400 he arrived in New York in September 1929, registered at a YMCA, began jobhunting.

Within a short time, he was hired as a file clerk at a salary of $27.50 every 2 weeks. Indeed, the streets were paved with gold.

One month later, the stock market crashed. Tom O'Ryan was out of a job.

C. JOBHUNTERS ON COBBLESTONES

The era of wonderful nonsense skidded to a fast stop. In job interview lines, O'Ryan often heard:

"Look at that Irish immigrant taking jobs away from good American citizens."

Even that traditional Irish haven, the police department, was closed to O'Ryan as a noncitizen.

Right then O'Ryan filed citizenship papers. Later, he was awarded citizenship in the minimum time possible.

O'Ryan took spot jobs on boats. He worked as a messenger. He even applied as doorman at Radio City Music Hall.

"Sorry," the Music Hall's chief of service said. "You're big—but you're not big enough."

Would there be an usher's job available?

"You're too big to qualify as an usher," the chief said.

Size did prove helpful in landing the subway tunneling job. Unfortunately, it didn't last long.

D. DO IT YOURSELF SALES AND ADVERTISING

One day, as a messenger, O'Ryan delivered a package to a company trying to sell a consignment of damaged men's suits.

He volunteered to take on the job, investing his last few dollars in sales brochures describing the suits. Soon he was holding sales meetings during lunch periods, handing out brochures, taking orders.

"Within 20 days, I had sold several hundred suits," O'Ryan said.

E. THE BIG RHUBARB

Then, bitten by the free enterprise bug, O'Ryan borrowed $20, rented a horse and wagon for $4 per day. Every morning, at 4 a.m. he would arrive at New York's wholesale vegetable center, buy a load of produce, then clop-clop over the Brooklyn Bridge to sell it house to house in Flatbush. Often it was 10 p.m. when he reached home.

"On a good day, I made enough to buy food—for the horse," O'Ryan said.

"Why not specialize?" a friend asked.

That sounded good. O'Ryan chose rhubarb. He bought stocks of rhubarb, stored the boxes in his landlady's basement.

Unfortunately, the hot-water pipes caused fermentation in the rhubarb. The house took on a most distinctive smell. Pedestrians began using the other side of the street.

O'Ryan's landlady was irate. Only native Gaelic charm—and an offer to whitewash her cellar free of charge—saved the day.

At that time, to the envy of friends, O'Ryan got a full-time job as elevator operator at Saks Department Store. O'Ryan, soon catching the eye of management, was promoted to floorwalker.

F. BONANZA TO THE SANDWICH ISLANDS

From Saks, O'Ryan kept an eye on Wall Street. When he heard a brokerage house was hiring runners, he took the job at pay no higher than his Saks salary. He figured investment opportunity as a side benefit.

Soon he was investing a few dollars, then plowing it back. He parlayed his capital into several hundred dollars. When he had accumulated close to $5,000, his longtime dream of a tropical island became stronger. Why not go to the island paradise—Hawaii?

He quit his job and booked passage.

In Hawaii, he became restless. He started teaching school part time. Money dwindled steadily. When he got down to passage money, he sailed for San Francisco. He then crossed the continent in his entire fortune: a secondhand car with Hawaiian plates.

"I soon realized I could have gone to Hawaii and invested my money at the same time," he said. "I made a mistake: living off capital. I never did that again."

In 1936, he returned to Saks 34th Street store—broke, tanned, wiser. By 1937, Saks had promoted O'Ryan to assistant to dress buyer at $75 per week.

G. ENTER: TRANSIT ADVERTISING

Back in 1890, Tennessee's Barron G. Collier started selling streetcar ads in Memphis. By the time O'Ryan went to Saks, Collier was selling and servicing transit advertising throughout the United States.

In 1938, O'Ryan heard Collier was hiring salesmen in New York. He applied. The sales manager raised his eyebrows at the lusty Irish brogue.

"Ever sell transit advertising?"

"No."

"Look, fellow, we're turning down experienced salesmen," the manager said. "What makes you think you can do it?"

"I'm willing to work," said O'Ryan, turning red. "If I don't sell anything, don't pay me. Try me and see."

If a man offered to pay his own expenses, he must have confidence, at least.

"You're on," he told O'Ryan. "Twenty-five dollars per week draw."

O'Ryan joined several new men in for training. Then Collier announced out-of-town territories. O'Ryan was told:

"Your territory is Georgia and the Carolinas. You leave tonight."

Although he'd never been south, O'Ryan suspected a greenhorn Irishman would not be particularly welcome. However, admitting defeat was not within O'Ryan's character. He caught a train.

H. IRISHMAN IN GEORGIA

O'Ryan will never forget his first prospect—Craig's Honey Bread—in Columbus, Ga.

"Young man, we've never used your advertising, and we don't intend to start now," the baker told him.

O'Ryan went back Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. No sale. On Saturday, he took a new tack.

"I've been taught to answer all sorts of objections," he said, spreading his literature on the table. "Anything you ask I can find—even if I don't know the answer."

The baker sighed, "Looks like I'm going to have to have it. Better sign me up.

O'Ryan said later, "I think he bought so he could close shop and go home. But it gave me a big lift. After that, I started selling."

And sell he did. In 1938, O'Ryan ranked No. 1 in the Nation among Collier salesmen in bringing in 5-year contracts—the longest term sold. In 1939, O'Ryan's outstanding sales record won him promotion to Collier district manager for Tennessee, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

I. OUT OF TRAGEDY, NEW OPPORTUNITY

In 1940, shortly after founder Collier's death, the organization went bankrupt. Funds from the advertising business had financed disastrous real estate ventures.

O'Ryan joined a newly organized nationwide firm—National Transitads. He became southern division manager in 1942. When he became a vice president in 1944, he moved to Memphis, his home and business headquarters since. In the meantime, he made permanent contributions to the transit advertising field—

In Oklahoma City when all interior transit space was sold, O'Ryan developed the first exterior bus poster. (Exterior transit ads had been carried by streetcars. This was the first exterior bus poster.) Today, 65.9 percent of transit's volume comes from exterior vehicle posters.

O'Ryan expanded the exterior poster into the prototype of today's king-size poster—the mass display panel seen today on buses throughout the United States.

O'Ryan organized and served as first dean of National Transitads new sales school.

J. THE TOM O'RYAN ADVERTISING COMPANY

In 1947, O'Ryan resigned. In 1948, he formed Tom O'Ryan Advertising Co. He began by sighing an agreement to manage bus advertising in Memphis. In 1949, he acquired the Atlanta franchise.

In 1951, Tom O'Ryan was looking for a dramatic way to help Libby Foods get distribution for a new product. His reasoning: Why not put samples of advertising and the product on a bus—then drive it directly to wholesalers and retailers?

Thus the first merchandising bus was born. Since that time, O'Ryan has directed dozens of merchandising bus promotions. Other transit ad firms have put the concept to work, too.

K. O'RYAN AND BATCHELDER

In November 1953, a nine-city transit system in the Carolinas called for advertising bids. O'Ryan's firm was invited. So was Transit Advertising Co., Peoria, Ill., operated by Joseph H. Batchelder, Jr.

O'Ryan, who knew Batchelder from industry meetings, telephoned him and suggested: "Why not come by Memphis, and we'll go together?"

Batchelder agreed.

On the plane from Memphis to Charlotte, N.C., Tom O'Ryan and Joe Batchelder found considerable common ground in business philosophy. By the time plane landed, the two men had decided to bid as O'Ryan and Batchelder.

The new combination got the contract. O'Ryan & Batchelder, Inc., was underway.

By 1955, O. & B. was offering transit advertising in Charleston, W. Va., Indianapolis, Louisville, Milwaukee—plus 19 other cities. By 1960, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore had been added. Chicago was signed in 1964.

Today, O. & B. holds franchises in 70 U.S. urban areas. Advertising coverage throughout nearly 25,000 vehicles makes O. & B. the Nation's largest transit advertising company. O. & B. sales volume during 1965 was more than $16 million.

Tom O'Ryan, in the meantime, has been chairman of Transit Advertising Association, his industry's trade group. He was a prime mover in forming the World Transad Association—with members in the United States, France, Italy, Canada. He represents his industry as board member of Brand Names Foundation.

But for O'Ryan—a most active chairman of the Memphis-based O. & B. network—the best recognition came in 1962 when his firm acquired the New York subway advertising franchise. The immigrant Irish laborer had returned to the subways—in style.

Hon. Brady Gentry of Tyler, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article that was written by Mr. Dale Thorn, of the Tyler Morning Telegraph, Tyler, Tex., about Hon. Brady Gentry, one of the finest and most beloved citizens of Tyler and Texas as a whole. The article was reprinted in the Kilgore News Herald, on Tuesday, January 18, 1966.

Judge Gentry served with many of those who yet are Members of Congress. We all are pleased he is making a splendid recovery and wish for him every happiness and success in the future.

RECOVERING FROM ILLNESS—BRADY GENTRY REMEMBERED FOR SERVICE IN CONGRESS

(By Dale Thorn)

Each afternoon, Brady Gentry walks his niece from his fourth-floor hospital room to the front door of Medical Center Hospital.

About 2 months ago (November 7, to be exact), the former third district Congressman was stricken by a cerebral hemorrhage causing speech problems and partial paralysis of the upper and lower extremities.

Today, only the speech problem remains and the 70-year-old native east Texan is greatly improved, according to his niece, Mrs. Oscelie Thompson of 1223 Peach.

Ten years ago, while still a Member of the House, Gentry was in his prime. Just before Gentry's retirement from Congress, Representative CLARK FISHER of San Angelo paid tribute to the quiet-spoken Tyler solon, describing him as "the most interesting person I have met in Congress during the 14 years I have served."

"Never a party hack or a narrow partyliner," Fisher continued, "Brady Gentry always put the good of the country ahead of political considerations as he cast his votes.

"What greater tribute can be paid any man? His stature rises high above the run of party politics and back-scratching techniques."

On the Washington scene 4 years and seldom raising his voice in the House, Gentry won recognition as one who diligently informed himself on bills and voted his convictions with apparently no regard for party lines or political expediency.

In this and other respects, he was recognized as one of the most unorthodox politicians in Congress. He often voted in patterns that might be expected to lose a man support among his constituents.

Yet, in his one bid for reelection, against a formidable foe, he came out on top. In 1954 he defeated the man who had preceded him, LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Gladewater, who in 1952 made an unsuccessful bid for the U.S. Senate against Price Daniel.

Gentry spent virtually the entire campaign period of 1954 in Washington and repeatedly told friends that BECKWORTH was very popular and would probably beat him.

But Gentry won in a close vote and BECKWORTH returned to Congress in 1957 after Gentry stepped down. Ironically, the only election Gentry ever lost was a congressional election back in the 1930's.

The victor in that race was a former schoolteacher by the name of LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

In 1957 Gov. Price Daniel named Gentry as chairman of the State highway commission. In making the appointment, the Governor referred to Gentry as "the best informed person on highway administration and legislation."

Gentry declined Daniel's appointment, but earlier, from 1939 to 1945, he had served as chairman of the commission and was president of the American Association of State Highway Officials in 1943. In the House he served on the Committee on Highways and Roads.

During his four terms as county judge of Smith County, one of his major achievements was the development of an improved system of county roads.

Later, he took the lead in the program to correlate the State and National highway systems.

A bachelor, Gentry was born on a farm near Colfax, in Van Zandt County, on March 25, 1895. He borrowed money from a Van Zandt County farmer to pay for his education at Cumberland University and Tyler Commercial College.

His first political job was a clerkship in the Van Zandt County tax collector's office. After moving to Tyler he served first as assistant city tax collector, then as county attorney and later as county judge.

With his background of farm life, Gentry has always had a warm spot in his heart for the man who follows the plow. It was under his leadership that the Texas system of farm-to-market roads was established.

For over 20 years, Gentry has taken an avid interest in the golfing career of Ben Hogan and traveled all over the United States to watch him play in tournaments.

A member of Willow Brook Country Club, Gentry has never had much interest in playing the game himself, but last spring a Dallas sportswriter tagged him with the title "Ben Hogan's Shadow."

In Congress Gentry was a conservative. He preached governmental economy and was opposed to foreign aid on the scale proposed by the national administration.

Today, Brady Gentry looks forward to regaining his full strength and leaving the hospital.

Gentry seldom bothers to reminisce about his past—a record of achievement that rivals Horatio Alger stories.

Politics may never again know such an unpolitical man.

The United Nations and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, now that the Vietnam issue is before the U.N. Security Council the delegates there will no doubt discover some of the difficulties the United States has struggled with in its efforts to deal with the Communists in southeast Asia.

The U.S. resolution to the U.N. Security Council on Vietnam recommended that "appropriate interested governments" arrange a conference "looking toward the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in southeast Asia."

In an editorial of February 2, 1966, the Chicago Daily News stated that the United States "comes to the U.N. at a time when all else seems to have failed."

Yet, the editorial says, "If it does nothing else, the United States appeal to the U.N. Security Council cuts the ground from under some of the critics of the administration's Vietnam policy."

The Daily News reminds us that the U.N. members "have seen for themselves how Hanoi and Peiping rejected all U.S. peace overtures."

Because of its realistic analysis of an issue with which we all must deal realistically, I hereby include the editorial in the RECORD:

THE U.N. TACKLES VIETNAM

If it does nothing else, the United States appeal to the U.N. Security Council cuts the ground from under some of the critics of the administration's Vietnam policy. These critics have protested long and loudly that the proper way to handle the Vietnam problem was to dump it in the lap of the United Nations, as if that body had a magical solution for every problem anywhere.

Some of the reasons why the U.N. was not earlier and formally brought into the Vietnam war are quite apparent now that the step has been taken. The first and perhaps the only result is to bring into the U.N. chamber the same acrimonious debate that has been raging outside it.

Moreover, the formal setting of this debate seems more likely to harden attitudes than soften them, and force irreversible decisions by record voting, including the use of the U.N. veto. Perhaps this no longer matters; at this stage attitudes have already hardened, and the formality of voting may not change the situation.

For all practical purposes, the United Nations has been involved in the Vietnam war all along, if only on an informal basis. whatever advantages now comes of involving it formally is largely tactical, for the situation in Vietnam is hardly comparable to those that have been resolved in the past by U.N. intervention. The only rough parallel is Korea, and the U.N. was able to act then only because Russia was on a temporary "walkout" at the time.

Nevertheless, the United States comes to the U.N. at a time when all else seems to have failed. The members of the U.N. have seen for themselves how Hanoi and Peiping have rejected all U.S. peace overtures. And they have seen how North Vietnam—not the United States—curtly rejected in advance any ideas for a settlement the United Nations might produce.

This in itself ought to be proof for the U.N. as to who wants peace and who doesn't. Unfortunately, proof of this kind isn't what tips the scales in the United Nations, any more than it alters the opinion of those in this country who would have peace at the price of dishonor.

Indiana Celebrates Its Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1966, Indiana celebrates its sesquicentennial year.

The accomplishments of the people of Indiana during the past 150 years have been many, and the contributions to the Nation in times of peace and war have been a source of pride to all Hoosiers.

In the January 1966, issue of the Hoosier Farmer, the official magazine of the Indiana Farm Bureau, a very authentic and interesting portrayal of the era in America when Indiana was settled appears.

In order that the Members of Congress share in the knowledge contained in this interesting article, under unanimous consent, I request its publication in the RECORD.

The article follows:

The American Revolution was underway. The British were on the move and as they strengthened their garrisons across this young country, they gathered into their fold the Indians who were violently in opposition to the American settlement.

Virginia, under the governorship of Patrick Henry, claimed title to the Northwest, and hence to Vincennes, under her charter of 1609. When American spies learned that Fort Sackville, the English fort at Vincennes, was undermanned, Governor Henry made the momentus decison to send an army to capture it. To do the job, he called upon a militia officer who represented the county of Kentucky in the Virginia Legislature; George Rogers Clark.

Governor Henry commissioned Clark a lieutenant colonel, authorized him to draw 1,200 pounds from Virginia's treasury, and to enlist an army for the confrontation. By May of 1778, Clark had gathered in 150 men and he assembled them on the Ohio River near the present city of Jeffersonville. On July 4, 1778, he moved against the British, first capturing Kaskaskia. On July 14, he moved onward to Fort Sackville. To his amazement, the British garrison had left and the American flag was raised without a shot being fired.

When the British commander at Detroit got news of Clarks' success, he was enraged. In December, he rushed 600 troops to Vincennes and recaptured this beseiged outpost. Again the British flag went up.

When Clark, who had returned to Kaskaskia, heard the news, he decided to retake the fort. This momentus decision to march again upon Fort Sackville has been recorded as one of the great moments in Hoosier history.

Unknown at first to Clark was the decision of the British commander at Fort Sackville to release most of his troops for the winter. Clark would never have learned of this had it not been for the heroic journey of Francis Vigo, a rich trader of Vincennes, who fled the town and took the news to Clark.

With Vigo's financial backing, Clark managed to scrape together 170 volunteers. On February 23, he set up camp just 2 miles from the fort. While his men cleaned their firearms, Clark sent a message to the inhabitants of Vincennes, warning them of the impending attack. That night they moved forward.

The fort was quickly surrounded and Clark began a harassing barrage of rifle fire. With the morning came an increased barrage so furious the Britishers in the fort could not get into position to return the fire. With only 30 able-bodied defenders, and 600 miles from help, Fort Sackville surrendered. At 10 a.m. on the morning of February 25, 1779, the American flag was raised again over Vincennes never to come down again.

The consequence of this battle was to be of significant importance to the Colonies and to the growth and expansion of the United States. Virginia ceded Vincennes to the United States in 1784. The formation of the Northwest Territory followed in 1787. Within a year, 20,000 Americans came down the Ohio to the new land, for with the Northwest Territory came the prohibition of slavery, public education, and the guarantee of religious freedom and civil rights to all people. And when the Indiana territory was created in 1800, Vincennes became the seat of government.

The early Indiana pioneer was hardworking and practical. The new country offered a challenge to muscle rather than to mind. The early settler contented himself with the limited culture he had brought with him. The family Bible and sometimes one other book were the extent of his cultural tools.

The woman had the most difficult time. She usually had only an iron skillet for cooking. The only lamp was a clay pot filled with bear grease. The food she put on the table consisted of cornbread, wild berries, plums and apples, turnips, potatoes, and all sorts of wild game and fish.

These early trailblazers had their good times in spite of the daily struggle for existence. The boys rassled, ran foot races, and participated in shooting matches. Standard amusements included sugar making, bee hunting, husking bees, and apple cuttings.

An early Hoosier citizen, one Randall Yarbro, when interviewed in 1889, recalled seeing the first house built in Jeffersonville—a one-story loghouse. He helped his father build the second one in 1811.

At that time roads were only worn paths or perhaps corduroy (logs laid close together across the path). Horseback or foot was the only means of travel. Some progressive persons learned from the Indians and built drags—two shafts with their one end tied on either side of a horse and the other dragging the ground with a box of a seat.

Even wagons were a rarity. Yarbro reports that the first two-horse wagons were as much a curiosity as were the first telephones or "iron horses."

Money then was also a rarity. Most commerce was carried out by barter and trading. The man who had a dollar of good money was a wealthy person. Beaver skins and pelts were often a medium of exchange.

Times have indeed changed since those first hardy Hoosiers crossed the Ohio River and moved north or followed the rivers south from Wayne County. Fantastic changes have occurred in the past 150 years.

During 1966, our Indiana sesquicentennial year, the Hoosier Farmer will examine the times and tales of those pioneer days. And along the way we will consider too, some of the great men who have forged and shaped the history and the heritage of our State and Nation. And, too, we will report upon special events that will commemorate our Indiana sesquicentennial and 150 years of progress.

How Could Anybody Desert Them Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial by the owner of the Martins Ferry-Bellaire Times Leader, Mr. A. V. Dix, who is one of the owners of the Dix newspapers in Ohio and Kentucky. I think this should be must reading for every Member of Congress and especially those who say we should pull out of Vietnam. Mr. Dix has been to the Far East several times, and I consider his knowledge on political matters in that area to be outstanding.

HOW COULD ANYBODY DESERT THEM NOW?

It was a sweltering day in Saigon, as most of them are.

Standing on the corner of Tu Do, which, under French rule had been called Catinat Boulevard, and the wide street that runs along the Saigon River, I watched a big, white Navy transport, one of ours, standing at the dock, its decks crowded with poorly clad Vietnamese, all pushing against the ship's rails starring at a great city which until that morning had been only a name to them.

Earlier that morning, from the roof of the Majestic Hotel I had watched its progress up the Saigon River, a sludgy stream, full of garbage and filth, human and otherwise, all the way from Cap St. Jacques. It had come from Haiphong, far to the north, where it had picked up its human cargo of Vietnamese fleeing from the advancing forces of Ho Chi Minh's Communist army. Many of them had been taken off the beaches when the Communists entered the city and made their way to the docks in an attempt to halt the exodus.

Along Catinat, and other nearby streets, the sidewalks were full of refugees who had come earlier. They had been living there for days, doing their cooking, washing, giving birth to babies, and, some of them dying, waiting to be moved to refugee camps and later to resettlement areas.

Soon the moving began, and then the big white ship began to spew forth its human cargo to take the places of the people on the sidewalks until they, too, could be moved.

All of their possessions, except the little they could carry on their backs, had been abandoned in their flight.

They were frightened and hungry. They had been told by the Communists the Americans were cruel sadists, and even cannibals who might kill them and grind them into hamburger. These stories were told them by a people who themselves had tortured those they were able to capture in their escape attempt. Viet Minh soldiers caught one escaping boy, put his bare feet on a rock, and beat them to a pulp with rifle butts. "Now walk to freedom," they told him. The boy crawled to freedom and was in a Saigon hospital where a then U.S. Navy doctor, a Lieutenant Dooley, was trying to save his feet. They had driven a row of tacks, more than 100 of them, around the top of one man's head. "There is your crown of thorns," they told him. And they had driven bamboo chopsticks through the eardrums of another because they suspected him of listening to a Bible reading by a priest.

Other ships came later. The Saigon River is so winding and so obscured by high reed grass that the ships seemed to be skimming right over the meadows.

They could come in only with the tide which along with the ships brought back the filth it had taken seaward earlier in the day as the tide went out. To turn around they must nose the prow firmly against a muddy bank, swing the stern around, then back off and head back downstream.

They did this time and again until nearly a million refugees had flooded into Saigon, and meanwhile uncounted thousands more fled over the border at the 17th parallel a little north of the old capital of Hue. On the way down they were given generous portions of sticky rice. Many, thinking it might be their last meal for days, hoarded it. They would compress it into balls and hide it in remote corners of the ship where it would later be traced through a fetid odor.

It was quite an operation, especially as much of it went on under the guns of Saigon's Binh Xuyen rebellion which was aided and abetted by the departing French who didn't want anybody to succeed in southeast Asia as long as they couldn't have it.

Many of the tailenders were mowed down by Communist machineguns on the Haiphong beaches, and some we just had to leave behind as they stood chest deep in the surf, pleading arms outstretched.

They finally resettled these people in villages throughout the land, providing them with meager shelter and in all about 5 acres of ground, half of it uncleared jungle.

They did very well. They improved their homes, tilled their soil, built churches and little industries. They became self-supporting even though many were preyed upon by venal small-time politicians. In fact, the entire economy of the country began to improve, and that was something the Commies in adjoining countreis just couldn't permit, if they were to stay in power.

So, the campaign started. The beginnings were small, but everything was employed. They used economic pressures, political distrust, and the very foulest sort of terror tactics. Now it has snowballed into a major affair. How it happened is of little consequence; it is now a fait accompli and we have to do something about it, or "the terror" will spill out all over Asia, and from there, who knows where.

There are those who would have us desert these hundreds of thousands of people who put their trust in us. Should we pull out they would all be liquidated and in ways not very nice. Most of those who would have us quit Vietnam have never seen either it or any of the people who left their homes, farms or business enterprises to begin all over again under freedom, because we said it would be all right and we'd look after them.

Maybe we shouldn't have said it; maybe we shouldn't have made those promises. But the fact is, we did. And I have the feeling that if we desert them now to a certain and horrible fate, then we will face sure retribution of some sort. And maybe we'd deserve it.

Personally, I'm glad I'm not President Johnson, to face the decisions he must make. I'm afraid I wouldn't have the courage. But I've seen these things in South Vietnam many times over the years. I've seen the refugees; I've been in their new villages, in the jungles in between. I've talked to them and know their hopes and their gratitude for being saved from the Communists. So, desert them now? How could anybody?

Elbie Jay Plans a Marrying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under authority to insert my own remarks and extraneous matter in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to insert another column by Art Hoppe, the master satirist. His column, published in the San Francisco Chronicle, of January 30, follows:

Elbie Jay Plans a Marrying

Howdy there, folks. How y'all? Time for another tee-vee visit with the rootin'-tootin' Jay family, starring ol' Elbie Jay, who can rope, hogtie and brand 500 Congressmen quicker'n a wink. 'Course, he's also got two young daughters.

As we join up with ol' Elbie today, he and his pretty wife, Birdie Bird, are in the parlor of the big white house, Birdie Bird keeps lookin' out the window and ol' Elbie appears a mite fidgety.

Elbie. Well, I suppose we got to talk to them about the marrying. Where they from? Waukegan, Illinois? Waukegan. It ain't even in Cook County.

Birdie Bird. Now, Elbie, you know Pat's a very nice boy. And I'm sure his parents are lovely.

Elbie. Maybe so. But what's wrong with that daughter of ours? Why, she could've married a duke or a prince—some young fellow whose folks we could treat as equals.

Birdie Bird. Shhhh. Here they come now. Now you be nice, you hear?

(The parents of the intended groom, a pleasant-looking middle-class couple enter. Elbie extends his hand with a professional smile.)

Elbie. Sure nice of you to come howdy and press the flesh. That's a fine boy you got. You must be mighty proud of him, serving in his country's uniform.

Groom's Mother. Yes. Of course, every time I think of how fortunate he was to be assigned to duty right here in Washington, I thank God.

Elbie (with a wave of his hand). Don't mention it. Glad to do it for the young man our daughter has democratically chosen as her intended. Like I said to Birdie Bird here, "Our country ain't got no room for class distinctions."

Groom's Father. How odd. That's virtually what I said to Mother here after Pat broke the news to us.

Groom's Mother. Yes, I will admit I was a little disappointed at first. I did have my heart set on Pat marrying a college girl.

Elbie (frowning). What do you mean? She goes to college.

Groom's Mother. Oh, yes, a nursing college, isn't it? I'd thought more of a real college. But then father here said there was no disgrace in having a nurse in the family these days. Not if she's a registered nurse. And by the way, how are her grades?

Elbie (testily). She's had a lot on her mind lately. And her sister does real well in college.

Groom's Mother. Oh, the one that runs around with movie stars? I suppose girls in Texas do mature early, don't they? For Pat's sake, I hope so. Not that we have anything against Texans, mind you. In Waukegan we treat them as equals.

Groom's Father. Yes, as I said to mother here, "At least it beats Pat's fighting in Vietnam." And after all, I said, this is a democracy. So despite the obvious handicap of an immature wife with a penchant for notoriety who comes from the backwoods section of Texas and who is not—er—academically inclined, I'm sure that Pat will somehow still manage to go far.

Elbie (thundering). Yep, about 10,000 miles. Just as soon as I can sign his transfer orders.

Well tune in to our next episode, friends. And meantime as you mosey on down the long trail of life, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy used to say:

" 'Tain't no use for proud daddies to fret about their tads marrying beneath 'em. They ain't got no other choice."

Little Help From Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, nations around the world extend open hands for assistance from the United States. Even our wealthiest allies depend on our trade, loans, and military support. Yet how many are standing by us today in our struggle for peace in Vietnam? Very few. Not only are they not helping us, they are speaking out against our actions. An excellent proposal to this situation was suggested in an editorial in the February 3, Knoxville, Tenn., Journal, which I ask to be printed in the Record:

If Only LBJ Dared

A man we know recently spent a few days in the hospital. He got a letter which read this way: "There are two who are pulling for your early recovery. I am one of them and Blue Cross is the other."

Sometimes it looks as if Uncle Sam is in a predicament similar to that of our man in the hospital, except that we frequently find it impossible to name some government friendly enough to us to be counted in the same class as Blue Cross.

On cold, snowy days some Americans have time to brood over the evident lack of appreciation for the role which the United

States of America has played in modern history and especially in relation to certain governments.

American arms and troops have twice in this century saved Europe from subjugation by a powerful enemy. American arms and troops in defense against Communist aggression halted the Reds in their tracks in South Korea. The protective umbrella of these same arms and troops have been spread over Britain, Europe, Greece, Japan, the Philippines and free nations everywhere since the end of World War II.

Yet, with the exception of token contingents from Australia and South Korea, not one of these nations which have been protected by American military and financial strength for a quarter of a century has volunteered assistance in the critical South Vietnam situation. Not only has there been a lack of physical assistance from all but a few of these countries which have been the beneficiaries of our manpower and money, but we have even been denied their moral support. In the case of France, for example, we have seen a former ally actually consort with the Communists who plan the destruction of that country no less than ours.

It should be kept in mind, too, that the protection of the United States has provided for a long list of countries—more than 100 of them—which have been the recipients of the Marshall plan or other foreign aid, has been at our own expense. As a matter of fact, the tremendous cost of maintaining our military forces in Europe, for example, is one of the factors which make it impossible for the American Government to achieve a favorable balance of payments and to reduce the run on our store of gold at Fort Knox.

As a result of our insistence upon financing, in effect, the whole world, the claims against our gold supply, now reduced to about $13 billion, are about twice that amount. Most of these I O U's are in the hands of central banks in Europe and are at least legally callable on demand.

Of course, the President will not have the nerve to do it, but this fact does not obscure the picture of action that deserves to be taken. Such action would be far more drastic than the reference he has recently made to withholding foreign aid handouts from countries which are hostile to us in every way until it comes time for them to be on the receiving end of Federal gifts.

What the President should do, if he were free to do it, would be to pull out of Europe all American troops, weapons, and equipment and to use these forces in the South Vietnam war. This would be an act of simple justice and at the same time would relieve both our adverse balance of payments and shake up the economies of every nation in which we now have our troops quartered, primarily for their own protection.

One may entertain himself on a winter's day by imagining the indignant cries of alarm and consternation that would arise if any such action were announced by the White House. Not only would deathly fear grip the chancelleries of our European friends at being left without the protection of U.S. forces against the looming threat of Russian communism, but there would be equal concern about a cessation of U.S. spending to support these forces.

The United States is still in position to protect itself from any external threat which may be brought against it. It must be conceded, however, that there is a basis for unhappiness on the part of the American people to find that we are on a one-way street when it comes to a crisis such as exists in South Vietnam. Every other nation is willing to accept help from us, but few are willing to stand with us in our need.

Bombing Only Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the shrill cries of Communist-infiltrated peacenik groups are being heard far out of proportion to their numbers and respectability. I am pleased to note that the President, as Commander in Chief, is being supported by respectable voices across the country, one of which is the Park Forest Reporter, an outstanding independent publication serving that community in Illinois, which carried a most timely editorial in its February 2 edition:

BOMBING ONLY CHOICE

Acceleration of the war in Vietnam was inevitable as Communist foes pay little attention to peace efforts. It was obvious that President Johnson ordered the resumption of bombing of military targets in the north with reluctance, still he had no other choice.

The 37-day moratorium which was used to probe every possible avenue toward a peaceful settlement of the Viet situation met a firm rebuff from a stubborn foe who remains defiant and unyielding. The Vietcong are unwilling to negotiate unless their terms of removal of all U.S. and other foreign forces from Vietnam are carried out.

From their point of view, any other compromise would be surrender, at least in the military sense. The harsh realization is that they are convinced they will win the war. They already control nearly 70 percent of South Vietnam territory. A heavily armed 200,000 man U.S. force augmented by South Viet troops has been unable to uproot them. Despite suffering heavy losses of men, they continue their harassing tactics in the face of their enemies, inflict their damages and often manage to flee undetected. Physically, it's nigh impossible to tell a friend from a foe. The enemy who an hour earlier tossed a bomb into an American billet, lolls around a South Vietnamese compound at chow time to take his meal of U.S.-provided foods.

The Vietcong is relying on what they consider the softness of Americans. They recognize that the slow bleeding process of a war which could last as long as a generation, and not completely popular in our land, will provide the impetus for an eventual pullout, similar to the defeat the French were forced to accept after a 10-year struggle in Indochina.

An unsettled South Vietnam Government adds to the confusion of a clearcut victory effort and the corrupt practices by friendly officials tends to extend the war and to accelerate its cost.

Yet only a decisive victory will turn the tide in our favor. It dictates a fight that should go all out, short of use of nuclear weapons. There are many reasons for a peace now, but it takes two to come to terms at the peace table. Hanoi just isn't ready to talk terms and our talk must become the echo of bombs raining down on their arsenals, strategic highways, and ports.

The Vietcong have as yet faced no major manpower problem. All the land battles have been fought on enemy ground. Bombings on their soil may awaken them to the reality that Uncle Sam isn't soft, has the courage to take the fight to the enemy and will be resolute enough to persevere until the victory tide turns in his favor.

The role the United Nations will play is vague at this writing. Many of our stanchest allies have no stomach for this war, particularly in its undeclared status. If the Congress declared a state of war existed they would have to suffer the risks a blockade would create. It might take just this action to determine which of our allies are friends and which are neutrals or worse.

We don't believe that mainland China will get involved in an all-out war. They are a decade or more away from risking their very existence as a power. Their dragon may snort fire, yet they are wary enough to save their strength for a day when chances for success are not limited.

A General Benefit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, any businessman recognizes that a "good deal" is one in which both sides—or all sides—benefit.

The Government recognizes this, also.

The administration's decision to raise savings bond interest rates is a realistic reaction to changing conditions in the money markets.

A higher savings bond interest rate can serve individual savers and the general economy.

Everyone stands to benefit.

Many newspapers across the land have praised the action taken to increase the interest rates. One such editorial appeared recently in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, and because I feel it is typical of many, I offer it for the RECORD.

KEEPING FAITH

President Johnson has simply recognized the Government's fiduciary responsibility to the holders and purchasers of E and H savings bonds in directing the Treasury to increase the interest rate, since interest rates paid on competitive forms of savings have climbed well above the 3¾-percent E and H bond rate.

There will, of course, be some added cost to the Government. But failure to bring these bonds into line with the market could, in time, erode their attractiveness, and increase the burden on other kinds of Treasury financing. More important, the typical small saver would be cheated of his due reward unless he switched his savings to a bank or savings and loan account.

The move could have been postponed for a time, of course, until there were more definite signs of buyer resistance. But, as J. A. Livingston, the Bulletin's financial editor, noted in first calling attention to the inequity of the old rates some weeks ago, the Government owes its bond-holding citizens more consideration than market forces might, alone, require. This move to protect their interests is the proper complement to the patriotic appeal, enunciated afresh by Mr. Johnson, on which the savings bond program is founded.

Vincent J. DiMattina: A Real American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the immediate past we have seen the rise of a breed of American who has no place either in the traditions or future of this country. I refer to the draft card burners, those who deny and shirk their military obligation to the country because they "disagree" with the military policy of the administration. It is with some pride and a great deal of pleasure, therefore, that I would like to talk about Vincent J. DiMattina of Brooklyn.

Vincent J. DiMattina is the New York State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. But he is much more than that. He is, for example, a man who at the age of 16 had to leave school and go to work on the Brooklyn docks. The Brooklyn docks, like waterfronts all the world over, are a tough place to make a living. But Vincent DiMattina did. Then the war came along. In 1942 he enlisted in the Navy and after boot camp took instruction in deep sea diving and was assigned to Seabee Battalion 104. He served with that unit for almost 4 years in the Pacific theater of war and reached the rank of chief boatswain's mate by the time he was discharged in December of 1945.

Returning to Brooklyn in 1946, Commander DiMattina once again went to work on the docks. But like so many others in those days, the war had shown him that an education was not a luxury but a necessity. In Commander DiMattina's case it was not merely a return to college. He had to go back to high school. Working a full week on the docks, he somehow managed to complete his high school and then went on to college. From there it was law school. And all this while working a full, hard day. In 1954, some 8 years later, he was admitted to the bar of the State of New York.

Even more amazing, Commander DiMattina, while working and going to school, found time for an active role in veterans' affairs in Brooklyn. In 1951 he was elected county commander of the VFW in Kings County. He also managed to organize and recruit members for 16 new VFW posts in Brooklyn.

Along the way he served the VFW and his fellow veterans well. He served as Loyalty Day chairman, chairman of the department rehabilitation committee, department inspector, judge advocate, and was elected to the successive posts of junior and senior vice commander of the Department of New York. He was elected commander of the Department of New York at the 46th annual convention in Lake Placid, N.Y., on June 26, 1965.

Commander DiMattina is a member of the Brooklyn Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, U.S. Government Appeals Agent for the local draft board, a member of the civilian advisory board to the 3d Naval District, and past grand knight of the Our Lady of Loretto Council No. 585 of the Knights of Columbus. He has also served as assistant counsel to the minority leader of the New York State Assembly in 1963 and 1964 and presently is counsel to the speaker of the New York State Assembly on military and patriotic affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Vincent J. DeMattina for many years and am happy and proud that our association has led to a close and warm friendship. I would like to offer a salute to the VFW's New York Department commander, Vincent J. DiMattina—a real American.

Automotive Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, Assemblyman Alexander Chananau, a distinguished member of our New York State Legislature, recently testified before the traffic safety hearings of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Government Operations Committee. Assemblyman Chananau cosponsored the 1965 safety car law in the New York State Assembly, and as an authority on automotive safety, he has spoken on a subject of major concern and interest to all of us. I wish to call Assemblyman Chananau's testimony to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF NEW YORK STATE ASSEMBLYMAN ALEXANDER CHANANAU, DEMOCRAT, BRONX, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, FEBRUARY 3, 1966

Chairman RIBICOFF and members of the subcommittee, as a member of this New York State Joint Legislative Committee for 3 years and cosponsor of the 1965 safety car law under which the prototype program was initiated, I can testify that it is the one program Detroit wants to stop cold.

This is bipartisan legislation we are discussing in New York State, and we hope at the congressional level. The problems this essential legislation runs into are bipartisan problems.

With Assemblyman Julius Volker, Republican, of Buffalo, I battled for it on the floor of the assembly in 1965 while Senator Speno, a Republican who had developed the program, put it through in the senate. In this matter, and in our prior and current efforts to have the first equipment and new tire safety laws passed, we felt the power of Detroit at work.

This New York State Legislative Committee has considered and legislated in every major field from visual acuity to speed limits to alcohol impairment to drug use to psychiatric and psychological prediction.

Gentlemen, we have found that the current automobile is unnecessarily unsafe and productive of injuries and deaths, and we have found that getting essential changes made, device by device, is a long and difficult struggle.

We have followed Senator Speno's leadership in the New York Legislature as has, directly and indirectly, the rest of the Nation. We have found that obsolete concepts of salability based on styling still reign in Detroit, despite recent assurances to the contrary. As an indication, there is no one in the automobile industry in charge of safety design who has vice-presidential status, but each of the Big Three has a vice president for styling.

A much better indication is the fact that 50,000 Americans were killed last year and 3,500,000 injured by smashing around inside the interior of the car, by being projected outside the car, or by being hit by a car. We cannot stop the majority of accidents from occurring because we don't, at this point, have the knowledge which would permit such a utopia.

But we can stop the majority of the deaths and injuries from occurring because the car is readily changed for safety purposes. People are not readily changed.

In 1966, we again have bipartisan legislation under consideration to continue the safety car project, a $250,000 appropriation directed toward Federal grant subsidies and any and all public or private financial assistance. Cosponsors at this point are Senators Speno and Liebowits and Assemblyman Joseph M. Margiotta, Republicans of Long Island, and me, two Democrats and two Republicans. We expect trouble.

Now, what have we here before us in this feasibility report? We have the first automobile design safety check list, consisting of several hundred identified automobile hazards, the first such checklist for designers ever compiled in 50 years of automobile engineering literature.

We have proof that a car can be built, the New York State safety car prototype, that will prevent 75 percent of injuries and fatalities at crash-impacts of 50 miles per hour, 75 percent in side collisions, 90 percent in rollover accidents, and 90 percent when a car runs into the rear of another. The study before us also shows ways to reduce accidents through mechanical changes and to cut down pedestrian injuries.

We have the concept of a car designed according to aerospace systems analysis which protects astronauts.

It took 7 years of concentrated effort based on dedication and conviction to produce the safety car prototype project in New York State. We believe that we are, by experience, experts in this subject of automotive safety and we have had the advice and service of the best technicians, engineers, scientists and physicians in doing our job.

We urge the Federal Government to join us in this essential effort now, continuing the only existent safety car prototype project of its type in the world. We welcome greater Federal effort in traffic safety and trust that the enthusiasm now being shown by certain Members of the Congress and various Federal agencies will not wane. We welcome guidance from the Federal Government as time passes. Massive research projects will, we hope, be initiated and carried through. We ask you to show your intent, fighting spirit and conviction by joining us now in getting this prototype built. It will tell us all what should be done, what can be done and how to do it. It is design, safety design from the beginning, that marks the difference between this project and the "safest" car now being manufactured for sale.

Buffalo's New Urban Renewal Commissioner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Buffalo faces all the challenges which other major U.S. metropolitan areas face: the decline of the central commercial core, blight in the gray areas, traffic congestion, a dwindling tax base, and so forth.

But I am happy to report the city of Buffalo, behind the leadership of Mayor Frank A. Sedita, is tackling these problems with new vigor and determination.

A keyman in this great undertaking is our new urban renewal commissioner, Richard L. Miller. I am proud to say that Mr. Miller is an old and close friend of mine. He played a key role in the conception and development of the Buffalo urban renewal program, and he comes to his new post with laurels won in pushing forward Buffalo's dynamic downtown renewal program.

Buffalo is on the move. And young men like 40-year-old Richard Miller are playing key roles. Under leave to extend my remarks, I here include an article from the Buffalo Courier-Express of January 25, which sets forth Mr. Miller's view of his new and challenging assignment:

MILLER TAKES STERN VIEW OF RENEWAL

(By Jim McAvey)

REALISTIC VISIONS

Buffalo's new $17,500 a year urban renewal commissioner, Richard L. Miller, is no builder of castles in the sky.

He is a hardheaded pragmatist with visions of a more beautiful city. He believes these visions can be made realities only through the down-to-earth, patient expenditure of energy needed to sail programs over seas of redtape.

"We are going to have to combine our aspirations with realism," Miller said. "There is a lot of redtape to go through and it takes time."

Just turned 40, the fair-skinned, 6-foot, 200-pound commissioner looks askance on "miracle working" urban renewal schemes.

OBJECTIVE: CONFIDENCE

"I think Buffalo can be made a greater city, but this job is only part of it," he said. "Urban renewal can only provide the physical setting for living. There are other aspects—economic, political, social, cultural."

A native of Buffalo, the blue-eyed Miller has a full head of blond hair that sweeps straight back from a high forehead. He has the broad shoulders and coordinated movements of the athlete he was.

He gives the impression of being intensely sincere about the job he is undertaking.

"I'm not starting anything," Miller said. "This is a continuing program that has to grow. We have to develop a sound and expanding program, one that will gain the confidence of the people of Buffalo and of the Federal Government, which provides most of the money."

Miller believes most people have a feeling the Federal Government runs the whole urban renewal program.

"Actually," he said, "the responsibility is on the city. We have to merit continued Federal support or the Federal Government can put the brake on. Our local performance is what counts."

WELL PRIMED

Miller said he is depending on men who have been working in the urban renewal department to brief him on the status of programs. There are 66 employees in the department.

But he gave much evidence of having detailed knowledge of the programs.

He said his work as executive director and secretary of the Greater Buffalo Development Foundation had much to do with his views on urban renewal. He was executive director of the foundation from May 1958 until he took over his present job January 1.

The foundation played a vital role in the planning and promotion of the downtown renewal project. Miller sees the downtown project as an excellent example of what can be brought about without Government funds.

CODES, INCENTIVES

"Downtown is showing what we can do on our own," he said. "Part of the deal is for people in official capacities to encourage people to do something about their environment."

Miller does not believe that rehabilitation of dilapidated houses and neighborhoods "just happens," or that enforcement of housing codes is, of itself, enough.

"People have to be convinced that something good is going to come from their efforts to improve their properties," Miller said. "We must give people incentives, through public actions, to upgrade their properties far beyond minimum standards required by the code."

FAMILY MAN

A 1949 Dartmouth graduate who served in the Navy in World War II and the Korean war, Miller started out to be a newspaperman. He was a reporter for the Buffalo Evening News in 1951 and again from 1953 to 1958.

He smokes a pack a day, golfs, bowls, reads, and spends a lot of time "amusing my four kids."

He is married to the former Patrizia Nagy of Toledo, Ohio, a sculptress who has given him "a great deal of interest in the arts."

They live at 650 Lafayette Avenue.

Education Benefits for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 12410, the GI education bill, was not only morally right but economically sound for our Government.

To provide for the smooth and constructive return of our servicemen to civilian life is just as essential as it is to prepare him with needed training and equipment to enable him to do a proper job in the Armed Forces.

I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that this action will pay similar dividends to those realized from the investment in education for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. I am sure this assistance will account for an increase in our gross national product as did the investment in the education of veterans of World War II and Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this legislation was long overdue.

America Understands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, with the resumption of bombing of North Vietnam there has risen considerable controversy in the American press concerning the bombing and the intensified peace efforts that preceded it and are continuing.

Extensive coverage has been given to a very vocal minority that opposes our efforts to maintain the freedom of the Vietnamese with the result that it is, at times, difficult to determine how the average American views these activities. However, a recent editorial, which appeared on February 2, 1966, in the Beaumont Enterprise, an outstanding newspaper published in southeast Texas, states succinctly the feelings of an overwhelming majority of our citizens who support the President and who understand and are aware of our responsibility and purpose in southeast Asia.

The text of the editorial follows:

A TEXAN DECIDES

In spite of our disappointment that the 37-day lull in the bombing of North Vietnam failed to bring peace talks, we feel that the long pause was on the whole a net gain for this country.

We have underscored our devotion to a peaceful settlement in Vietnam in a way that neither friend nor foe can misinterpret.

We have cut the ground from underneath the feet of those critics in Europe and Asia, who, for varying reasons, have tried to paint us in the colors of aggressors or new colonialists.

Our reconnaissance has been such that, now that the bombing is being resumed, we know where the enemy troop and supply buildups have taken place and we can hit those places quickly and in great force.

Thus, it seems to us that the pause did more good than harm.

Given the intransigence of Hanoi and Peiping, the negative, churlish and unyielding attitude of the Communists, the President had no choice but to renew the bombing attacks on the enemy's staging grounds in North Vietnam.

Be it noted, also, that during the entire period of the bombing pause, there was never the slightest lull in the terrorist tactics of the Vietcong on the ground. Unharmed men, women, and children among civilian refugees were savagely slain, along with American and South Vietnamese soldiers.

We are glad that President Johnson made a new Vietnam peace bid, even as he ordered the bombers back into action. The two actions taken together would seem to indicate that we will, in the words of the late President Kennedy, "never negotiate from fear, but never fear to negotiate."

It is likely that hard decisions and harder days are ahead for President Johnson and all

Americans. But we can face them secure in the knowledge that we have done all that reasonable men can do to gain a just and honorable peace in southeast Asia.

Maritime Budget Is Inadequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called to the attention of my colleagues in the House the plight of our merchant marine and expressed disappointment and concern over the cut in the 1967 budget funds for this important fourth arm of our country's defense. In this connection, I insert in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Joseph Curran, chairman of the AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, which follows:

> The budget request for the Maritime Administration this year is sadly inadequate. It reflects an adoption of the Interagency Maritime Task Force report. This report was rejected by the President's Maritime Advisory Committee. We also understand that this report is opposed by the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor.
>
> Longstanding national policy provides that we shall have a merchant marine to carry a substantial portion of our waterborne import-export foreign commerce, and also capable of serving as a naval auxiliary in time of war or national emergency. To assure that our merchant marine would serve the Nation in this dual capacity, various aids such as the operating and construction subsidies are extended to qualified operators.
>
> Because of the lack of Government leadership which reflects indifference and neglect in advancing this policy, our merchant marine has declined to where it carries less than 9 percent of our waterborne foreign commerce.
>
> The Secretary of Commerce must have realized the cause of the declining fleet clearly when just recently he stated that he is opposed to building foreign and that the Government has not fulfilled its obligation in building a merchant marine.
>
> In realization of the sad state of our merchant marine, the President established the Maritime Advisory Committee. At its first meeting, the Maritime Advisory Committee adopted a resolution endorsing our national maritime policy, as stated in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, as in the public interest. Following this, the Committee developed a program, the basic theme of which is the renewal and expansion of the American merchant marine.
>
> At the time it became obvious that the Maritime Advisory Committee was going to come up with a program for developing a merchant marine, the Interagency Maritime Task Force was established to counter and add confusion to the MAC recommendations. To add to the confusion, the task force, which contains the Maritime Administrator's recommendations, has advocated less ships to carry less cargo and even these ships to be built principally in foreign yards.
>
> This year's budget request of $85 million for construction subsidies ($47 million less than last year) provides for building only 11 ships. This is raised to 13 after some doubtful and very peculiar juggling of figures.
>
> The operating-differential subsidy request is $185 million ($5 million less than last year).
>
> Members of the House and Senate have expressed their disappointment of the budget request. Their course of action to correct the situation is not known at this time. Even if Congress should increase the inadequate budget request, as as been suggested, it is doubtful that the Administration would use the funds.
>
> The Interagency Task Force report and this year's budget request highlights the fact that administrative dedication to our Nation's maritime policy is a prerequisite to the successful administration of our maritime laws. Currently, the Maritime Administration is set on a completely opposite course of action which would administer the merchant marine out of existence.
>
> If this confusion and neglect is not corrected soon, there will be no merchant marine to transfer into the President's proposed Department of Transportation.

Foreign Markets for Poultry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the development of foreign trade in the poultry industry is most important for the continued growth of this vital industry in the United States, as well as the contribution it would make toward a more favorable balance-of-payments picture for our country.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a news release of the National Broiler Council, an organization dedicated to the growth, development, and improvement of the poultry industry. This news release, dated December 23, 1965, announced participation of Mr. G. Ted Cameron, president of the National Broiler Council, and Mr. Frank Frazier, executive vice president, in the U.S. Feed Grain Trade Exhibits and Seminar, scheduled to take place March 7 to 18, 1966, in Tokyo, Japan.

Participation in this project by the National Broiler Council I am sure will prove most valuable in the development of foreign markets for the poultry industry in the United States.

The article follows:

> DECEMBER 23, 1965.
>
> WASHINGTON, D.C.—The appearance of two American broiler industry leaders on the program of the U.S. Feed Grain Trade Exhibits and Seminar scheduled for next March 7–18 at the U.S. Trade Center in Tokyo, Japan was announced here this week by Clarence D. Palmby, executive vice president of the U.S. Feed Grains Council.
>
> Palmby announced that G. Ted Cameron, president of Mountaire Poultry Co., Inc., North Little Rock, Ark., and Frank Frazier, executive vice president of the National Broiler Council, Washington, D.C., will be key participants during various segments of the entire seminar. Cameron is president of the National Broiler Council.
>
> In making the announcement, Palmby pointed to the timely topics to be presented by each of the broiler industrymen. "The realm of 'Practical Broiler Production in a Scientific Age' and 'The Broiler Business—Finance, Controls, and Marketing' constitute two papers bearing important messages to be given by Mr. Cameron. He is a true practitioner and exemplifies the executive who heads the multiphased operation which comprises a modern broiler firm, and the Far East audience will be especially interested in what he has to say."
>
> The Feed Grains Council executive emphasized that the topic Frazier will cover, "Consumer Information, Market Research, and Market Support Functions of a Commodity Organization," will not only benefit the sponsors of the trade show, but will strengthen market development programs in Japan.
>
> "We were especially glad to receive the report that the Broiler Council's board of directors accepted our invitation extended to Frank Frazier," stated Palmby who is acting for the various groups cooperating with the Foreign Agricultural Service of USDA in making the arrangements for the Tokyo event. "We have observed the outstanding job that the National Broiler Council has done during the past several years, and consider it a classic example of intelligent self help in molding a production-oriented industry into a hard-hitting, market-oriented group using strong programs in merchandising, research, and consumer education—all to the benefit of both the industry and the general public," he added.
>
> Palmby noted that the Feed Grains Council cooperates wherever possible on worthwhile projects that can be of value to groups promoting the export of agricultural products. "We feel the planned trade show, done in cooperation with the American Soybean Association, the National Renderers Association, the U.S. Agricultural Attaché's office in Japan, and the International Trade Fairs division of FAS to be one of these extremely worthwhile projects," he stated.
>
> The announcement from the U.S. Feed Grains Council concluded noting the satisfaction and appreciation of the council's executive when he said, "Cameron and Frazier, along with the others who will make up the program, insure our efforts in making a positive contribution to our expanding dollar sales of an important, interrelated group of American agricultural products to Japan. We certainly are indebted to the National Broiler Council leadership for their cooperation."

Vice Adm. John S. McCain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, those of you who know and respect Vice Adm. John S. McCain will be as pleased as I to learn of the outstanding tribute paid to Admiral McCain by our United Nations Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg.

On January 29, the Old Guard of the city of New York honored Admiral and Mrs. McCain. Ambassador and Mrs. Goldberg were unable to attend the banquet but the Ambassador sent the following telegram to the Old Guard Commandant, Colonel Rizza:

> I regret indeed that matters of state over which I have no control will prevent me from being with the Old Guard on Saturday evening, January 29, when you honor my friend and colleague, Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr. I am especially sorry I cannot be present because I have the highest regard for Admiral McCain. Please convey my regrets to the members of the Old Guard. I would like to tell you that Admiral McCain is

turning in a superior performance in his post in the U.S. mission. He is a good right arm and I value his advice highly. It is also a personal pleasure to be associated with him in our work for peace here at the United Nations.

I also want to convey my cordial regards and respects to Mrs. McCain who has likewise been a great help to my wife and myself in our work here at the United Nations.

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG.

This telegram was read to all who were present. I am sure those of us who admire Admiral McCain, the greatest living expert on and exponent of sea power, will say amen to everything that Ambassador Goldberg has said about Admiral McCain and his charming wife.

Most Budget Growth Due to Nondefense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the budget for fiscal 1967, which President Johnson submitted to Congress January 24, calls for estimated total expenditures of $112,847 million. This is an increase of $36,308 million over the budget for fiscal 1960, just 7 years ago. Actual expenditures that year totaled $76,539 million.

Some will say that the war in Vietnam and our other defense needs have justified these huge increases. It so happens, however, that only 41 percent of the increases have been due to our defense requirements. While defense spending increased by $14,850 million since 1960, nondefense spending went up by $21,458 million during the same period.

I would like to show what accounts for most of this drastic increase in nondefense spending.

The largest of these increases has been $6,272 million for health, labor, and welfare. Economic opportunity programs account for $1,600 million of the increase—these programs began in 1965—public assistance, not including medical care for the aged, increased by $1,303 million; health services for the aged account for $1,122 million of the increase—this program began in 1961—other health services and research increased by $1,684 million; vocational rehabilitation, and so forth, by $438 million; and school lunch, special milk, and food stamp programs by $104 million.

Spending for space research and technology has increased by $4,899 million, the largest part of this sum having been the $3,487 million increase for manned space flight. Funds for scientific investigations in space went up by $531 million, meteorology and other space applications by $92 million, and money for other research, technology, and supporting operations by $790 million.

Interest on the national debt has gone up by $3,588 million since fiscal 1960.

Expenditures for education have increased by $1,968 million, the greatest portion of this having been the $1,219 million increase for elementary and secondary education. Spending for science education and basic research increased by $305 million, higher education funds were reduced by $121 million, and other aids to education required $567 million in additional money.

Expenditures for natural resources went up by $1,305 million. Funds for forests, recreational resources, minerals, fish and wildlife, and so forth, were all increased, the largest increase having been $819 million for land, water, and power resources.

Money spent for international affairs and finance has increased by $1,113 million, the largest share of this having been due to increased outlays for economic and financial programs of $692 million.

Spending for general government has gone up by $1,049 million. This includes money for tax collection and central fiscal operations, property and records management, protective services and alien control, legislative and judicial functions, central personnel management, territories, and possessions, and so forth.

Commercial and transportation outlays are greater by $709 million, which includes increases for aviation, water transportation, postal service, area and regional development (this program began in 1962), regulation of business, and highways.

While spending for agriculture and agricultural resources dropped by $234 million, this was because an increase of $619 million for farm income stabilization and other smaller increases were more than offset by reductions for rural electrification and telephone loans and farming and rural housing loans.

Our political and military leaders have warned us that the war in Vietnam may be a long and hard one. The huge sums that will be necessary for prosecuting this war to victory ought to be offset, as far as possible, by corresponding decreases in other areas of the budget. Much of the responsibility for many of the programs that have been increased over the years could be shifted to State and local governments and to private individuals and organizations. The programs could then be conducted at considerably less expense and would be of less interference to the war effort.

The piecharts which the executive branch prepares annually, with so many cents for this and so many cents for that, are pretty, but remember: Each of these slices of pie will cost a pretty penny. In fact, each penny in the charts represents well over a billion dollars.

Good Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the reverse Peace Corps proposed by President Johnson, which would permit those from other lands to come here to teach their language and culture in American schools, makes good sense.

In the first place, America gained its strength by having many cultures on which to draw.

Our minds are sharpened when new approaches and new ideas are demonstrated. We can better understand our own country by knowing more about other lands. We can better understand our own language by studying other languages. We all know that the best teacher in Spanish, for example, is someone who is speaking in his or her native tongue.

This is not only a world of have and have-not nations, the New York Herald Tribune noted recently, "but a world of nations in which have and have-not people live."

It points out that a great value will come from "making the struggle to raise the living standards of the poor more than ever a cooperative international venture."

Knowing that many will find this of interest, I offer the editorial for publication in the RECORD:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Feb. 3, 1966]

THE REVERSE PEACE CORPS

The reverse Peace Corps proposed yesterday by President Johnson opens some interesting possibilities. He asks that 5,000 foreigners be brought to the United States to teach their language and culture in American schools, and to work in the antipoverty program here. The teaching is reminiscent of the promising cultural exchange proposals made by President Kennedy as part of his Alliance for Progress program; addition of the antipoverty work would emphasize that the struggle to improve the human condition is indeed worldwide.

It is true, certainly, that foreign nationals could find plenty of poverty to fight in their own countries. But techniques learned here would better equip them for the task, while many of them could bring insights that might be strange to the average comfortably situated American, and that would be highly useful in the poverty war.

The greatest value, however, might well be in a growing recognition that we are not merely a world of have and have-not nations, but a world of nations in which have and have-not people live, and in making the struggle to raise the living standards of the poor more than ever a cooperative international venture.

Foreign Aid—Help for Those Who Help Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, if Americans work hard to earn their dollars and pay their taxes, then we can ask of countries expecting our aid that they be willing to work hard in order to make good use of the aid.

This sounds simple enough. In an editorial entitled "Facts of Life," the Baltimore Sun praised President Johnson's message on foreign aid which declared that Uncle Sam will help those countries that can make us of such help to help themselves.

As the Sun points out:

> There is no magical way to make the jump from impoverished, backward economies to industrial affluence.

President Johnson's recommendations for a 5-year economic aid authorization, for a splitting off of military aid, and for a total of $3.39 billion "are soundly based," the editorial stated.

Because this is a subject of concern to us all at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have referred inserted in the RECORD, where I feel sure it will be studied by many of my colleagues:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 3, 1966]

FACTS OF LIFE

President Johnson's message to Congress on foreign aid is a reminder of the facts of life today in the underdeveloped countries. Their populations are increasing too rapidly; their production of food, or their capacity to buy food in world markets, is not increasing rapidly enough. The United States will help them to bring these factors toward a workable balance, if they will show that they can make use of such help to help themselves.

The President's message made the point—so old fashioned that it often is overlooked in a sophisticated world—that "the essence of economic development is work—hard, unremitting, often thankless work." There is no magical way to make the jump from impoverished, backward economies to industrial affluence. He noted that the steps toward modernization must include a heavier investment of a country's own resources in improved farming methods, in school and hospital construction and in essential industry; land reform and tax revision; a realistic facing of the problems caused by the rapid increase in population; an economic climate that will attract foreign investment and will keep local money at home. To those who may resent such advice from such a wealthy nation, the President can point out that it is based on our own experience, and that many of the steps were difficult for us, too.

A major change in foreign-aid emphasis, as well as in procedure, thus is proposed by the President. It is time for such a change, and Mr. Johnson should be encouraged to carry it out. Continued American help to economic development programs is essential, in our own interest no less than that of others, but aid is wasted if the programs are set up on weak foundations. Within this framework, Mr. Johnson's recommendations for a 5-year economic aid authorization from Congress, for a splitting-off of military aid, and for a total of $3.39 billion are soundly based.

USDA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a fine editorial on the budget requests of the Department of Agriculture which appeared in the February 2 edition of the Burlington Hawkeye. I believe the author, Mr. John McCormally, has presented an excellent analysis of the relationship of agriculture to the Nation's economy and the contribution the Agriculture Department makes to all citizens in both urban and rural areas.

I also believe that the separation of nonagricultural items from the budget of the Department of Agriculture would contribute to better public support of our agriculture program and to a better understanding of the true scope of this effort. The article follows:

USDA

When the next year's agricultural department budget is announced, critics bemoan the billions being lavished on the farmers, or spent on misguided farm support programs.

Apologists always reply that the budget is misleading. That there are many things done in the name of agriculture which are for the benefit of the city man as much or more than for the farmer. Examples are the meat inspections programs to protect the housewife shopper, and those campgrounds in the national forests.

Extension Director Jim Hodges sends over a bulletin which makes even more graphically the point that the Agriculture Department's interests range far. It reports that Department entomologists have developed a new insect repellent for protection against both water and land leeches, those ugly little globs which attach themselves to the skin and suck out blood.

The new preparation, field tested in jungle areas of the Philippines, is especially designed for use by our troops in Vietnam. It really ought to be charged to the Defense Department budget. No one ever argues much about that.

False Witness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRENTISS WALKER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1966, I inserted into the RECORD an editorial from a Mississippi publication pointing out the injustices done to the city of Jackson, Miss., and its fine police department as a result of unproven charges of police brutality brought by racial agitators after the arrest of civil rights demonstrators last June in that city.

One might be led to believe that the feelings expressed in that editorial are held only by Mississippians and people of other Southern States. However, in the Sidney, Mont., Herald, on December 22, 1965, there appeared an editorial which brings out the fact that such actions are not restricted merely to the Southern States, and deems such charges a warning to every community in this land.

This interesting and thought-provoking article follows:

FALSE WITNESS

One of the disturbing signs of these times is the readiness of some supposedly intelligent and responsible persons to accept and publicize, without question, an accused lawbreaker's claim that he was abused by the police. Take the case in Jackson, Miss., last June, when several hundred persons were arrested while picketing the State legislature, for parading without permits and refusing to disperse when so ordered. Agents of the U.S. Justice Department, "civil rights" attorneys and representatives of national news media were on hand during arrest and confinement of the demonstrators. None of them reported any undue force used by police. But then a three-man committee from the National Council of Churches talked with demonstrator-prisoners for only 2 hours (by their own statements), and thereafter presented to a group of U.S. Congressmen their "official" report charging the Jackson police with "Hitlerite" tactics, including gassing and beating of prisoners, kicking pregnant women in the stomachs, forcing women to undress in front of policemen, denial of food and medical treatment, and other such atrocities.

Headlines of several prominent newspapers blared this "news," TV commentators on nationwide networks "sorrowfully" reported it, several Members of Congress from other regions deplored the "police state" situation in the South which it seemed to represent—all without checking or waiting for proper authorities to check the validity of those charges against the Jackson police. Meanwhile, the mayor of Jackson and Mississippi State officials were demanding a Federal investigation to clear up the matter.

That investigation was completed many weeks ago, and not one single charge against Jackson police has been filed by the Justice Department. But we haven't seen any banner headlines announcing their exoneration of the NCC group's accusations. We've heard no apologies or corrections from any of the commentators or Congressmen who propagated those false stories across the Nation. Nor have we seen any sign that those "clergymen" who made up the NCC committee have done anything to atone for bearing false witness against the policemen of that southern city.

There is a warning note in all this for every community in the land. While the Southern States and communities have been the main targets so far, false charges of police brutality are now being made in other areas, too. The FBI has investigated 1,787 such allegations this year. Only 13 were found to warrant indictments. It is understandable that an accused lawbreaker might in turn accuse the police of mistreating him. But when clergymen, newsmen, and public officials promote charges of police brutality without first making sure of the facts, there is reason for the rest of us to question either their intelligence or their motives.

Vietnam Views Expressed in Hawaii by Visiting Newspapermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, newspapermen, because of the very nature of their work, are an excellent source of information concerning the opinion of a nation on important issues.

Recently, a distinguished group of 17 newspapermen, representing such countries as Australia, South Vietnam, Okinawa, Malaysia, Republic of China, Japan and New Zealand, during a stopover in Hawaii gave what they believed were the views of their people concerning the conflict in Vietnam. Their frank appraisal of the situation ranged from a recently awakened interest by the people of Australia to one of alarm by the people of New Zealand. But, by and large, the general concensus was one of support of the U.S. position.

The group is visiting the United States at the invitation of our Government. Because we respect and value the views of the Asian and Pacific countries, and because the opinions of many of these nations are reflected in the opinions of the visiting newsmen, I commend for your reading the article which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of Thursday, January 20, 1966:

ASIA, PACIFIC NEWSMEN BACK U.S. VIET POLICY

Asian and Pacific newspapermen visiting Honolulu yesterday expressed worry and regret over the war in Vietnam, but most said they thought U.S. intervention there was necessary for world peace.

Nghiem Xuan Thien, editor of Saigon's Thoi-Luan Daily News, said:

"The key to military success in my country is protection of the villages—because it is the villages that supply food to the Vietcong."

Thien is one of 17 newsmen from the Far East and the South Pacific who are looking at Hawaii this week before going to the Mainland at the invitation of the U.S. Government.

Thein, who fled Hanoi and the Communists in 1954, said:

"It would take millions of troops to protect the South Vietnam frontier. It would be impossible."

He said the United States is doing a good job protecting many of the villages. "U.S. protection of a village is like an oil spot—it spreads U.S. friendly influence."

Said J. Lloyd Marshall, feature writer for the Perth Daily News in western Australia:

"The penny has finally dropped in Australia.

"Twelve months ago there wasn't much awareness of the war. Now there is a keen awareness and the people realize that what they are really up against is Red China.

"We know that if South Vietnam is lost Red China will get her hands on the southeast Asia food bowl. Australia realizes that the Australian nation would then be at stake."

Morihide Tomikawa of the Okinawa Times political desk, said:

"The people of Okinawa are deeply concerned with the escalation of the Vietnamese war. We have had many, many demonstrations seeking peace."

Because of Okinawa's strategic position in the Pacific and past experiences with war "Okinawans always fear what will happen."

Chen Ken-sin, bureau chief of Sin Chew Jit Poh in Malaysia, said:

"Malaysia would be threatened if South Vietnam falls to the Communists. Our Prime Minister has stated time and again that he wants to see a peaceful settlement."

Albert H. Liu, reporter for Taipei's United Daily News, said the Republic of China is firmly behind the American intervention in Vietnam.

"Peace and security of southeast Asia can be won," he said. "Our Government hopes America continues her present policy in Vietnam."

Ikuo Kanmuri, editorial writer for Kyodo News Service in Tokyo, said:

"Japan is very worried over the war's escalation. Every day the press keeps saying that it hopes the war will not get bigger.

"Some people think the United States is to blame as much as the Communists."

Keith Eunson senior editorial writer of the Otago Daily Times in New Zealand, said:

"New Zealand considers the war with alarm. We back every peace proposal the United States had made.

"But what's the solution?"

Not In Vain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT TENZER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, it is to the President's everlasting credit that he gave Hanoi every opportunity possible to show some signs of willingness to negotiate before he ordered the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam.

The New York World Telegram of February 1, declared editorially:

> Surely no nation in history in the midst of a war ever made so many conciliatory overtures to an enemy. And no enemy has been less provoked and more wrong, morally, in its aggression.

But in spite of the bombing resumption, as the World Telegram declared:

> Still, Johnson is not giving up on the hope that talking is better than fighting. We have asked the United Nations Security Council to meet especially to deal with the Vietnam war.

I am much in agreement with this editorial when it states:

> What the Security Council can do, or is willing to do, is a question. But the proposal shows how far this country has been willing to go in an effort to supplant the battle with debate at a conference table.

Perhaps the move to the United Nations Security Council is only a step in the direction of the conference table which may very well take place in Geneva. Speaking for myself and as the voice in the 89th Congress of the people in my district, I say, the sooner the better. The life which may be saved might be a loved one.

The World-Telegram's editorial is a resolute affirmation of this country's determination that the loss of American and allied lives shall not have been in vain. I am pleased to ask permission to have the editorial inserted in the RECORD.

[From the New York World-Telegram, Feb. 1, 1966]

THE BOMBING RESUMES

After 37 days of deliberate restraint, the United States—in agreement with the South Vietnamese—has resumed bombing military targets in Communist North Vietnam.

This is, quite plainly, a military necessity. Most Americans, in our judgment, would say it is about time. The risk of not trying to disrupt Communist supply sources, infiltration routes and other assets of the North Vietnam invaders are substantial from the standpoint of the safety of the allied forces in the south.

But the South Vietnamese and the United States took these risks to give the Communists every opportunity, beyond doubt, to agree to something: a cease-fire, negotiations, a slowdown in the fighting.

President Johnson's statement yesterday summed up the situation exactly: We were urged to wait 10 to 20 days for a response from Hanoi. We waited 37 days and got nothing. Meanwhile, Communist violence against the South Vietnamese and our own forces went on, even during the one-sided new year truce.

The Vietnamese and our troops are anxious for peace, "but while there is no peace they are entitled to the full support of American strength and American determination."

Still, Johnson is not giving up on the hope that "talking is better than fighting." We have asked the United Nations Security Council to meet especially to deal with the Vietnam war.

What the Security Council can do, or is willing to do, is a question. But the proposal shows how far this country has been willing to go in an effort to supplant the battle with debate at a conference table.

Surely no nation in history in the midst of a war ever made so many conciliatory overtures to an enemy. And no enemy has been less provoked and more wrong, morally, in its aggression.

The bombing may not persuade Ho Chi Minh and his backers to come and talk. It will help take the heat off the troops in combat.

But since the Communists won't even give a civil answer to the overtures for negotiation, or to world opinion, the only choice is to try another proposition—military pressure.

Our only objective is "peace and freedom" in South Vietnam. If this is not possible by negotiation, we simply will have to achieve it the hard way, by force.

Mr. Speaker, we are the strongest and most powerful nation in the world. We have the equipment—the firepower, the ammunition—to exert the "military pressure" of which the editorial speaks, however, I am convinced that our President and the overwhelming majority of Americans want peace. That is why I believe that President Johnson will use this military power with restraint, with caution, with the reservation that having twice stopped the bombing, we may do so again when the talks begin.

On January 10, 1966, I suggested that we consider a blockade of the port of Haiphong. Today, February 7, 1966, in the light of events which have taken place in the space of only 28 days, I propose postponing consideration of that suggestion for the time being, so as not to hinder or frustrate our President's peace efforts.

I share the views of my constituents that every avenue and door to peace be kept open. This is the position of our President today and it will be to his everlasting credit if this continues to be his policy—so that his efforts to establish peace in the world shall not be in vain.

Plain Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. HANLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in making it plain why the airstrikes over North

Vietnam were resumed, the New York Herald Tribune did a masterful job on February 1 when it stated that if Ho Chi Minh insists on war or surrender, he must have war.

"No American can feel happy at being presented with this choice," the newspaper stated, adding that since Hanoi made it so abundantly clear that it was rejecting all overtures for peace talks we were left with no alternative.

The editorial stated:

> Few Americans would want to endanger the lives of our men in Vietnam by a continued withholding of the means to strike at North Vietnamese supply routes, or allow Ho to work his wicked will from sanctuary.

This is an issue which concerns us day and night, and I commend the Herald Tribune for its concise, logical presentation of the facts. I believe many of my colleagues will want to see it, and I therefore offer it for the RECORD:

BOMBS AND RESOLUTIONS

In announcing the resumption of bombing attacks on North Vietnam, President Johnson made it plain that this was the result of the considered judgment of the responsible military and political agencies of the American Government. And that judgment can only be seriously contested on the assumption that the United States has no business in Vietnam at all.

For the bombing pause failed to produce any hint from Hanoi that it was willing to sit down at the conference table. It not only continued to insist on acceptance of its original four points (which would mean total victory for the Vietcong) but has added, as the British Foreign Office terms it, "a new and even more unacceptable prior condition"—recognition of the Vietcong as "the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam."

Since Ho Chi Minh insists on war or surrender, he must have war. No American can feel happy at being presented with this choice. But since it has been made so abundantly clear by the rejection of President Johnson's peace overtures, few Americans would want to endanger the lives of their men in Vietnam by a continued withholding of the means to strike at North Vietnamese supply routes, or allow Ho to work his wicked will from sanctuary.

At the same time, the United States is fighting this war to end it, and the President has given renewed evidence of American determination in this respect by taking the case formally to the United Nations.

This has not been done before for several reasons. In the first place, the only international body which had been seized of the Vietnamese dispute was the Geneva Conference of 1954. That body could be recalled to discuss the problem; the British Government, as one cochairman, has been trying to do so. The Soviet Union, the other cochairman, has refused.

There is also the fact that neither North Vietnam nor Red China, the power prodding Ho Chi Minh toward continued war, is a member of the U.N., and both have repeatedly and explicity denied that the U.N. has any role to play in their affairs.

The American resolution, however, does not set forth specific terms for a settlement, or even outline fixed steps toward a settlement—which would almost certainly have brought immediate rejection by Hanoi. Rather, the American proposal would place the Security Council officially in back of a general search for peace, such as the United States has already, informally, asked the U.N. to undertake. This would include a conference, with the objective of applying the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 (the latter concerned Laos) and of setting up and supervising a cease-fire. Composition of the conference is not spelled out; the door remains open for mediation or arbitration, as suggested by Pope Paul.

The effect of such a resolution would bring pressure upon the Soviet Union to do what it has thus far refused to do—sponsor another session of the Geneva Conference. It would also, if adopted (or even if accepted by a majority and lose through a Soviet veto) furnish Security Council support for American peace efforts. And in any case, by accompanying the bombs with a resolution, President Johnson dramatizes anew the American position: to fight if necessary; to negotiate if possible.

Federal Funds Already Have Aided Many Persons in Volusia County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the great State of Florida is moving into the vanguard of those States making maximum use of provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, the war on poverty.

I am proud of the tremendous progress being made by the city of Tampa and Hillsborough County which comprise the congressional district which I have the privilege to represent in the House of Representatives. On our east coast, Volusia County is moving forward in several antipoverty programs. The Daytona Beach News-Journal, one of Florida's great newspapers, is running a series of articles dealing with that county's efforts in this battle.

The article follows:

FEDERAL FUNDS ALREADY HAVE AIDED MANY PERSONS IN VOLUSIA COUNTY

(By Ray LaPrise)

As Project Upgrade officials are struggling to get approval from the Office of Economic Opportunity, Atlanta, on their own application for working funds and the application from the West Volusia Council on Human Relations, some Federal money to fight poverty already has come into the county.

Volusia school officials got a $71,068 grant last summer to operate Head Start. This is the project under which 526 5- and 6-year-olds from low-income families throughout the county got kindergarten instruction, medical care and nutritious lunches in 13 schools from June 8 to July 27.

As the program went on for tots, their parents also were invited to attend night meetings at the schools where qualified speakers lectured on such topics as legal aid and how to manage on low budgets.

The antipoverty program also has been felt through Neighborhood Youth Corps. John Shaw, manager of the local Florida State Employment Service, said his office was asked to recruit young people—mostly high school dropouts—by the Florida Park Service, Florida Forestry Service and Road Department.

Shaw, who also serves as chairman of Upgrade's committee on employment, job training and counseling, said 37 young people from this area were hired out of the 61 who applied for Neighborhood Youth Corps since last June.

As members of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, they work 32 hours a week and spend another 2 hours a day studying. Among them are eight youths and one girl on duty at Tomoka State Park.

Financially handicapped students at Bethune-Cookman College here and at Stetson University, DeLand, have been enabled to continue their work because of what is called the work-study program.

Bethune-Cookman College got a grant of $18,000 for the spring and summer semesters last year and another grant of $90,000 for the fall 1965 semester and 1966 spring semester.

College officials distribute the money to students hired for such campus jobs as laboratory and library assistants and dormitory supervisors.

A number of Stetson students also benefited by work-study grants received by the university, including $14,235 for last spring's semester, $40,000, last summer and $22,396 for the 1965 fall semester.

Upgrade's present officers are former Daytona Beach Commissioner Stanley Nass, president; Mrs. Glenn A. Bassett, Daytona Beach, secretary; Volusia School Superintendent John Smiley, vice president; and Volusia Juvenile Judge Robert L. Lee, treasurer.

Upgrade also has 11 committees, whose chairmen are:

Rev. Rogers P. Fair, resident participation, 15 members; Volusia Health Officer D. V. Galloway, health, 7 members; Florida State Employment Service Manager John Shaw, employment, job training, and counseling, 5 members; Juvenile Judge Lee, finance, 4 members; Dr. Harland Merriam, evaluation to programs, 5 members; County Commissioner Smith, governmental, 4 members; Mrs. Richard Fellows, welfare, 8 members; urban renewal relocation officer, James Daniels, housing and home management, 6 members; Julian Markham, education, 7 members; Rev. Lilburn Moseley, consumer education and information, 6 members; and Daytona Beach Attorney Leon van Wert, legal aid, 7 members.

Upgrade, until it gets money to rent its own office space, will go on filling out forms and storing its files in Van Wert's office at 136½ South Beach Street.

Public Land Treatment: Watershed Project Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed by the efforts being made in the State through local soil conservation districts to improve and make better use of our land and water resources. I am particularly interested in the work being done in local watershed projects to reduce flooding, protect lands and homes, and bring about a brighter economic future. I am concerned that this work move ahead as rapidly as possible. Serious flooding in 1962 and 1964 produced millions of dollars in damages in my State; we need to be better prepared in the future.

One problem in watershed progress is potentially of concern in many States where public and private lands are intermingled. In several cases, public land agency funds have been insufficient to meet land treatment needs; but projects were not approved by the Congress that proposed the use of Public Law 566 funds for land treatment on Federal land, although the law does not limit such use.

A resolution passed by the Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts at its recent meeting bears on this subject. I would like to insert it as a part of my remarks, and to urge that the problem be resolved so that these projects can be approved and move toward completion, to the benefit of all the people of Idaho.

Whereas Public Law 566 requires proper land use and proper treatment along with structural measures for flood prevention, agricultural water management, and other purposes, and

Whereas the Watershed Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee refuses to approve watershed projects under Public Law 566 if those projects require the use of Public Law 566 funds for accelerated land treatment of Federal lands, and

Whereas Idaho is a "public land" State with more than two-thirds of the total land area in national forest or public domain so that every Public Law 566 project will contain substantial areas of Federal lands in need of proper treatment, and

Whereas the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management advise that sufficient funds are not available to accomplish the accelerated conservation treatment needed on Federal lands within several projects being planned within the State of Idaho, and

Whereas these plans have been or are being developed at considerable cost from both Public Law 566 and State of Idaho funds; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the IASCD in convention assembled, That the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management be requested to secure sufficient funds in their appropriations for specific use in Public Law 566 watersheds to accomplish the planned accelerated program or, that the House Committee on Agriculture permit approval of projects even though Public Law 566 funds would be used for accelerated land treatment on public lands; Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Governor Smylie, Regional Forester Floyd Iverson, State Director Joe Pallini, Senate and House Agriculture Committees, Idaho Congressmen, Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, Director of the Budget Bureau, Chief of the Forest Service, Director of Bureau of Land Management, and Administrator of SCS.

Selective "Sacrifice" Unfair, Won't Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the misdirection of both the war in Vietnam and equally tragic, the domestic economy is slowly dawning on many Americans. Columnist Eliot Janeway, of the Chicago Tribune, discussed in a very illuminating fashion the domestic economic inconsistencies of the administration in an article which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

SELECTIVE "SACRIFICE" UNFAIR, WON'T WORK

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, February 6.—Vietnam isn't the only theater of war that's no man's land. Here at home the war is also being fought as a game of now you see it, now you don't. That's what selective sacrifice boils down to, and selective sacrifice is what Washington is demanding.

The off-again-on-again deal on auto and telephone sales taxes is the latest example. Operation Candy Bar—as the 12-day tax present to carbuyers and phone users is getting to be called in Washington—singles out these two industries and their customers for highly selective sacrifice.

The $1.2 billion the administration proposes to raise from new auto and sales taxes is a drop in the bucket alongside the $30 billions already needed to make good the Vietnam deficit for this fiscal year and next. To the consumer, the proposed taxes would be just a minor irritant. But to the country, Washington's reliance on selective sacrifice is becoming a major worry—not merely because of the obvious question of fairplay raised by singling out favorites and victims: but because selective sacrifice won't work and, therefore, is no way to fight an escalated war in the nuclear age.

LIST IS GROWING

The list is growing. When the aluminum producers put on a half-penny price rise, which still left their product at pre-1960 levels, they were reminded that we're in a war. But when the tab to buy off New York City's illegal transit strike started to jump $10 million per press conference, the guidelines were set for peace as usual.

When the administration moved to roll back the price of copper, it bit off more than it could chew. For copper is an international commodity, and no Government action to control its price within this country will control it throughout the world.

One of the ways Washington has held the American price down has been by limiting exports.

This will be a bargain for American users so long as the supply holds out. But it is costly for foreign users (and, incidentally, to earnings on American copper exports). Meanwhile, the shortage abroad has bid the world price up to more than double the American price. At the present rate of strain and dislocation, the Government will soon have to lean on still another selectively controlled section of the market. It already has a black market to control, which is another sign that there really is a war on.

Each experiment in selective controls forces the next. The inflation of world copper prices is now being duplicated in the hide market. The Vietnam bulge has already doubled the price of this basic material, and the cost to American shoe and leather producers has risen as fast as it has to foreign merchants. So far, the American consumers of copper, who are manufacturers, have had all the inflation protection. The American consumers of hides—who are shoe buyers have had none. Consequently, shoes could cost as much as 10 percent more by the time the next school year rolls around.

SAME DEAL FOR HIDES

If what was good for copper is good for inflation control, the same deal should be good for hides, too. If the way Roosevelt ran his war sets any examples for us today, we should note that one of his first moves was to slap export controls on hides. Admittedly, however, this problem was simplified for him because the emergency of 1940 did not come to a boil until after Europe had been lost. Today, Europe is our rich ally, and she wants our hides. Also, back then, Latin America was a bigger factor in the world hide market than she is today—despite all the money we have poured into aid there.

On the merits, then, fair play and L.B.J.'s guidelines would seem to entitle shoe buyers to selective controls on hide exports and, therefore, on hide prices. We're exporting 40 percent of the supply from our annual cattle kill, and so there's no doubt that export controls would cool off the overheated hide market. But this would add the cattlemen to the list of selective price control victims; and there are lots more of them than there are aluminum mills or telephone companies.

Selective controls on hides would also stir up a storm of protest abroad—not only among our allies, but from Russia and the satellites in Eastern Europe. They know how to handle themselves in Washington more effectively than American businessmen do. Perhaps it's time to ask not what we can go on doing for them, but what they can start doing for us, beginning with Vietnam.

Head Start Is Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, last summer over 500,000 preschool children throughout this country took part in one of the most imaginative programs for social betterment ever conceived.

Eve Edstrom, writing in this morning's Washington Post, makes it clear that the ambitious hopes inspired by the Head Start program were in large measure realized.

This favorable experience was also recorded in Indianapolis, located in Indiana's 11th Congressional District, where 600 children took part in the 8-week program last summer.

In fact, results were so satisfactory that 1,200 preschool youngsters in Indianapolis are now involved in a year-round Head Start program to prepare impoverished children to get the most out of school.

Because of the widespread interest in the results of the pioneering Head Start program, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by the Washington Post's staff writer, Eve Edstrom:

IS HEAD START A SUCCESS? ASK ANY 5-YEAR-OLD IN IT

(By Eve Edstrom)

It was a summer when a child found a lap to sit on, a hand to hold.

It was a summer when a child ate her first apple, held a knife and fork for the first time.

And it was a summer when a child learned, learned to speak, to share, to smile.

This was the summer of Head Start, the most popular and the least controversial of all the Nation's war on poverty programs.

From the report of a consultant to a Head Start project in a Southern hollow: "When the children were asked what they wanted to do when they grew up, the answer was, 'I want to draw.' This meant to draw a welfare check. There was nothing else for them to look forward to."

The Head Start object is to give a better meaning to a life.

Even so, this program to open up opportunities for impoverished preschoolers is not without its critics. A Syracuse, N.Y., poverty official suggests its chief accomplishment was that "it got the public schools off the hook."

"Head Start prepares slum kids for the schools instead of changing the schools to meet the kids' needs," he said.

And an Oakland, Calif., poverty warrior suspects that Head Start's greatest accomplishment is that "everyone connected with the program had good feelings."

Well, maybe the good feelings are justified.

The 5-year-old's unmarried mother had never let the child out of the house. During her first days in a Head Start class, she didn't talk, wouldn't eat, refused to look at an adult. She faced a future in a class for the mentally deficient.

But a 16-year-old Head Start volunteer became the little girl's special friend. First came a word or two, then a few bits of conversation, finally chatter. The youngster proved to be exceptionally bright and sensitive. She is now in a class for normal children.

The case is not unique. In many situations, children who had been mute for lack of any adult stimulation talked for the first time. There was one such 5-year-old who had spent most of his waking hours sitting at the feet of his blind grandfather.

Perhaps the most significant feature of Head Start was the fact that there was at least 1 teacher for every 14 children—41,000 teachers for 561,000 children.

In addition, each teacher had two assistants so that the adult-child ratio was at least 1 to 5. Not only was each child able to get individual attention, but emphasis could be placed on doing—visiting the firehouse or the zoo—instead of listening.

One-third of the teacher aids were mothers of the children. And they were helped to gain confidence in themselves. One mother, who was absent 1 day because of illness, returned to hear the children tell how much they missed her.

"No one has ever said that to me before," she told the director. "I never thought anyone would miss me."

Communities also found new ways to reach the parents. In Los Angeles, for example, washers and dryers were donated to Head Start centers so that mothers could do their laundry while discussing problems with neighbors, teachers, and social service aids.

Fathers particpated, too. They painted buildings, built furniture, transformed junkyards into playgrounds. The entire town of Winstonville, Miss., converted a church into a Head Start center.

Nationwide, during this summertime program, the services of 500,000 volunteers, ranging from mothers on relief to suburban socialites, were used. They proved that volunteers can be used effectively in a field where professionalization has been the rule.

But not all the components of Head Start were so successful. Head Start was conceived as a comprehensive program to meet the total needs of a child so he would have a foundation for breaking out of poverty. In numerous communities, however, it proved difficult to deliver the medical, dental, and social services that the children needed.

"Bruce stammers and cries easily; when he first came to school he could communicate only by pushing or hitting," a Head Start teacher's report reads. "Now a smile lights up his face whenever we will listen patiently while he stammers out the words he wants to say. He is learning to keep his hands to himself and to play less roughly."

Bruce was one of the lucky ones. Head Start secured a psychologist for him, to investigate the roots of his stammer. But most of the preschoolers with problems face no such certainty of treatment.

The cost of cures will grow as the children grow. A recent Office of Economic Opportunity study of a Neighborhood Youth Corps group estimated the cost of giving each teenager a full medical examination and treatment at something over $200. But for the dental treatment they estimate an additional $300 will be necessary.

However, as one Head Start director in Mississippi said, "If we did nothing but give the children two good meals a day, we've done a lot—I never saw so many hungry children." Several of her children wanted to stay late "for something more to eat."

And so by the end of the summer experiment, there appeared to be a national concensus that the 8-week program should be considered just the end of a new beginning for children of the poor.

President Johnson called for followup services for children who had been enrolled in the summer program, for year-round Head Starts in communities that have the facilities and teachers, and a repeat summer program for 500,000 preschoolers in 1966.

The demand for Head Start has outstretched available dollars. Followup services and year-round programs have been slow in getting started. Currently, there are about 110,000 in the year-round program, and, through President Johnson's personal intervention, funds for 200,000 children will be available during the next school year.

And this means, in the words of one Head Start teacher, 200,000 children will be helped to get a "surer grasp on their sometimes shaky heritage which promises them the right to the 'pursuit of happiness.' "

One Man, One Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the president of the League of Women Voters in Mount Clemens, Mich., recently wrote a letter to the editor of the Macomb Daily in which she outlines some of the reasons behind the league's support for the Supreme Court's decisions on apportionment of State legislatures.

I am very pleased that the league has taken this position on this important constitutional issue. Mrs. Marshall Bomar, the president of the Mount Clemens league, states her case very well in her letter. I invite the attention of my colleagues to Mrs. Bomar's letter to the editor and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter follows:

[From the Macomb Daily, Jan. 29, 1966]

BACK POPULATION BASIS FOR STATE LEGISLATURES

The members of the League of Women Voters of the United States believe that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned substantially on population. The league is convinced that this standard, established by recent apportionment decisions of the Supreme Court, should be maintained and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended to allow for consideration of factors other than population in apportioning either or both houses of State legislatures.

Of overriding importance to the league in coming to this decision is the conviction that a population standard is the fairest and most equitable way of assuring that each man's vote is of equal value in a democratic and representative system of government. Other considerations influencing league decisions are that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended hastily or without due consideration because of an "unpopular" court decision, and that individual rights now protected by the Constitution should not be weakened or abridged.

Against the background of its longstanding interest in State government, the league also hopes that by maintaining a population standard State government may be strengthened by insuring that State legislatures are more representative of people wherever they live. Finally, the league feels certain that the term "substantially" used in Supreme Court decisions allows adequate leeway for districting to provide for any necessary local diversities.

MARILYN E. BOMAR,
President, League of Women Voters,
Mount Clemens.

Our Man at the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson chose Arthur Goldberg to be our Ambassador to the United Nations he chose one of the most able and talented public servants in our Government. In the short time that Ambassador Goldberg has served the Nation at the United Nations he has earned the esteem of not only his fellow Americans but also that of his colleagues in the world organization.

A proper commendation of his particular talents is contained in the following column by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the February 7, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune. I commend Mr. Drummond's column to the attention of our colleagues:

DULL SPEECHES DON'T COUNT—GOLDBERG SEEN FILLING BILL AS A STAR U.N. NEGOTIATOR

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's surprise decision to take Arthur Goldberg off the Supreme Court bench and make him Ambassador to the United Nations is paying good dividends.

In the judgment of most of the foreign diplomats who have worked with him and watched him at firsthand during the 6 months he has been on the job, Mr. Goldberg is proving to be the most effective representative the United States has had at the U.N.

This is solid praise from experienced professionals who are by no means biased in favor of the United States. But this does not keep them from esteeming ability when they see it, especially when it comes quickly into view.

Bluntly put, the consensus on Goldberg at the U.N. is: poor orator, great negotiator.

The reason Goldberg is so useful is that his special talents are especially adapted to what is most needed to get things done—or at least move ahead—at the United Nations.

He is a negotiating craftsman.

He is patient, tireless, calm, and affable.

As a lawyer who usually had labor as his client and as Secretary of Labor who had the Government as his client. Goldberg had long used his skills at mediation and reconciling deeply held differences. These skills are signally useful at the U.N.

Those who have listened to Goldberg's public speeches at the General Assembly and at the Security Council would not describe them as other than dull and boring, delivered in a flat voice and at too great length.

Few things are less important at the U.N. than public oratory.

Those who have worked with and watched Goldberg as a private negotiator and as a persuader in the corridors of diplomacy, agree that he is articulate, lucid, and succinct.

Few things are more important at the U.N. than offstage negotiation. One ambassador from a neutral country put it to me this way:

"Good oratory at the U.N. is about 7 percent of the job. Ninety-three percent of the job is behind the scenes talking privately with delegates and winning support. This is what makes Goldberg so valuable to the United States and to the U.N. We're impressed."

Obviously nobody accomplishes anything singlehandedly at the United Nations. It takes a convergence of events and at least a near consensus of will within which a negotiating craftsman can work.

Within such consensus Ambassador Goldberg has already contributed significantly to three major U.N. accomplishments.

He helped greatly to bring about the 9-to-2 vote (four abstentions) which put the Vietnam war on the agenda of the Security Council. The Security Council may not act further, but this very step holds a prospect of opening up new avenues for negotiation.

More than anyone else, he reconciled the differences which at different stages threatened to prevent the Security Council from reaching a unified action on both the India-Pakistan war and Rhodesia.

He contributed to ending the dues deadlock which had immobilized the U.N. for an entire year.

His fellow ambassadors at the U.N. know that Goldberg has all doors open to him at the White House and the State Department, that he helps to shape as well as expound U.S. policy.

President Johnson is now more sure than ever that the unorthodox Goldberg appointment was the right one.

Wise Selection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the President is once again to be commended for another wise appointment—that of Constance Baker Motley to fill a vacancy on that Federal district court in New York City.

No one underestimates the importance of finding men and women of dedication, talent and devotion to their country for important posts such as Federal judgeships.

The Washington Post has hailed the nomination of this woman, calling her "eminently fitted for a Federal judgeship." The newspaper complimented the President for having named her and the judiciary on having acquired her.

I herewith submit the editorial to which I have referred for inclusion in the RECORD:

PORTIA ON THE BENCH

President Johnson's choice of Manhattan Borough President Constance Baker Motley to fill a vacancy on the Federal district court in New York City is wholly felicitous from every point of view. As one of the principal attorneys for the NAACP's legal defense and education fund, she has had a wealth of courtroom experience; she is known as a tough, resourceful and witty advocate, at once shrewed and learned in the law. She has had legislative experience, too, as a New York senator and a brief turn at executive responsibility as Manhattan's Borough President.

By all the standard qualifications, therefore, she is eminently fitted for a Federal judgeship. That she happens also to be the first Negro woman to be given so important a judicial office comes as a kind of frosting on the cake. It was time to find someone of her race and sex for the Federal bench. We congratulate the President on finding her and the judiciary on acquiring her as a fresh and vital addition.

Why the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty Should Be Rejected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of economics at Georgetown University and chairman of the National Captive Nations Week Committee, has written a scholarly article on the proposed consular treaty between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of the article:

WHY THE UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. CONSULAR TREATY SHOULD BE REJECTED

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

There are 10 solid reasons why the U.S. Senate should emphatically not ratify the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty which the Committee on Foreign Relations reported out favorably last August. Most of these reasons were scarcely touched upon in the somewhat superficial public discussion that was precipitated by the committee's sudden action. This condition, however, should be no cause for wonderment. Since the signing of this Second Treaty of Moscow on June 1, 1964, every attempt has been made to keep the convention out of the arena of public discussion as much as possible.[1]

When the consummate attempt was made to railroad this seemingly innocuous pact through the Senate, numerous legislators and organizations joined in a strong protest against its blind ratification. Interestingly enough, some of the press distorted this fact into some sort of rightwing opposition. One paper, for example, painted it in terms of a deluge of letters inspired by the "Liberty Lobby and other rightwing organizations," though these groups expressed themselves marginally and in the final phase of last summer's episode.[2] An editorial in another organ supporting the treaty observed with guarded overtones, "most of the opposition seems to be made up of organized letter-writing members of such ultra-conservative groups as the John Birch Society and the Liberty Lobby." [3] Employing this same smear tactic, a third proponent of the convention showed little esteem for the general intelligence of the Senate when it recklessly charged that the Senate was scared off by the Liberty Lobby which "saw to it that the Senators were bombarded with protest letters." [4]

Anyone who has followed closely the developments surrounding the treaty even before it was signed, cannot but view such reporting and editorializing as crassly inaccurate and misleading. As early as March 1964, the National Captive Nations Committee publicly opposed this pact, 3 months before it was signed in Moscow.[5] In June of that year several national ethnic organizations declared their opposition to the pact. When a number of Senators and others joined the growing chorus of bipartisan protest to the pact's ratification, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee decided not to consider the convention until the next Congress.

With the new 89th Congress in being for its 1st session, periodic inquiries were made as to the scheduling of open, public hearings on the treaty. Some serious discussion of it was being fostered by interested parties.[6] The consistent reply given to the inquiries was that no hearings were as yet being set.[7] As late as July the same position was maintained.[8] In that month, however, citizen groups observing the Seventh Captive Nations Week observance throughout the Nation registered their strong opposition to the treaty, and again the call was raised for public hearings. At about this time it was announced that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had authorized the chairman to schedule public hearings.[9] The now-on-now-off treatment caused one committee member to assert that this latest action came "as a complete surprise to me."

Contrary to the quoted press reports and editorials, the opposition to the treaty was markedly cross-sectional, including liberals as well as conservatives, Democrats as well as Republicans. Objectively speaking, the reasons offered by so-called ultrarightwing groups should be evaluated on their own merits rather than substituting for them labels of invidious distinction. The same rule in objective reasoning would apply to any stand taken by their counterparts on the left. Moreover, what was not generally known about the 1964 summer episode was the quiet effort of a concerned Congressman who apprised 57 Senators of the defects in the treaty and even threatened to have the House Foreign Affairs Committee conduct open and fair hearings on the issue.

Examples of the replies to the Congressman's initiative make for perspective reading. Thanking him for his critical observations, one Senator adds, "I have not as yet had an opportunity to study this treaty carefully, but my present inclination is to vote against it." Another prominent Senator states, "You find me in complete agreement with your views on this most important subject. It is my intention not only to vote against the Convention when it is considered by the Senate but to do all that I can to persuade others to vote against it." Concerning the critical material given him, a third Senator reflects the aroused interest of scores of others in the Senate when he comments, "It will help me to better evaluate the treaty when it comes up for a vote in the Senate."

These facts should be adequate to convince one of the slanted reporting indulged in by a few newspapers that clamored for the treaty's ratification without even open and fair public hearings on the issue. Evidently, they were stunned by the outcome last August and had no other recourse but to wade in the muck of invidious labelism. Now for the 10 reasons.

Footnotes at end of speech.

I. NO PUBLIC HEARINGS

Viewing this whole development in all its aspects, any objective observer would have to conclude that the deliberate attempt to preclude open, public hearings on the issue is cause enough for the rejection of the convention. Every significant treaty requiring Senate ratification has been accorded this normal, democratic procedure so that legislators may weigh the various arguments surrounding it. Those who claim that the consular pact is an ordinary and insignificant treaty are either unaware of its basic significance and thus would profit from such hearings or employ this contention to abet the possibility of a blind ratification. By all evidence the proponents of the pact have displayed a morbid fear of public hearings and wide discussion on the issue.

The evidence also shows quite clearly that an attempt was made toward the close of the last session of Congress to railroad the treaty through the Senate. Fortunately, the maneuver was thwarted by the alert action of numerous groups and individuals. For example, in a press release the National Captive Nations Committee called for "open and frank public hearings" on the convention and protested against "the maneuver of ramming this ill-advised and harmful treaty down the throats of our people without fair and open hearings."[10] Representative Edward J. Derwinski, of Illinois, performed an invaluable service in his persistent charges against the railroading of this treaty.[11] A striking editorial in one critical paper began "Details are now at hand concerning the swift railroad job, with Senator Fulbright as chief engineer, which was done to get the Soviet Consular Treaty out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee some days ago."[12]

Not to have the maneuver appear too crude and arbitrary, the committee heard testimony from the Secretary of State Dean Rusk and several State Department associates. The committee print that followed contains all the marks of swift maneuver and haphazard publication. For example, the title of the pamphlet is "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," but on page 3 a caption reads "Consular Convention with Russia." If at this stage of American understanding the concepts of Soviet Union and Russia are held to be synonymous, then we are in real trouble with respect to some reasoning on this issue.

To mention another example among the many, the dialog between the chairman and Senator Hickenlooper makes for absorbing reading. In his opening statement Senator Fulbright lets the cat out of the bag by stating "The committee met in executive session July 20, 1965, to consider the convention and decided at that time to take it up formally and submit it to the Senate for its advice and consent."[13] Senator Hickenlooper follows by stating, "I want to correct a misunderstanding. I understood you to say in the opening statement that the committee had decided to submit this to the Senate for confirmation."[14] Contrary to his opening statement, the chairman covers himself by replying "The committee would have to vote on it after we have had committee hearings." Then, in the print, the dialog is interrupted by the insertion of the President's message and the convention itself, and 15 pages later Senator Fulbright further contradicts his original, plain statement by saying, "We had decided to proceed with hearings if the committee so voted. That is what I meant to say."[15] His words scarcely reveal such meaning.

Despite much talk about hearings at this point, only one staged hearing was held. Secretary Rusk was heard on points emphasizing the protection Americans in the U.S.S.R. would receive, the little difference between this treaty and other consular conventions, the risks of espionage we have to assume in our open society, the inadequacies of our Embassy in Moscow, the need for normalizing relations, mutual understanding, the improvement of communications, and other equally vague generalities. As the writer stated in a letter criticizing one of our papers, "by virtue of his antiquated and misleading conceptions of the Soviet Union, which even the late Adlai E. Stevenson tactfully repudiated in November 1961, Secretary Rusk can scarcely be regarded as the sole, adequate witness."[16] These salient points in the Rusk testimony will be answered in the remaining reasons against the ratification of the treaty.

How much of all this was pitifully misinterpreted can be gleaned from this statement of a Senator supporting a blind ratification of the pact: "Those writers are ignorant of the fact that hearings were held."[17] The official publication of the committee is accurately titled "Hearing," but the Senator insists hearings, governmental or public, were held. He also believes the treaty is with Russia. Moreover, some verbal legerdemain was detected in the distinction drawn between the treaty and the actual opening of consulates. According to the State Department, one shouldn't be too concerned with the treaty because "the question of opening consulates * * * will be the subject of separate negotiations."[18] Why then all these pressure tactics concerning the treaty's ratification? Actually, the formal and legal basis provided by the treaty is most essential to the question of opening consulates. It is also worthwhile to note the haste on the part of the Department in exacting appropriations from Congress for a consulate in Leningrad with several $500 water coolers, extra bedrooms for single girl secretaries and what have you.[19]

Again, this first reason is reason enough to justify a rejection of the treaty. Its proponents apparently fear a full and open examination of it in the public form. Without open, public hearings, a ratification of the pact would be an arbitrary and blind one. The democratic staging of such hearings would necessitate thoughtful consideration for the nine remaining reasons.

---

[1] For a detailed background on this see Lev E. Dobriansky, "The Second Treaty of Moscow," Congressional Record, Feb. 8, 1964, pp. 2119–2122.

[2] E. W. Kenworthy, "Rightists Oppose Pact With Soviet," the New York Times, Aug. 19, 1965.

[3] "The Consular Treaty," the Evening Star, Aug. 24, 1965.

[4] "Scared Off," editorial, the Washington Post, Aug. 23, 1965.

[5] Communication to chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mar. 10, 1964.

[6] "New Myths, Old Realities," editorial, the Richmond News Leader, Feb. 16, 1965.

[7] E.g., "No Hearings Set on United States-Soviet Consular Treaty," the Evening Star, Feb. 15, 1965.

[8] "Senators Delay Consular Pact With Russians," the Evening Star,, July 12, 1965.

[9] Hearings Due on Russian Consular Pact," the Washington Post, July 22, 1965.

[10] "Fulbright Urged To Hold Open and Frank Hearings on Consular Convention," Aug. 3, 1965.

[11] E.g. William Moore, "Derwinski Hits Plan for Russ Consulates," Chicago Tribune, Aug. 10, 1965.

[12] "Normal Relations," the Richmond News Leader, Aug. 13, 1965.

[13] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," hearing, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 1965, p. 1.

[14] Ibid., p. 2.

[15] Ibid., p. 17.

[16] "Consular Convention With the U.S.S.R.," Congressional Record, Aug. 19, 1965, pp. 20312–20313.

[17] "Proposed Consular Convention With Soviet Union More to Advantage of United States Than to Russia," Mr. Young of Ohio, Congressional Record, Aug. 17, 1965, p. 19838.

[18] John C. Guthrie, Communication, May 14, 1964.

[19] Daniel Repaport, UPI story, May 8, 1965.

Ohio Cherokees Excited by Antipoverty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM GIBBONS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty is not designed just to help Negroes or white people improve their lot. The war on poverty is designed to help all Americans. And that means those of our citizens with the proud distinction of being able to claim Indian blood.

In the January 26 edition of the Van Wert, Ohio, Times, I noticed an unusual story about some Ohio residents of Cherokee ancestry who are excited about the prospects of a particular antipoverty program in their area. It is a touching story of proud people, many of whom today are just barely getting along. The war on poverty, to its everlasting credit, is starting to offer these proud people hope for a brighter tomorrow. In my mind, this is what the war on poverty is all about. I commend the story to those critics of the war on poverty who say they cannot see what we are attempting to do. I likewise commend it to my other colleagues who support the Economic Opportunity Act. It shows what progress we are gradually making in the long, uphill climb from the depths of poverty:

OHIO CHEROKEES EXCITED BY ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

WAVERLY, OHIO.—Hope of improving their standards of living is causing a ripple of excitement these days among an estimated 175 people of Cherokee Indian descent living in this area.

Announcement of a recently approved grant of $11,337 for a study of needed antipoverty projects has raised the hopes of most and favorable reaction seemed unanimous.

The Federal grant specifies that at least two Cherokee Indians be included on the Community Action Committee that will make the study and guide the projects.

Most of the Indians who settled about 1860 along Straight Creek in Adams County were from Oklahoma. Their descendents today reside in an area near the confluence of the Pike, Highland, Adams and Ross County lines.

C. A. Way assistant county school superintendent and a member of the committee, has received a list of those with Indian blood. Selection of the two to serve on the committee is expected soon.

It is estimated that 175 people of Cherokee descent live in the area. Their economic conditions range from what observers say is tolerable to very bad. Many are on relief rolls. Among the youth, the school dropout rate ranges from 70 to 90 percent.

Some do not have electricity and haul water from some distance. Coal and wood stoves provide heat for cooking and living. Newspapers often serve three purposes—providing reading material, wall paper and broken window coverings.

Most do little farming on poor land. While some deny any Indian blood, the majority are proud to claim their heritage. As a group, they resent anyone who lays false claim to Indian blood.

Perhaps the most articulate among the group is Orville Perkins of Dry Bone Road, Pike County.

Asked his opinion of the proposed antipoverty program, he said: "There wouldn't be anything better if it goes through. I think the money question is one of the most important. We need more job training and better job opportunities.

"If we have a little more to do with, we can move into better homes and raise our standard of living. I'm just lucky to have this house. There are families living in much worse places and paying higher rent," he commented about his modest shingle home.

Currently Perkins, who has a large family, is awaiting surgery and unable to work.

Mrs. Cosby Gibson is another Pike Countian proud of her Indian blood. Widowed several years ago, she owns her own home. Her 31-year-old nephew, James L. Nichols, has enrolled in the home study course offered by a school of practical electricity and industrial training in an effort to better his opportunities.

Among the possibilities being discussed by the Community Action Committee is assistance for the families through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The antipoverty program being planned here includes all the needy of the community, not just the Indians.

Conservation Work Promotes Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, a busy people must have the opportunity to relax in an atmosphere that renews their spirit and their physical well-being. That is why so many Americans leave the crowded cities whenever they have the chance and seek relaxation and enjoyment in the rural countrysides of the Nation.

We must continue to expand our outdoor recreational opportunities during the years ahead to adequately serve our rapidly growing population.

In Texas, we are meeting this challenge in several ways that I believe are of general interest because by increasing outdoor recreational facilities a pressing public need is served, land ideally suited to recreation is put to its best use, and the local economy of the areas providing this service is thereby helped.

Many farmers and ranchers in Texas have converted and are planning to convert part of their landholdings to income-producing recreation. Nearly 3,600 of these recreation enterprises have already been established in the State, with Federal assistance under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. About 180 soil and water conservation district cooperators have switched more than 85,000 acres from farming activities to recreation as a primary source of income, and 116 district cooperators have reported they intend to convert more than 63,000 acres to recreation as their main income source.

Five multiple-purpose watershed projects have been planned in Texas which specifically include recreation development. These projects have provided nearly 155,000 visitor-days of recreation since 1962 when the Food and Agriculture Act of that year amended Public Law 566 to make recreation development in small watershed projects eligible for Federal assistance.

There is water-based recreation potential in every watershed development project. About 7,780 surface acres of water have been created by watershed work in Texas since Public Law 566 went into effect in 1954. And more than 5,000 acres of water were provided in fiscal year 1965 alone under Public Law 46, the act establishing the Soil Conservation Service.

The progress being made in Texas in the development of outdoor recreation as a purpose of soil and water conservation reflects a wise use of our soil and water resources for the benefit of both the urban and rural resident. These accomplishments show that we can meet the challenges that confront us in resource conservation and development. I commend highly all those dedicated conservationists, in private and public life, who are making this essential progress possible.

Mr. and Mrs. Bart Lytton Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this February 27 the Los Angeles Lodge No. 487 B'nai B'rith will be holding its annual Mr. and Mrs. American Citizens Award banquet. This year's honorees will be Mr. and Mrs. Bart Lytton.

Mr. Lytton is perhaps best known as the founder, president, and chairman of the $700 million Lytton Financial Corp. (LFC), the Nation's fifth largest savings and loan holding company, and as chairman and chief executive officer of Los Angeles-headquartered Lytton Savings & Loan Association and Palo Alto-headquartered Lytton Savings & Loan Association of northern California, LFC's two principal subsidiaries. Mrs. Lytton is also active in the business as a member of the board of directors of both LFC and Lytton Savings.

The Lyttons are equally well known for their activities in local, State, and National, cultural and community affairs. They are the principal donors of the $1.5 million Lytton Gallery, one of the three major buildings at the new Los Angeles County Museum of Art and the structure that houses the museum's special and changing exhibitions. They are also the founders of the Lytton Center of the Visual Arts, in Hollywood.

Bart Lytton is a member of the national committee of the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York and of the Board of Governors of the Los Angeles County Museum of History and Science. Beth Lytton serves as a member of the board of municipal art commissioners.

The cultural influence of the Lyttons extends to the musical world, as well. Mr. Lytton was general chairman and Mrs. Lytton, chairman, of the music festival committee of the first Los Angeles international music festival held in conjunction with the University of California at Los Angeles in 1961. They are founding patrons of the Los Angeles Music Center.

Mr. Lytton is national chairman of the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League group sponsoring a 5-year $1 million research study—considered the most comprehensive ever attempted—by the University of California at Berkeley on the causes and wellsprings of anti-Semitism.

Mrs. Lytton serves as Governor Brown's appointee on the Board of Trustees of Metropolitan State Hospital. From 1960 to 1962 she was publisher of the Beverly Hills Times.

But the startling business success of the Lyttons and their organization provide perhaps the most dramatic chapters in their biographies. A native Pennsylvanian and a product of Staunton Military Academy, Westminster College, and the University of Virginia, Bart Lytton entered the real estate financing field in 1948 as a mortgage broker after a varied career in the newspaper, radio, magazine, motion picture, and public relations fields.

Mrs. Lytton, the former Beth Golden, was raised in Beverly Hills and attended El Rodeo School and Beverly Hills High School. Their daughter, Timi, is a senior at Stanford, majoring in art. She also attended the Beaux Arts Institute in Paris for a year. The Lyttons live in Holmby Hills and maintain a summer residence in the Malibu Colony.

I know that I am joined by thousands of Americans who know Mr. and Mrs. Lytton as I do in wishing them continued good health and good fortune. They are truly Mr. and Mrs. American Citizen.

Leftist Wrecking Crew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, those who enter politics for the purpose of wrecking the existing political organizations are always those who do not have the support of the people and who cannot therefore succeed in an honest appeal on the issues.

The following column by Evans and Novak from the February 7, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune details the latest effort—by what might be termed a new No-Nothing Party to wreck the Democratic Party.

I think that it is important that Americans be aware of the people and the strategy behind this new leftist wrecking crew.

The article follows:

Inside Report: Leftist Wrecking Crew

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Washington.—Only a vague, confused dream last summer, the drive to weld far-left organizations into a political front is reaching alarming reality.

The short-term plan is to intimidate liberal Democratic Congressmen who back President Johnson on Vietnam by running leftists against them this fall.

But more troubling to the Democratic Party is the long-term campaign, worked out at a secret meeting of leftist leaders in Chicago January 8 and 9. It was decided not only to help the scattered 1966 candidacies of radicals but to build a nationwide political organization for 1968, 1970, and beyond.

What this amounts to is a leftist wrecking crew injecting a sinister new element into American politics. The message to liberal Democrats is clear: take an anti-Communist foreign policy stance and we will drive you out of office—even if it means splitting the liberal vote and thus electing a Republican. Conceivably, a weak-willed liberal or two will crumple.

The first target has been selected. He is Representative Jeffery Cohelan, of California, and he is definitely not crumpling. A liberal Democrat with a 95-percent ADA rating last year, Cohelan's sin is support of Mr. Johnson in Vietnam—and he is not backing down before hysterical demands of constituents in the Oakland-Berkeley area (including a demand that President Johnson be impeached).

Consequently, Cohelan has an opponent for reelection: Robert Scheer, a bearded editor of the Leftist Ramparts magazine and an articulate apologist for the Communist Vietcong. Scheer cannot beat Cohelan in the Democratic primary, but he plans to run as an Independent in November with the underlying intent of electing a conservative Republican.

Cohelan's district is probably safe enough to withstand this challenge, but he is taking no chances. He has asked prominent party figures (including Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien) to speak for him.

The far left has more vulnerable targets than Cohelan. A leftist labor leader named Sid Lens may run a third-party campaign against Democratic liberal Senator Paul Douglas, who faces the political challenge of his life from Republican Charles Percy. The left is looking for a radical to oppose freshman Democratic Representative Wes Vivian, elected from a heavily Republican district in Michigan and shaky even in a two-man race. Veteran Douglas and newcomer Vivian could pay for their Vietnam policy by electoral defeat.

All this fits with the Chicago meeting of a month ago. On hand were such leaders of the new left as Stokely Carmichael of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (Snick) and Paul Booth of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

Similar gatherings at Santa Barbara, Calif., (last summer) and Washington (last fall) bogged down in haggling. But the Chicago session skirted the issue of whether Communists should be excluded (though Scheer has welcomed Communists to his campaign against Cohelan). From Chicago evolved a three-point program.

Point one: a national newsletter entitled "The Alliance of New Politics," edited by Arthur I. Waskow, a leftist intellectual in Washington.

Point two: a "money bank" to finance the 1966 wrecking operations plus long-range planning. The Chicago timetable called for raising $100,000 within 6 weeks, another $100,000 by March 1 and $300,000 more by June 1 for a total of $500,000.

Point three: a "body bank" of 500 student militants to participate in a training school this summer. They would be the nucleus of a national leftist organization to grow over the years.

These are no mere pipedreams. The Chicago meeting discussed assignment of field men—Paul Albert, a lieutenant of Representative Phil Burton of California, for the west coast and Larry Goodwyn, who formerly ran the now defunct Texas Liberal Coalition, for Texas.

If this operation can pick off a Cohelan, a Vivian or—biggest game of all—a Paul Douglas in 1966, it will fatten on its own success and expand in 1968. For the Democratic Party, the time to stop the wrecking crew is now.

VFW Supports Decision on Communist Burial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense acted wisely and in the best tradition of America when it last week refused to allow the burial of convicted Communist conspirator Robert G. Thompson in Arlington National Cemetery.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States supports this action by the Department of Defense. I include in the Congressional Record a copy of an announcement by the VFW, dated January 27, 1966:

VFW Endorses Defense Department Decision Prohibiting Burial of Convicted Communist Conspirator in Arlington Cemetery

The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Andy Borg, of Superior, Wis., today voiced his organization's "enthusiastic approval" of the Department of Defense decision to prohibit the burial of convicted Communist official, Robert G. Thompson, in Arlington Cemetery.

"The Department of Defense," Borg said, "is absolutely right, both morally and legally, in prohibiting the remains of a convicted Communist conspirator from being buried in Arlington or any other national cemetery. The VFW expresses its thanks and its admiration to Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance, who personally handled this matter for Secretary McNamara, and to the Department of Justice for the advisory opinion that such a decision by the Department of Defense is legally correct. Deputy Secretary Vance's successful effort to preserve the sanctity of our national cemeteries constitutes a reassuring example of able and patriotic public service."

The VFW commander pointed out that he had communicated directly with the President and other U.S. officials urging that Thompson's burial in Arlington be prohibited. "The VFW is, of course, highly gratified," he said, "that the action of the Pentagon in this matter in is accord with recommendations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars."

Explaining the VFW position, Borg said, "Robert G. Thompson was convicted of conspiring to overthrow the Government of our Nation. We of the VFW believe, and we believe the overwhelming majority of the American people share our belief, that anyone who turns against his country certainly forfeits the privilege of being buried beside our Nation's heroes. We vigorously reject the contention that because Robert G. Thompson was decorated for heroism in World War II, he had, regardless of his subsequent actions, a lifetime entitlement to burial in a national cemetery. Such a decoration certainly cannot be interpreted as a license to try to overthrow our Government. Rather, the decoration carries with it the obligation of being an even more exemplary citizen."

Continuing the VFW leader said: "Patriotism is not a part-time endeavor; it is a total and life-long requirement of citizenship. Betrayal of that trust should certainly disqualify one for the honored burial reserved for the patriots at Arlington or any other national cemetery. We of the VFW are, therefore, grateful that the resting place of our Nation's heroes will remain hallowed ground."

Congressman Zablocki Delivers Thoughtful Speech on American Foreign Aid Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablócki], recently delivered a thoughtful and perceptive speech, focusing on the course our foreign aid should take in the coming years He recommended increasing use of regional arrangements, such as the Asian Development Bank, which will soon be before this body for approval.

The gentleman from Wisconsin's trenchant address was given to the annual Conference on International Management of the Council for International Progress in Management in New York City on January 26, 1966. The text follows:

The Free World's Challenge in the Next Decade

(By Representative Clement J. Zablocki, of Wisconsin)

My friends, it is indeed a pleasure and an honor for me to have this opportunity to participate in the annual conference on international management sponsored by the Council for International Progress in Management.

The distinguished reputation of CIPM is well known on Capitol Hill and most particularly to those of us who serve on committees of Congress which deal with international relations.

It is widely recognized that CIPM is the contractor with the longest continuous record of service in U.S. assistance programs.

The services of CIPM for the Federal Government began just about the same time as mine—early in 1959.

I was a freshman Congressman then, and CIPM was a hearty pioneer into the unexplored realms of technical and managerial assistance.

In those days we talked about ECA and ICA and the Marshall plan. CIPM worked with them all—just as today it is working with the Alliance for Progress and the Agency for International Development.

You who are connected with the CIPM can justly be proud of the accomplishments of your organization.

You have sent more than 500 outstanding experts in management to more than 30 different countries.

You have conducted management training programs here in the United States for thousands of foreign nationals.

Through your council many leading American corporations have given their assistance to the instruction of those who have come from abroad to learn modern American management methods.

Through the years CIPM has pioneered and remained farsighted in its aims. In today's conference—with its emphasis on the coming decade of dynamic change—you demonstrate once again your high goals and forward-looking spirit.

Tonight I, too, wish to discuss the future.

One need not be a prophet to see the next 10 years as a time of rapid change and eminent challenge. The free world will be challenged as never before by the revolutionary forces at work on the earth.

I believe it should be recognized that many of these forces are of our own making.

Is it not we in the west who have created the technological and scientific revolutions which have made it possible for man to break the chains of subsistence living and to progress to an affluent and comfortable society?

Is it not we who have created the media of mass communications which have carried the message of our prosperity to even the most remote corners of the earth?

Is it not the Western World which has created the global revolution of rising expectations?

In the past several months I have traveled around the world and have visited some 15 countries in Asia, the Middle East, and Europe. There is no place where I have been that the awareness of a new world has not penetrated.

Some Filipino children living in remote barrios probably have never ridden in a motorized vehicle, but they can identify the airplanes that fly over from Clark Field.

Indian youths with only a few rags to cover their nakedness crowd the the sidewalks of Calcutta to hear a few strains of rock 'n roll music.

Afghan nomads with transistor radios can hear the Voice of America telling them about debates in the United Nations and a power failure in New York City.

Everywhere I went the story was the same: people expect things to be different.

They have found that simple independence is not enough. They are still as hungry and sick and poor and illiterate as they were in the days of colonialism.

They have freedom, but now they want the material progress that freedom has meant for the West. They expect a better life for themselves and certainly a better life for their children.

These are, we must agree, legitimate aspirations. They are the same hopes and dreams which inspired the men who settled and built this country.

But these aspirations can be easily twisted and distorted by the inflammatory propaganda of the Communists.

When people see the old world dying and the new world not yet born, when their ambitions continue to outrun the prospects of fulfillment, it is little wonder that communism has an appeal.

If we were in the position of the emerging peoples we too might listen with fascination if men came to us and said:

"We have the prescription for the future; We have the total answer; we can tell you what to do; because, look, we have already done it."

This simple claim to know the answers is one of communism's greatest weapons—and one which we in the West must not underestimate.

This, of course, is not the whole story. The world is much more complicated than a battle for survival between capitalism and communism.

For one thing, the confrontations are no longer simply that of east versus west, but north versus south. There are many issues between the highly advanced nations, including the Soviet Union, and the less developed nations.

Last year, for example, some 75 underdeveloped nations—some of them formally allied with the West—joined in condemning both the United States and the USSR for their restrictive trade policies.

The industrialized nations of the Northern Hemisphere, their declaration charged, are not doing enough to close the gap between the rich and the poor of the world.

These are the forces of discontent which the Communist Chinese have set about to harness to their purposes.

Last September the Chinese Government issued an article by Vice Premier Lin Piao which articulated a strategy of global guerrilla warfare in which the emergent nations of the world would surround, isolate and ultimately annihilate the industrialized nations.

Interestingly enough, the Chinese did not exempt the Russians from this fated extinction.

As instruments of this policy, the Chinese have sought to recruit not just Marxists, but all those angry men and women who seek to tear down the present world system.

Call them what you may—Jacobins or anarchists or ultras—they dream of a world turned upside down in which you and I must come to them to beg for bread.

In other words, they are irreconcilable to peaceful change and progress.

On the global scene today, whole nations must be classified as irreconcilable.

Take, for example, Indonesia. It is not a Communist country. In fact, in recent months more than 100,000 Communists have been slaughtered there.

Yet Indonesia refuses to work with the West or with the World Bank or with the United Nations. It defaults on its debts, menaces its neighbors militarily, and calls for the victory of the new emerging forces over the old established forces.

Indonesia is, in effect, an outlaw on the world scene. It is an irreconcilable.

This leads me to my principal theme for this evening: The central purpose of American policy—and the policy of the West in the coming decade—must be to reconcile the unreconciled to the continued validity and viability of the present world system.

This policy must be pursued in several ways.

First, the West must maintain the military strength to contain the maverick nations. We must be able to deny them their conquests and curb their ambitions.

Finding that they cannot change the world, nations like China and Indonesia may some day come to accept it—as the Soviet Union has come to accept a form of peaceful coexistence.

Second, the West must be willing to give a stake in the future of our system to those peoples and those countries which now stand outside the circle of prosperity.

It is to this end that our foreign assistance programs must be aimed. They must be geared to building habits of economic and social responsibility in the recipient nations. They must provide emerging peoples with opportunities for self-help and self-achievement in an environment of cooperation.

Unfortunately, our foreign aid has often fallen short of these objectives.

Instead, we have provided gifts, grants, and soft-soft loans to other countries, sometimes on the grounds that they would never be able to repay normal commercial loans.

Although this aid was virtually a handout, it did provide certain short-term advantages. It gave our Nation a measure of political leverage to further American foreign policy interests around the world.

At the same time, however, it was creating unhealthy dependencies and, ultimately, ill will on the part of the recipients.

Consider for example the billions of dollars in military and economic assistance which the United States has given Pakistan in order to hold its allegiance to an anti-Communist alliance.

Yet today Pakistan is allying itself on many issues with Red China and has begun a course of flirtation with the Soviet Union as well. Furthermore—as I discovered on my recent trip to Pakistan—anti-American feeling is running high.

Some American officials still believe that our aid is useful only insofar as it advances particular immediate political interests of the United States.

I believe this point of view is tragically shortsighted.

American aid has been likened to a doting mother-in-law who showers presents on her daughter and son-in-law as they struggle to get a start, but who wants to tell them how to run their household. It's not long before the young couple tell mother where she and her generosity can go.

At the same time, I do not subscribe to the extreme opposite point of view that the United States should channel most of its foreign aid through the United Nations or one of its worldwide agencies.

By adopting this approach to the problem of aid, our Nation would lose virtually all control over the disposition of our foreign assistance funds.

Furthermore, little credit would accrue to the United States if our aid was part of a global pool.

It is my belief that there is a practical middleground in this controversy which deserves serious attention.

I propose no panacea—but rather an approach which avoids some of the less desirable aspects of both bilateral and universally multilateral assistance.

It is my belief that the United States would be better served to reduce its attention to the shortrun political advantages of aid in favor of a more farsighted, more businesslike approach, with an emphasis on regional arrangements.

It is more in keeping with justice and human respect for the United States to play the role of a beneficent banker—even one who makes risky loans now and then—than to be typed as a meddling mother-in-law.

Much as a good banker seeks to advance the economy and development of his community, so the United States must foster the advancement of the terribly crowded neighborhoods of nations in the world.

But the United States cannot take up this task alone. There are too many anguished cries for the material things of life that better health, education, and mass production have made available. There are too many desperate pleas for justice for any one nation to fill.

We must, therefore, enlist the help of the other industrial states in sharing the burdens of international development.

One effective way in which this can be accomplished is through regional banking arrangements.

As you know, one such bank—the Inter-American Development Bank—has been in operation for more than 6 years.

This institution has increasingly assumed the characteristics of the economic and financial center of the hemisphere. Created to promote the economic development of Latin America in 1959, it now accounts for more than one-fourth of the international public development financing channeled to that area.

Last year an African Development Bank was formed. And now Congress is being asked to approve an authorization of $200 million for an Asian Development Bank.

The creation of these regional Banks is, in my view, an immensely important step in the right direction.

By thus institutionalizing our foreign assistance we convert it from the "act of charity" to an act of community responsibility.

Although we lost some short-range diplomatic leverage by channeling our funds through such a Bank, we retain a strong voice in policy through weighted voting procedures.

And—more important—we replace irritating political "strings" with requirements for sound business practices. Project justifications can be as rigorous as prudent management requires, and not subject to the whims of foreign leaders whom our Government wishes to woo for the moment.

Further, these regional Banks give the people of the area a stake in their own future. They themselves must commit resources to these institutions. They must be determined to join in cooperative endeavors, uniting their talents and resources in pursuit of a common vision of progress.

It is my hope that the countries of the Middle East will soon take similar steps toward the establishment of a regional Bank.

Perhaps it might also be practical to form a special regional financial institution to assist the development of the many small islands of the South Pacific. The United States, Great Britain, and France—each of whom administers territories in that region—might take the lead in the creation of that development Bank.

Ultimately, perhaps, it might be possible to contemplate a development institution for Eastern Europe. Such an arrangement could be a powerful means of breaking down the Iron Curtain.

While present conditions in Europe preclude the immediate prospects of an Eastern European Development Bank, the idea is not at all farfetched.

Rumania, for example, already is permitting private Western investment in its industrial development programs. Other bloc countries may shortly follow suit. If Western investment in Eastern European economies become common, there would be fertile ground for a regional bank.

Through such regional bodies, poor nations and poor people can realize their stake in the peaceful progress of the present world system. They can look forward to the material prosperity which the technological revolution has put within the reach of all mankind.

In this way, certainly, we in the West can help to reconcile the unreconciled and thereby help insure the safety and security of the world for decades to come.

In concluding, I want to make it clear that there will always be a need for bilateral foreign aid. But we must see clearly the basic incompatibility of seeking both short-range political advantage and a commitment to long-range international development.

I believe we saw this clearly when we created the Marshall plan, and through our generosity and leadership assisted the Atlantic nations to new heights of prosperity.

Today we must revive that same spirit if we are to have any hope of dealing successfully with the problem of our obligations to the underdeveloped world.

In so doing—it should be noted—we shall expand our own prosperity and well-being By building the purchasing power of the developing nations, we increase world consumption and create a global economy less subject to fluctations and depressions. Thus, our own economy benefits.

As British Economist Barbara Ward has said so well, one of the most vivid proofs that there is a moral governance to the universe is the fact that when men or governments work intelligently and farsightedly for the good of others, they achive their own prosperity too.

Let us resolve, therefore, that in the decades to come, we shall meet the challenges posed by revolutionary change in the fullness of the vision which has been given to us as sons of freedom and inheritors of the bounty of God.

Speech by Speaker McCormack to the Panel on Sciences and Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, during the opening session of the seventh meeting of the Panel on Science and Technology of the Committee on Science and Astronautics on January 25, our beloved Speaker, the Honorable John W. McCormack, joined with Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey in delivering opening remarks that truly set the tone and character of a highly productive 3-day meeting.

As I am sure most of his colleagues know, John McCormack for many years has concerned himself deeply with the scientific and technological progress of this country, especially with regard to the role of Government in support of scientific research and development. As most of you know, he was a principal architect of the 1958 Space Act that created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It has been through his wisdom and foresight that the House has been able to achieve its present leadership in the policy decisions of Government leading to our unprecedented scientific and technological strength.

It is indeed with great pleasure that I include in the Record today the remarks of Speaker McCormack, which so clearly outline the goals and objectives of the Committee on Science and Astronautics and its Panel on Science and Technology:

REMARKS OF SPEAKER JOHN W. MCCORMACK, SEVENTH MEETING, PANEL ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, JANUARY 25, 1966

I am indeed pleased to be here at the opening of the seventh meeting of the Panel on Science and Technology, and to be part of such distinguished company.

Meetings such as this one are very important to the leadership of the country and to the future progress of our people. This is especially true in view of the vast and constantly expanding fund of knowledge we are acquiring through our national scientific research and development programs.

I have a deep satisfaction in the role the Congress, and particularly the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has played in bringing into reality the tremendous results that have come from the great scientific and research development efforts now underway in the United States. I would venture to say that without the support, the faith, and confidence of Congress in our scientific and technological communities this meeting would probably not have taken place.

The revolution in science that has progressed with fantastic rapidity in the past 20 years has impacted to some degree upon almost every human activity in which people of our times are engaged. The impact upon this and future generations has been so profound that it is impossible at this point in time to perceive clearly all the critical decisions of the past both in Congress and in the executive department that have lead to our present level of scientific confidence and achievement.

The Federal Government will support research and development during this fiscal year to the extent of approximately $16 billion. Its rate of expenditure has been increasing year by year and has been a major factor in the development of our scientific power as we know it. Congress has the responsibility for evaluating the need for such support and providing prudently the funds needed to carry on the many, many programs presently underway in every Government agency.

This committee was created by a resolution introduced in the House by our very distinguished majority leader, Carl B. Albert, who is also a very important member of the committee. The House, in its collective wisdom, derived from years of experience in supporting scientific research in the Government, clearly saw to the need for a standing committee to oversee the rapidly growing involvement of Government in research and development. This meeting today is in a real sense a manifestation of that wisdom.

I am very proud of this committee. I was a member of it for some years before my duties as Speaker forced me to relinquish my chair. But in spirit I still remain a member of this committee because I feel a deep sense of association, over many years in Congress with the problems and difficult decisions it faces year after year. To my mind, the judgments and decisions of this committee pertaining to our national scientific vigor carry with them a most significant importance to the future strength and growth of our country. The welfare of the American people, the dynamic progress of our economy and the leadership of the American Government in our struggle to maintain a peaceful world will all be influenced by the work of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Therefore, it is entirely fitting that the meetings of the Panel on Science and Technology include outstanding men of our times from other countries, especially those nations to which our past history has been so intimately involved and with which our future is closely bound. The language of science is truly an international dialog, transcending in its nature all parochial attitudes and partisan policies. Science seeks the truth, and it is the truth of our material world that we attempt in every waking moment to recognize and understand. This is a most difficult task for men to whom millions of people look for correctness in judgment and wisdom in decision.

Therefore, I feel it to be a great honor to be present this morning with the Vice President of the United States, with my colleagues of the committee, and with distinguished scientists and engineers.

Dan Jessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the American Football Coaches Association recently installed Daniel Jessee to be its new president, the first Connecticut and small college coach to be given this honor. I have spoken earlier of the career which brought him to this peak. I was privileged to be present at a reception held by his fellow small college and high school coaches of Connecticut, and I insert an account of that fellowship and comradeship at the meeting which was held here in Washington to be added to the RECORD.

This account is written by Bill Garrett of the Gannett News Bureau, and demonstrates the warm friendship which all in Connecticut feel for Dan Jessee:

TRINITY'S MR. JESSEE GOES TO WASHINGTON

(By William A. Garrett)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Every Nutmegger with a warm spot for football—from the Governor on down—told Dan Jessee last night how fortunate Trinity College and Connecticut were that he elected to go East rather than stay West years ago.

The Trinity coach—formally Prof. Daniel Jessee—received the accolade on the eve of his installation as president of the American Football Coaches Association, at a reception put on by Connecticut college and high school coaches.

This noon Jessee and some colleagues were to lunch with President Johnson at the White House.

It was Gov. John N. Dempsey who pointed up in a citation presented to Jessee by Don Russell of Wesleyan the good fortune that accrued to Connecticut when Jessee left the Pacific coast, where he already had demonstrated his prowess as athlete and mentor.

Looking on were scores of football's finest, from admiring State colleagues to national figures such as Syracuse's Ben Schwartzwalder, Penn State's Rip Engle, Otto Graham of Coast Guard, Army's Paul Dietzel and Eddie Enos of Montreal Loyola, a University of Connecticut product.

Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Democrat of Hartford, a Little All-America back at Wesleyan, added to the applause. Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat of Hartford, had commended Jessee earlier. Joe Fontana of Southington, who chaired the event, lauded Jessee as one of sports' "most fierce competitors."

Jessee will be AFCA's first Connecticut and small college president. Dempsey cited the coach's record of 144 victories to 74 defeats and 7 ties, and his 4 perfect seasons.

The Governor saluted Jessee as "a man wholly dedicated to the well-being and betterment of intercollegiate sports." Karl Kurth, Trinity line coach who is to succeed Ray Oosting as athletic director at the college, introduced Oosting at a brief ceremony. Jessee's wife, Charlotte, also was acclaimed for her contribution to the coach's achievements.

Weaver High's Edward T. Knurek presented matched luggage to Jessee. There also were comments from Trinity Dean Bob Vogel, Fred Tonsel, of New York, called the college's most loyal fan, and George Ferris, its most loyal alumnus.

Also there were Wesleyan's Norm Daniels, Hugh McCurdy, its athletic director, and Waino Fillback, of Middletown High. Jesse Dow represented southern Connecticut, and Bill Moore and Bill Loika were from central Connecticut. Tom Kelly, of Manchester, was among the football editors on hand, and Tom Monahan, athletic director at Bristol, and Connecticut's Bob Engels were among other well-wishers.

Fern Tetreau, of Fairfield, spoke for the Connecticut Football Coaches Association, which he heads. Connecticut's J. Orleans Christian, newly inducted into the College Baseball Hall of Fame, shared the throng's congratulations. "I'm pretty proud," said Christian—of both his and Jessee's honors.

Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State Call for Positive Democratic Leadership in the New York State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Harold R. Moskovit, president of the Affiliated Young Democrats, made the following announcement:

The State legislative committee of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, at a meeting held on January 8, 1966, at the Hotel Piccadilly in New York City, called for active and positive leadership of Democrats in the assembly and State senate with full responsibility to all the people of the State to assure reelection in 1966.

The organization expects its legislative program for 1966 to be introduced in the State legislature by their 22 members in the State senate of which the chairman is Senator Samuel L. Greenberg, of Brooklyn, and their 47 members in the assembly, of which the chairman is Assemblyman Daniel M. Kelly, of New York County.

Their legislative program follows:

We demand a bipartisan committee in State and New York City to set up a long-range tax program for 25 years and not the yearly rush for expediency.

We urge the legislators to support the following program which we consider important to the welfare of the people of this State and pledge ourselves to devote every effort to the enactment thereof; to wit:

"Raise drinking age to 21 years; primary election for all State officers; adopt new code of New York City Air Pollution Control Board for cleaner air; more housing; permanent personal registration be made statewide, with two changes, (1) must vote at two consecutive national elections and (2) do not have to reregister if voter moves within same county; vote at 18 years; stop turnstile justice by recodifying the statutes as they relate to juveniles, with uniformity of Federal and State laws; more vocational camps, rehabilitation and training centers, 2 voting days for national elections, first Mondays and Tuesdays in November; more State aid to education; extend ban on racial discrimination in housing; protection against slum landlords; create more judgeships; legalize off-track betting by referendum; raise minimum wage to $1.50 an hour; mandatory free tuition at all State and city universities and all community colleges; outlaw boxing; permanent spring primary election day in June; stronger code of ethics; presidential preference primaries; legislature to at last ratify the 15th amendment; preserve our great natural resources; program to discourage dropouts in schools; State aid to public museums; create statewide recreation department; bonus for Korean veterans; increase teachers salaries; more and better aid to the aged and mentally ill; 3-day-weekend plan to celebrate all holidays, except religious holidays; help migrant workers; stronger law against dope peddlers; and finally, that a printed verbatim record of all the proceedings of the State legislature be made, and be made available to the public."

Diseases Aren't Cured by Treating Symptoms—A Responsible Student Speaks Out on Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, amid all the dissensions and the violence on our campuses today, unfortunately the voice of the dissenter gets the most publicity. The voice of the fairminded, intelligent, and responsible student is seldom seen on TV or printed in the newspapers.

This article written by Richard Russell, a student in his junior year at Wisconsin State University—Eau Claire, and appearing in the Spectator, the student newspaper is one of the best appraisals of the Vietnam war that I have yet seen.

I recommend this article to my colleagues:

DISEASES AREN'T CURED BY TREATING SYMPTOMS

(ABOUT THE AUTHOR.—A 2½-year veteran of the Spectator staff, Richard Russell has closely pursued the development of the Vietnam war through extensive daily reading.

("America can't keep playing diplomacy to please countries like the Upper Volta Republic. It's about time our Government realized that, if we don't act in our own self-interest, no one else will do it for us," Russell says.

(Russell's article is the first on "The Soapbox," a page of opinion and depth reporting which will be featured throughout the year.)

(By Richard Russell)

Take an area of 40 million people and 284,000 square miles (about the same as Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky). Give it a steady temperature of 70-plus degrees and a summer rainy season which yields 80 inches of precipitation annually (much like southern Florida). Run a mountain range of 9,000 feet (like Oregon's Cascades) through the middle of it, and cover the rest with densely overgrown swampland (like Louisiana's).

Attack the inhabitants with 200,000 native guerrillas and respond with 200,000 foreign mercenaries. You now have a recipe for war in Indochina.

The people of the peninsula are largely a mixture of the Indonesians of the south and the Chinese of the north—whence the Indochinese. They had a flourishing civilization of their own between 500 and 1750 A.D. The Khmers, as they then called themselves, had their capital and chief religious center in the city of Angkor. The recently discovered ruins of the Angkor Wat (temple) indicate a high level of architectural development.

But buddhism and inner political conflict combined to destroy the Khmers, and the region underwent a period of regression until reawakened by French colonial forces. Between 1859 and 1893, France occupied the splinter states of Cambodia, Laos, Cochin China, Annam, and Tonkin. Cochin China was made a colony; the rest were protectorates.

France improved the region somewhat, with roads, harbors, and commerce, but kept a firm hand on the controls of government. The native rulers were allowed to continue, but they had only nominal power. France operated Indochina as a monopoly.

There was considerable resentment built up against this attitude of the French by the time World War II started. When Vichy France ceded control of Indochina to the tyrannical Japanese, resentment continued to mount. After Japan had lost the war, France had difficulty reasserting its territorial claim because of increasing pressure from Indochinese nationalists.

THE RED MENACE

Now, for a moment, let us look at another time and another place. Back in 1917, while Germany was at war with the world, a revolution broke out in Russia against the oppressive regime of Czar Nicholas II. Nicholas was defeated, deposed, and later killed. A democratic government lasted only a few months before Bolsheviks led by Nikolai Lenin and Leon Trotsky overthrew it for their own Communist regime.

The Communists also gained control of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Mongolia, and parts of Finland and Japan. World War II presented them with an opportunity to seize Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, East Germany, and East Austria.

In 1947 they saw another opportunity. The world was weary of war, and dismissed and rebellion in China as insignificant. It was really a Communist invasion. In 2 years, Red leader Mao Tse-tung had driven the nationalist forces of Chiang Kai-shek onto the island of Taiwan, thus bringing into the Communist fold the most populous nation on earth.

In later years, the world has seen communism expand into North Korea, Tibet, East Congo, and Cuba, with influence in Egypt, Algeria, Guinea, Indonesia, and any number of South American nations.

HO STRIKES

In all their gains, the Communists never once won a democratic election. Their only loss was East Austria, when that nation was neutralized. Yugoslavia, although pursuing its own course under Josef Tito, remains firmly Communist.

Returning to the Indochina of 1947, we find that France had granted greater autonomy to Cambodia and Laos. Cochin China, Annam, and Tonkin had been combined into the single country of Vietnam. All three nations were undergoing very gradual emancipation.

But some Indochinese could not wait. Nationalist forces demanded immediate sovereignty. Rebellions flared. The French Foreign Legion busied itself with brush fire wars.

During this period, the expansionist Mao met Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh, a leader who, like Mao himself, was a self-made man of great personal appeal and considerable military ability. With Mao's support, Ho organized the immodestly named Vietminh, masqueraded as a nationalist to solicit support, and launched a vicious guerrilla war against French rule in Indochina.

As this war drew international attention, U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles recognized the scope of the problem: "The propagandists of Red China and Russia make it apparent that their purpose is to dominate all of southeast Asia * * * the so-called rice bowl which helps to feed the densely populated region that extends from India to Japan. It is rich in many raw materials, such as tin, oil, rubber, and iron ore."

Unfortunately for the French colonial forces, they placed too many eggs in one basket. When that basket—the heavily fortified bastion at Dienbienphu—was crushed by the Vietminh on May 7, 1954, the end was in sight.

By an agreement of the major powers at Geneva, July 21, 1954, independence from France was granted to Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam, and the latter was partitioned along the 17th parallel. The northern zone, capitaled at Hanoi, went to Ho. The south had a West-oriented native government. A plebiscite was to be held in both zones in July 1956 to determine if the country should be reunified. However, Red-hating South Vietnamese Premier Ngo Dinh Diem flatly refused to believe that the Communists would permit a free vote. In July 1955 he virtually eliminated any chance of holding elections, and the country has been divided ever since.

THE WADING GAME

To prevent further Communist incursions into southeast Asia, the United States has joined in defensive alliances with Japan, Australia, the Philippine Republic, New Zealand, Great Britain, France, Pakistan, and Thailand. This has not prevented the Pathet Lao from taking over half of Laos and forcing the rest to be neutralized. It has not prevented wavering toward communism by Cambodia's Prince Norodom Sihanouk. It has not prevented the Vietcong from wreaking destructions over all of South Vietnam.

The United States has 200,000 troops in Vietnam, and will double that number by year's end. It has the 7th Fleet and heavy air support. It has the aid of the South Vietnamese Government. Yet it has not stopped the Vietcong.

When the Cong is exhausted, it slips back into the rain forest. When it is defeated, it recruits in North Vietnam. When it is hungry, it terrorizes villages. When it is ill-equipped, it ships in supplies along the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Who remembers the strategic hamlet? Last year, the United States reverted to the medieval system of fortifying hamlets, sending the villagers out to work by day, and locking them behind barbed wire at night. Horrified French officials pointed out that Dienbienphu was no more than a large "strategic hamlet." After losing several villages, the United States conceded.

Who remembers the "advisers"? This was America's title for the 40,000 troops it had stationed in Vietnam before 1965. They are now combatants.

Who remembers the American promise not to bomb in Laos? South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Cao Ky revealed recently that the United States has been doing so for over a year.

All these incidents are indications that the war is escalating. The United States is committed now to war, and war it must fight to the logical end. But, as any physician will testify, in fighting a disease, one does not treat the symptom; one treats the cause. We must circumvent the symptom—the Vietcong—and strike directly at the cause—Red China. And we must not stop until the disease is totally exterminated.

"War is hell," remarked Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, and Benjamin Franklin agreed, "There never was a good war or a bad peace."

Then why are wars fought? In naming Gen. William Westmoreland "Man of the Year," Time quoted Winston Churchill: "Nothing is worse than war? Dishonor is worse than war. Slavery is worse than war. Churchill's was the view of the moralist.

A more expedient comment was that of Adolf Hitler: "The victor will not be asked afterward whether he told the truth or not. In starting and waging a war it is not right that matters but victory." Hitler's goal—you will recall, was lebenraum—living space—for his supposedly master race.

CHINA CHOKES

Germany could not possibly have needed lebensraum in 1933 as badly as Red China needs it now. A land choked with three-quarters of a billion people, China has run out of room, food, and time. There is no place to go but south. The Russian tundra to the north is as uninviting as the Himalayan Mountains to the west. Japan, Taiwan, and India are already crowded and facing problems of their own. China must look to the south.

If Vietnam falls, communism will have taken one more step toward its goal of world domination. As mentioned earlier, only East Austria has even been reclaimed from the Reds. In all other disputes, the Communists have won, not by elections but by subterfuge or by force. As J. Edgar Hoover remarks in "Masters of Deceit," [Lenin] held that here could be no permanent coexistence between Communists and non-Communists. The latter must be liquidated, by force if necessary."

This is especially true of China, which is pressed by a severe food shortage, while the Indochinese countries are so well supplied with rice that they export it. Mere lives mean nothing to Red China, which has seen great purges, widespread epidemics, and countless starvations. In fact, a war would serve to cut down on the burgeoning Chinese population. It would also provide the government with an explanation of the food, medicine, and housing shortage. Quite literally, the Chinese have nothing to lose by going to war.

With the United States pushing up from the south and Red China pushing down from the north, a conflict is inevitable. The big problem of the Chinese is time. Right now they could fight a war but could not win one. They must limit their actions to so-called conventional warfare, fought by proxy in Vietnam.

But their day is coming. Not until late in the presidential campaign of 1960 did Candidate John F. Kenendy mention, even briefly, the possibility that Red China might have an atomic bomb in the works. Up to that time, their sole nuclear capacity had been a small, tame reactor given them by the Russians in 1958. Yet, on October 17, 1964, Red China exploded a small atomic bomb at Lop Nor in Sinkiang Province.

Current predictions are that the Red Chinese will have a stock of nuclear weapons and that the primitive capacity to deliver them to American shores by 1972. The worst part of it is explained by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp in his Life article, "The Nuclear Power of China": "China can, in a very few years, become the most dangerous nuclear power of all * * * because they do not seem to understand nuclear war and therefore may not be rationally deterred from starting one."

He lists three facts which delude China into believing it would survive a nuclear war. First, they have more people; thus more would survive. Second, only one Chinese in seven lives in the relatively vulnerable cities; hence the population is harder to hit. Third, because of the backward industrial and transport facilities in China, there is less to rebuild.

Dr. Lapp continues to show that such survival would in fact be almost impossible: "The Strategic Air Command has hundreds of B–52 bombers, each of which can carry two 25-megaton bombs in its belly—the equivalent of 50 million tons of TNT * * *. A single 25-megaton bomb is a fearful instrument of destruction. It is 1,250 times more powerful than the bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima. The blast wave from one such bomb would destroy almost all Chinese housing over an area of 250 square miles. Within this area fatalities would be 80 percent * * *. The fallout from a single 25-megaton bomb can coat 15,000 square miles with a residue of lethal radioactivity * * *. We can conclude that almost half a billion people would die, immediately or in a few weeks, because of a bomber strike of 400 25-megaton bombs."

He goes on to say that the bombers are being phased out of the American defense setup in favor of missiles. But the missiles, because they must be relatively light to conserve on fuel, have warheads of only one megaton. By 1972, this will be our sole retaliatory defense. A missile attack on China would barely achieve a fifth of the results of a bomber strike.

Furthermore, the Chinese army and navy are now limited in their mobility. This will not be the case by 1972, given 5 years of wartime crash production of airplanes, weapons, and missiles.

It is unfortunate that few people can bring themselves to believe that China fully intends war. Eugene Burdick and William Lederer have taken extensive stock of Far Eastern communism. In "The Ugly American" they show U.S. Ambassador to Sarkhan, Gilbert MacWhite, as a well-meaning diplomat. He is shocked to discover that his trusted houseboy knows English and has been relaying secret information to the Communists. MacWhite concluded: "There was a strain of coldness, an element of finality, about the whole thing he had never encountered before. Politics in Asia were played for total stakes."

Total stakes. America cannot play for less. Nicolo Machievelli summed up the alternatives: "There are two ways of contesting, the one by the law, the other by force, but because the first is frequently not sufficient, it is necessary to have recourse to the second."

STRIKE FIRST, PAY LATER

There are 14 cities in Communist China with a population over a million. They are also centers of production and transportation. If the United States attacks these cities now, it can, with a minimum of loss, cripple China's war capabilities. A few extra bombs could take out of commission the troop centers, the uranium plant, and the navy yards.

But the United States has always pledged not to strike first. Machiavelli had the answer to that, too: "A wise lord cannot, nor ought he to, keep faith when such observance may be turned against him, and when the reasons that caused him to pledge it exist no longer. If men were entirely good, this precept would not hold, but because they are bad, [a prince is] not bound to observe them."

To satisfy the queasy, we may borrow a page from the technique book of Adolf Hitler. Before attacking Poland in 1939, German troops captured their own radio station at Gleiwitz, broadcast a message in Polish announcing a Polish attack, shot a few Polish prisoners dressed as German soldiers, and left. If the thought of Poland attacking German weren't so laughable, the trick might have succeeded. It wasn't until after the war that solid evidence of the German deception was discovered.

No such ludicrity exists in the Far East. A highly plausible attack on Quemoy or Taiwan could reopen a war which has never been formally ended. The United States coud fake such an attack for public consumption, then jump in with all its horses as a Nationalist ally. Red China would fall, and Nationalist China could reclaim the mainland.

This picture is greatly simplified, of course. Nearly every war in history started out as a short war. The Chinese people have been brainwashed to expect an American attack. They are trained to hate America and Americans, to give no ground to the foreign aggressors, to fight with any weapon available. They will try to fight a long war.

To counter this tendency, the United States could use chemical warfare. China is served by three great river systems—the Hwang Ho, the Yangtze, and the Si complexes. A fear-inducing drug dropped into the headwaters of these rivers would enable allied troops working downstream to take control gradually, before cowering natives could respond. But not that the headwaters are on the Russian border. For a completely successful operation, America will need Russian cooperation.

RUSSIA NEEDS US

This is not nearly as farfetched as it seems. Since the Sino-Soviet split of 1963, the Soviet Union has become increasingly aware that southeast Asia cannot possibly hold all the answers to China's long-range food problem. Sooner or later, China will demand Russian territory. And when it does, it will have nuclear incentives.

The U.S.S.R. is aware, too, that the United States is primed to strike at Russia in the event of enemy attack. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said that both Russia and Red China can be completely obliterated, even if the United States is hit first. The Russians cannot afford to side with the war-hungry Chinese. They must then side with the only possible alternative—the United States.

After the war, probably another cold war will begin between the two great powers. But neither side will be fanatic about it. As a commercial rivalry, such a cold war might even be beneficial to the rest of the world.

We have seen that communism, stopping at nothing, has conquered half the world's population and a quarter of its surface area. We have seen evidence in Vietnam that China must go to war to feed its people and that they feel they have less to lose in a war. We have seen further how the United States and Russia are capable of stopping China if they strike in the next 5 years.

The American populace will rally behind its leaders if war comes, as it did in both World Wars and in the Cuban confrontation. And the leaders must also now realize that war is inevitable. As America abandoned its policy of neutralism to fight in World War II, so it will abandon its policy of nonaggression in world war III.

The question is not a question of war, it is a question of when. Let us hope the answer does not come too late.

"Tiger" Teague's New G.I. Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under the able, dynamic leadership of "TIGER" TEAGUE, chairman of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the House of Representatives today passed another historic milestone in veterans legislation. It is an outstanding tribute to Mr. TEAGUE that the House accepted his bill by the unanimous vote of 381 to 0.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Washington Post this morning. I thank the Post and commend this excellent editorial to the attention of our colleagues and to the people of our country.

A NEW GI BILL

With the United States heavily committed to the war in Vietnam for the indefinite future there is a good deal of sentiment throughout the country for reestablishing a program of benefits for veterans. The House of Representatives is to consider a bill today sponsored by Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE that would provide assistance for this group in several useful categories including education, job counseling and loans on homes.

Representative TEAGUE is wisely bringing the bill up in a manner that will preclude amendments that could sharply increase its cost. The level of spending his bill calls for, $330 million the first year and around $500 million each year thereafter, is considerably higher than an administration proposal but somewhat lower than a similar bill that passed the Senate last session. It seems to be a reasonable compromise between what the veterans' groups want and what the administration is willing to spend.

Famous New England Author-Critic To Be Honored by Fellow Craftsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that one of New England's most distinguished figures is to be honored by the creation of a memorial cultural center. The late Van Wyck Brooks, who died on May 2, 1963, made a lasting contribution to American literature. The New York Times carried a detailed report on the memorial plans:

LIBRARY TO HONOR VAN WYCK BROOKS—WING TO BE CULTURAL CENTER NEAR LATE AUTHOR'S HOME

BRIDGEWATER, CONN., December 29.—Some of the leading figures in American arts, letters and sciences have formed a sponsoring committee to help build "a smalltown cultural center" in memory of Van Wyck Brooks, the author-critic who died here on May 2, 1963.

The center will be constructed as a wing to the Burnham Public Library. It will cost about $200,000 and will house a re-creation of Mr. Brooks' study, the furnishings from his nearby home and portions of his library, as well as works of the writers discussed in his five-volume history of American literature, "Makers and Finders."

The architectural firm of Moore & Hutchins has designed the wing with two purposes in mind: to work toward the cultural betterment of the area and to serve as an inspiration and model for other smalltown centers across the country, according to Wendell Davis, New York lawyer, who will serve as committee chairman.

CONTINUING ARTS PROGRAMS

The wing and its contents will be made available to students of American literature. It will contain a meeting room with furnishings and equipment necessary for a continuing program of cultural activities. The program will be developed by a special committee that includes Mrs. Frank Lappin, library president, Mrs. Van Wyck Brooks and G. Douglas Johnson, first selectman of Bridgewater.

The cultural activities will include lectures, seminars, films, recorded and live concerts, and art exhibitions. A part of the memorial wing is designed to increase the town's current library facilities for adult and children's reference studies.

A drive for funds is now underway and is expected to last about 6 months. Contributions are already being received by the Van Wyck Brooks Memorial in Bridgewater.

The committee of sponsors, who were all friends and associates of Mr. Brooks, are:

Elizabeth Ames, director of the Yaddo colony; Francis Biddle, former U.S. Attorney General; George Biddle, artist; Dr. Carl Binger, psychiatrist; Pearl S. Buck, author; Norman Cousins, editor; Malcolm Cowley, author; Maxwell Geismar, author; John Hersey, author; Matthew Josephson, author; and Archibald MacLeish, poet.

Also, Elliott Macrae, publisher; Fredric Marsh, actor; David McCord, author; Adm. Samuel Eliot Morison, historian; Lewis Mumford, author; George D. Pratt, Jr., agriculturalist; Senator Abraham D. Ribicoff; John Richardson lawyer; Carl Sandburg, poet; Robert Spiller, professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania; Louis Untermeyer, author; Mark Van Doren, author; Dr. Warren Weaver, foundation executive; Glenway Wescott, author, and John Hall Wheelock, poet.

Leave House Members' Terms at 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week I directed the attention of the Members to my personal disagreement with the President's proposal to extend terms of House Members to 4 years. It is with pleasure that I note that one of the outstanding independent publications in my district, the Chicago Heights Star, commented in very effective fashion on this issue in their February 3 issue:

As We See It—Should Retain 2-Year Congressional Terms

President Lyndon B. Johnson's recommendation that U.S. Congressmen be elected to 4-year, instead of 2-year, terms deserves to be rejected out of hand. It would remove one of the firm checks from our cherished system of checks and balances.

Nobody will quarrel with the fact that political campaigning costs money, and Congressmen could effect a saving by seeking reelection quadrennially. But their pay is good—$30,000 per year—and so are their allowances for help. Nor does campaigning in a relatively small congressional district involve expenses to compare with statewide or nationwide appeals for voter support.

Biennial election of Congressmen provides voters with the important chance to enunciate approval or disapproval of presidential programs during the so-called off-year balloting. It also provides the machinery for introducing fresh blood into the legislative stream at timely intervals. And, in some instances, it makes the office holder responsive to the wishes of his constituents on a more continuous basis than would be the case if the job were safe for 4 years.

Particularly disagreeable in Mr. Johnson's proposal was the suggestion that the 4-year terms for Congressmen coincide with presidential terms. Enough deadwood is swept into office now on the basis of presidential landslides; with respect to Congress, off-year balloting offers a chance to remedy the mistakes. Even if 4-year terms were desirable—and they are not—it would be judicious to start them at midpoint in the presidential administrations.

General Gavin's Dienbienphu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the excellent column of Joseph Alsop concerning the recent opinions voiced by Gen. James Gavin on the tactical situation in Vietnam.

General Gavin's Dienbienphu

(By Joseph Alsop)

Da Nang.—If any place in Vietnam affords a decisive test of Gen. James Gavin's proposed war strategy of holding "enclaves on the coast," that place is surely this great Marine coastal base.

The results of the test suggest that General Gavin, like so many other people, would do well to come and have a prolonged look at the war before offering his advice about it. To see why this is so, you need only add up the requirements of the Gavin strategy here at Da Nang, which is by far the largest and the most important of the coastal enclaves now held by the Marines.

Two Marine regiments now garrison Da Nang. In the near future, however, the able and courageous Marine commander, Maj. Gen. Lewis Walt, plans to reduce the Da Nang garrison substantially, so that battalions can take part in forward operations against the enemy.

More Marine outfits can be released from static defense, mainly because of the cover provided by General Westmoreland's forward strategy. General Walt, who dislikes static defense as much as every other good soldier, is naturally eager to make a larger contribution to the forward strategy.

But suppose the cover of General Westmoreland's forward strategy is removed. Suppose that General Walt is asked to hold a mere coastal enclave centered on Da Nang. What then will be General Walt's requirements? As summarized by him, it can be authoritatively stated that the answer is as follows:

First, General Walt will need a Da Nang garrison of two Marine divisions instead of the present two regiments—or exactly three times as many troops.

Second, General Walt will need more artillery, including heavy artillery or continuous support from naval guns.

Third, General Walt will need U.S. Government backing in taking substantially heavier casualty rates than are now considered acceptable.

Superficially, this may seem paradoxical. But General Gavin cannot realize that his strategy would knock the vital South Vietnamese Army straight out of the war, for rather simple political reasons which must be examined in another report. That means leaving six American and South Korean divisions to face the enemy alone.

That also means surrendering all the rest of South Vietnam to the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, immediately after the American retreat to General Gavin's coastal enclaves. And alas, this is no longer the simple guerrilla war that General Gavin evidently imagines it is.

The backbone of the enemy's power today, without which the guerrillas would soon collapse, is a large and formidable force of regular troops, both Vietcong and North Vietnamese. These regular troops are now contained, kept on the run, and constantly subjected to grave attrition by General Westmoreland's forward strategy. But they would be automatically liberated by a retreat into enclaves and a free gift of all the rest of South Vietnam to the enemy.

The units of North Vietnamese Regulars now in South Vietnam equal either four or five divisions. The regiments and battalions of the Vietcong "main forces" equal eight divisions-plus. In addition, there are 30 Vietcong provincial battalions which could soon be transformed into "main force" units if they had no further work in their provinces.

Add up these figures. If the forward strategy should be abandoned, the enemy would have available in South Vietnam alone an offensive strength equal to about 16 divisions. In these circumstances, moreover, all of South Vietnam except the enclaves could be rapidly organized for supply purposes. And heavy artillery and five or six additional divisions could be brought down from North Vietnam. It would then be 6 divisions on our side against up to 20 on the enemy's side.

Such would be the enemy's resources for besieging General Gavin's coastal enclaves—and no one familiar with the course of this war can doubt for an instant that the proposed enclaves would be under heavy, obstinate and bloody siege in a matter of a few weeks or months. General Walt's reported requirements of two full Marine divisions to hold the Da Nang enclaves was based, it is understood, on a projected siege by five enemy divisions.

The projection was conservative and so was the requirement. It is frightening to contemplate the defense requirement for a Saigon enclave, with its far more difficult geography. In short, General Gavin's proposal unfortunately turns out to be one of two things, both mighty unpleasant.

It is either a proposal to give most of the country to the enemy while putting in far more American troops than General Westmoreland has ever requested. Or it is a plan for a series of coastal Dienbienphus, mitigated only by the freedom to turn tail and flee by sea.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Economic Activities Lag in Right-to-Work States, Statistical Data Reveals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in the Senate today I discussed briefly the differences between conditions in the 19 so-called right-to-work States and the 31 States in which there are no such State laws. I stated that I had statistical information of pertinence to add on the subject, and I present it as follows:

VOLUME OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY IN RIGHT-TO-WORK STATES

The impressive historical percentage gains that can be cited for right-to-work States in such economic measures as number of employees, retail trade, bank deposits, capital expenditures and the like, completely ignore the fact that the right-to-work States, as a group, currently lag behind the rest of the Nation in these and other aspects of economic life.

On a current basis, right-to-work States do not generally share in such activities in the proportions that would be expected, based on their share of the total U.S. population.

Thus, while the number of persons living in right-to-work States made up 28.6 percent—nearly 30 percent—of the total U.S. population in 1964, these States had only 23 percent of total personal income in the country in 1964, only 24 percent of the value of life insurance in force, only 18 percent of the bank deposits, and in 1963 furnished only 19 percent of value added by manufacture. A more complete analysis is given in the attached table.

Volume of economic activity in right-to-work States [1]

	U.S. total	Percent in right-to-work States
Population, 1964	191,394,000	28.6
(1) Total personal income, 1964	$491,000,000,000	22.9
(2) Nonagricultural employment, 1964	58,008,000	24.7
(3) Employees in manufacturing, 1964	17,230,000	21.4
(4) Production workers in manufacturing, 1963	12,325,000	22.3
(5) Total wages of production workers in manufacturing, 1963	$62,200,000,000	18.1
(6) Capital expenditures, 1963	$11,100,000,000	22.9
(7) Value added by manufacture, 1963	$190,490,000,000	18.6
(8) Bank deposits, 1964	$358,300,000,000	18.2

Volume of economic activity in right-to-work States [1]*—Continued*

	U.S. total	Percent in right-to-work States
Population, 1964—Con.		
(9) Motor vehicle registrations, 1964	86,297,000	30.0
(10) Retail trade annual payroll, 1963	$27,600,000,000	23.8
(11) Retail sales, 1963	$244,200,000,000	25.8
(12) Number of retail establishments with payroll, 1963	1,208,067	28.5
(13) Value of life insurance in force, 1964	$800,000,000,000	23.8
(14) Number of life insurance policies in force, 1964	308,294	29.3

[1] 1965 list of right-to-work States.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1965, supplemented by additional information from U.S. Department of Commerce and U.S. Department of Labor.

LEVELS OF LIVING

No amount of statistical wielding of historical percentage gains for average wages and per capita personal income can erase the fact that wages and other income today fall below the national average in right-to-work States and even further below the levels prevailing in non-right-to-work States. According to the 1960 census, nearly one-third of the families living in right-to-work States lived in poverty, with incomes under $3,000. In non-right-to-work States, the comparable figure was 17.2 percent.

Recent figures from the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the U.S. Department of Labor illuminate the unfortunate pressures generated by low wage economies. Although right-to-work States account for only 23 percent of all workers covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, close to half of the violations of this act take place in these States—that is, failure to pay the required minimum wage and overtime pay under the law and the illegal employment of child labor.

Educational standards are deficient in the right-to-work group. In the academic year, 1964–65, the average expenditure per pupil in public schools was $395 in these States as compared with $500 in the non-right-to-work States.

Failures in educational attainment are shown also in the high proportion of selective draftees rejected in 1964 for failing mental tests. This proportion was 38 percent in right-to-work States as compared with 21 percent in non-right-to-work States.

Comparison of levels of living in right-to-work States and non-right-to-work States [1]

(1) Per capita personal income, 1964:	
United States	2,566
Right-to-work States	2,055
Non-right-to-work States	2,771

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

(2) Wages of production workers in manufacturing, 1964:	*Average weekly wages*	*Average hourly earnings*
United States	$102.97	$2.53
Right-to-work States	94.49	2.30
Non-right-to-work States	105.86	2.59

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

(3) Families with incomes under $3,000, 1960:	*Total number of families*	*Percent with income under $3,000*
United States	45,128,000	21.4
Right-to-work States	12,506,000	32.2
Non-right-to-work States	32,625,000	17.2

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 1960.

(4) Violations of Federal Wage and Hour Act, 1964–65:	*Covered workers*		*Percent of minimum wage violations*	*Percent of overtime pay violations*	*Percent of child labor violations*
	Number	*Percent*			
United States	29,593,000	100.0			
Right-to-work States	6,726,000	22.7	49.5	46.9	46.7
Non-right-to-work States	22,867,000	77.3	50.5	53.1	53.3

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

(5) Expenditures per pupil in public schools, 1964–64:	
United States	$484
Right-to-work States	395
Non-right-to-work States	500

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(6) Selective Service draftees rejected for failing mental tests, 1964:	*Number examined*	*Percent failing mental test*
United States	818,300	26.5
Right-to-work States	254,100	38.4
Non-right-to-work States	564,200	21.1

[1] 1965 list of right-to-work States.

Source: U.S. Department of the Army.

LABOR STANDARDS LEGISLATION

Little protection is offered to workers in right-to-work States in terms of labor standards legislation, as compared with States without right-to-work laws.

The following table summarizes the facts for several types of labor legislation:

Labor standards legislation

Type of law	Right-to-work States (19)[1]		Non-right-to-work States (32)[2]	
	Number with law	Percent	Number with law	Percent
1. Minimum wage	6	32	27	84
2. Workmen's compensation: Maximum weekly benefit of $40 or more	9	47	28	87
3. Unemployment insurance:				
Maximum benefits of $50 or more	1	5	15	47
Average benefit above national average of $36	5	26	15	47
4. Fair employment practices	7	37	27	84
5. Equal pay for women	4	21	21	66
6. Child Labor: 3 out of 8 recommended standards included in law	5	26	18	56

[1] 1965 list of right-to-work States.

[2] Includes District of Columbia.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

Questionnaire on Banking Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, back in December I sent out a questionnaire on banking legislation to a number of New York City bankers. My primary concern was with legislation that I and my colleagues on the Banking Committee are dealing with during this Congress.

I received a good response, and I think that the views of New York City bankers, as expressed in their answers to the questionnaire, will be of interest to the Members of this House.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1966.

MY DEAR RESPONDENT: Early in December, I sent out a questionnaire to the 4 top executives in each of 60 New York City banks, as well as to a small group of bank officials in my own county. My questionnaire probed bankers' attitudes on legislation we in Congress can expect to see before us this year. Thank you for your interest in this questionnaire.

Most of the banks I contacted have replied in the 8 weeks since I sent out the questionnaire, and I have tabulated the results to date. Most banks had one official reply on behalf of the bank. Other banks returned several questionnaires. Some officers answered anonymously. Others stated that their questionnaire represented only their personal views. Here are the results of the survey.

Bankers were asked if they favored combining Federal bank regulatory powers in one Federal agency rather than the present three (FDIC, FRB, Treasury-Comptroller). Forty-two percent favored this step, 47 percent opposed it, and 11 percent declined to comment. Many of the latter were savings bankers who were not affected. The 47 opposition figure understates the strong opposition of the chief officers of 5 of New York's leading banks. They all opposed the combination of regulatory power, suggesting that in diversity, there is stimulus to progress. Some, however, while opposing the concentration of regulatory power, favored the establishment of something on the order of a Federal Banking Board of Appeals to which legal rulings of any of the regulatory bodies could be appealed, thus getting rid of conflicting interpretations of the same statute (such as have been troublesome to date when the Comptroller, for example, says that a law means one thing for national banks and the Federal Reserve Board says that it means another thing for State banks). It was mentioned that the proposed appeals board would retain the positive aspects of diversified regulation while eliminating the negative aspects.

Legislation (S. 1985, Senator DOMINICK) to require a public hearing on applications to receive a national bank charter was supported by a plurality of questionnaire respondents: 42 percent approved, 38 percent disapproved, and 20 percent declined to comment. Chief officers of the leading banks opposed this proposal by an 80 percent majority, with 20 percent declining to comment. Much of the general disapproval was predicated on the possible use of the hearings as "sounding boards" for dissatisfied banks. Some of those opposing hearings nevertheless favored hearings in cases where opposition had been expressed to the application. In situations like this, the public hearing would not be likely to be a sounding board of dissatisfaction.

A great majority of respondents were favorable to legislation (H.R. 7468, Representative FINO) to disallow the Comptroller of the Currency from allowing a national bank to branch de novo in a way that a State-chartered bank in a given State could not. Eighty-three percent of respondents favored this bill, eleven percent were opposed and six percent had no comment. Of major bank chief officers, 60 percent favored, 20 percent opposed and 20 percent declined to comment. The background to this legislation is that the Comptroller of the Currency has been inclined to take interpretive advantage of the law to let national banks branch in situations where State banks of that State cannot. The Utah bank case, decided by a Federal appellate court since the introduction of the legislation, seems to restrict the Comptroller just as the bill would, but, as some bankers commented, there is something to be said for having safeguards in writing when the Supreme Court has not spoken. Another portion of the bill seeks to head off discrimination against national banks by allowing national banks merging across State banking district lines to keep branches acquired by merger, when State legislation has been passed according this privilege to State banks. The need for this part of the legislation was not affected by the Utah decision.

A large majority expressed their faith in the dual banking system by (1) opposing any legislation which would equalize national and State banking systems by reducing the power of the Comptroller of the Currency to grant flexibility to national banks and (2) favoring legislation on the State level to establish equality by updating the several State banking codes. Diminution of the Comptroller's powers was opposed by the overall respondent group, 46 to 20 percent, with 34 percent not commenting directly or at all. Expansion of the State banking systems was favored by the larger group of respondents, 83 to 6 percent, with 11 percent not commenting. The chief officers of the five leading New York banks unanimously disapproved stripping any of the Comptroller's prerogatives and powers. They unanimously favored strengthening the dual banking system by updating and improving State banking legislation and the scope available to banks thereunder.

Some respondents commented on the need for increased flexibility even in the Comptroller's national banking system. Several other respondents noted one way in which increased State bank flexibility would have to be the subject of Federal legislation: such legislation would be needed to give State banks the same privileges and immunities with respect to taxation by foreign states and with respect to doing business in foreign states as pertain in the case of national banks.

Legislation (H.R. 7539, Representative ST GERMAIN, of Rhode Island), to allow bank underwriting of State and local revenue bonds was approved by a majority of all respondents. Sixty-three percent favored the measure, 18 percent disapproved, and 19 percent had no comment. The chief officers of the five leading New York City banks unanimously favored this bill. No mention was made of attitudes toward the expansive interpretations of Comptroller Saxon (now the subject of court action) which are allowing national banks to underwrite selected examples of these bonds despite the prohibition of the present statutes.

Legislation to revise restricted bank and savings and loan association bad debt reserves established by the Internal Revenue Service (H.R. 7585, Representative CURTIS, of Missouri) provoked split opinion. Of the total group of respondents, 40 percent favored, 31 percent opposed, 29 percent had no comment to make. Some of these regretted complete unfamiliarity. The five chief officers of the leading city banks split thusly: 40 percent favored, 20 percent opposed, 40 percent had no comment.

Legislation to require "truth in lending" as embodied in S. 2275 (Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois). Statistics on this bill prove little because many answers stated "I favor this in principle" and went on to question the language of the legislation cited. The reaction of the representatives of the five leading city banks is informative: 100 percent opposed, although generally favorable in principle. The major objection to this bill, and to this type of legislation, was the impression it was said to leave that the truth is not now being told in lending.

A four-part question was used to elicit feeeling on the bank merger legislative controversy. Opinion went along the lines of the bill now reported in the House. The general idea of legislation to exempt banks in whole or in part from the antitrust laws was favored 92 to 6 percent, with 2 percent not commenting. The big banks unanimously favored the idea. The question was asked whether bank mergers should be wholly exempt from antitrust laws or only exempt after the Justice Department has not acted within a 30-day period. Thirty-eight percent of the sum respondents group favored complete exemption, 53 percent favored exemption only after the time limit, and 9 perecnt had no comment or had previously opposed any inroads in antitrust regulation of banks. The officers of the five banks favored complete exemption, 60 to 40 percent. The factors that the court should consider once the Justice Department had brought suit against an agency-approved merger were also queried. Eleven percent of respondents felt that only antitrust factors should be considered, while seventy-five percent felt that other (convenience, service, general banking factors) factors should be considered, and 14 percent had no comment. The big banks unanimously favored consideration of factors other than pure antitrust by courts reviewing approved mergers. Retroactive exemption for banks already merged before the Philadelphia case was favored by 85 percent of respondents and all the big banks. Banking opinion thus records itself pretty much in line with the legislation finally reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Legislation to amend the Bank Holding Company Act by removing exemptions and bringing various devices within its purview (Senator Robertson, of Virginia, S. 2383) was favored. The larger respondents group favored it 60 percent to 9 percent opposed, and 31 percent not commenting. The chief officers of the five leading banks split 40 percent-40 percent-20 percent. In a sub-question, however, most respondents favored knocking out only a selected few of the more nortorious exemptions. This question did not appear to elicit a particularly informed response. Seemingly a majority of bankers are, however, in favor on some tightening of the Bank Holding Company Act. There is occasionally noted opposition to the proposal to include within the scope of the Bank Holding Company Act ownership of 25 percent or more of merely one bank.

FDIC-proposed legislation to empower banking agencies to get cease and desist orders against unsound banking practices, to suspend officers in violation, and so forth was backed by just about all those who commented. The only controversial part of the FDIC package being pushed by Chairman Randall is the authorization to the banking agencies to require banks to have private audits. Opinion in both the overall and big bank respondents' group was split about 50–50 on this proposal.

Legislation to vest in Federal bank regulatory agencies the exclusive jurisdiction to regulate and supervise bank collective investment funds (three specific types) was favored by 48 percent of the overall respondents' group, opposed by 18 percent and not commented on by 34 percent. Of the chief officers of the five big New York City banks, 60 percent favored this legislation, with 20 percent opposed and 20 percent not commenting.

A number of savings bankers were included in this poll, and they unanimously came up with "write-in" votes for H.R. 11433, Representative Multer's bill to establish Federal mutual savings banks. One factor emerging from savings bankers' opinions is a feeling of being in the second string of legislative consideration. This feeling is also important with respect to the banking programs before the New York legislature. Savings bankers are disinclined to support reforms needed by commercial banks while savings bank reforms remain neglected.

I appreciate your cooperation. Feel free to keep me informed of your views on these and other matters I have not dealt with.

Sincerely yours,

Paul A. Fino,
Member of Congress.

Interstate 87

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the January 31, 1966, issue of the Westchester County, N.Y., Reporter-Dispatch carried an excellent article concerning the routing of Interstate 87.

The issue in the controversy involved in the routing of Interstate 87 is the one with which my bill, S. 1974, deals. S. 1974 would require road builders to consider fish, wildlife, and recreation interests in highway routing. Hearings on the bill were held last year by the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Public Roads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article, "Interstate 87—Will It Destroy Open Space or Conserve and Serve County's Needs?" by Editor William L. Bookman, in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Interstate 87—Will It Destroy Open Space or Conserve and Serve County's Needs?

(Editor's Note.—The following is a frank espousal of a westerly alinement of Interstate Route 87 through North Castle and Bedford. In supporting this alinement editorially, the Reporter-Dispatch believes it is serving the best and the long-range interests of all the people of Westchester, and is following the wise course of conservationists everywhere who counsel the preservation of large areas of open, natural green space.)

(By William I. Bookman, editor, the Reporter-Dispatch)

Interstate Route 87 is a major highway being built north from the Cross-Westchester Expressway in Harrison to connect with Interstate 84, now under construction, near Brewster.

If Interstate 87 is built along one of the two proposed alinements between Armonk and Katonah, posterity will be denied the largest tract of contiguous parkland available for public development still remaining in Westchester. To the conservation minded in the county and beyond, loss of this opportunity for maintaining open space would be a disaster.

The vulnerable area consists of more than 2,600 wooded acres surrounding Byram Lake in the towns of North Castle, New Castle, and Bedford.

Until recent months the preservation of this natural park area appeared doomed, with the decision by the Federal Government to push Interstate 87 through the center of the area, disregarding both county and State protestations.

The picture has been changed by two developments:

1. Last month the county issued a brochure, "Open Space Program for Westchester County." It incorporated a recommendation to the county by Charles E. Pound, commissioner of parks, recreation, and conservation and S. J. Schulman, county planning commissioner. The brochure stated firmly for the first time as public policy, the desire of the county eventually to assemble the Byram Lake region as an open space preserve.

2. The Federal Bureau of Public Roads, in a move the impetus for which has been the subject of speculation, has ordered a halt to acquisition of property along the roadway through the potential preserve, and directed a resurvey of a more westerly route of 87, which would avoid all but a small corner of the Byram Lake region.

The county planning department estimates Westchester's probable population in 1985 will be 1,300,000 a growth of 400,000 over the current figure. This indicates a need, the planning department said for 4,600 acres of additional park land for the 1985 population, but whatever the target date at which the need is computed, a comparatively short time ahead from now represents the county's last feasible opportunity to make adequate provision for future park needs.

County Executive Edwin G. Michaelian stated in the county's brochure, "We all recognize that adequate open space is the hallmark distinguishing the suburbs from the central city."

The 2,638 acres of rolling, wooded hills surrounding Byram Lake Reservoir, if set aside, would satisfy more than half of the total acreage desired to be reserved by the planning department for the 1985 population.

Among 16 areas recommended by the planning department for acquisition, the Byram Lake region is unique in Westchester for its combination of size and accessibility. Just 8 miles from White Plains, the area is, nonetheless, rugged and laced with sparkling woodland streams. Byram Lake Road, which skirts the eastern shore of the reservoir, connects with Bedford Road in Mount Kisco and with Route 22 in Armonk.

Two privately operated nature preserves, the 268-acre Butler Nature Conservancy and the 110-acre Westmoreland Sanctuary, already exist within the bounds of what one day may be the county's second largest park. A number of property owners in the area have indicated their desire to add to the lands already set aside for conservation and recreational uses, but if Interstate 87 sunders the wilderness area, these future grants will not be forthcoming.

One example of the philanthropy which may transpire can be seen in the gift of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Meyers, who in 1962 presented Byram Lake and its fringe area to the village of Mount Kisco. Under the terms of the agreement, the gift is to be used "exclusively in the public interest for the purpose of a water supply, for conservation or park uses."

Mr. Schulman said recently that if Interstate 87 spares the Byram Lake area, it is possible the county will retain the park land region without having to spend one penny.

NEED FOR THE ROAD

The need for such a road as Interstate 87 has been documented by the State department of public works. After analyzing the growth of traffic through Westchester, the DPW, "Another express route is urgently required in this area to avert eventual glutting (of present route) and Interstate 87 is the only remaining facility in the Interstate System in New York State which may be utilized for this purpose."

At the present time, the New England Thruway—Interstate 95—is the only major direct-line expressway for both passenger and commercial traffic between New England and the New York metropolitan area.

Southbound traffic at the southern terminal of 87 will merge into that of the Cross-Westchester Expressway, and from there will take the New York State Thruway, the New England Thruway, or any of Westchester's three parkways.

Just to the east of Brewster, Interstate 87 will join Interstate 84, a road now under construction from Springfield, Mass., to Scranton, Pa. After joining Interstate 84 near Brewster, 87 would follow that route west across the Hudson River and as far west as the State thruway near Newburgh.

TO CANADIAN BORDER

Route 87 then heads north on the thruway (which explains the puzzlement of many Westchester motorists who thought of 87 merely with respect to the much publicized Armonk-Katonah portion) and on up the Northway to the Canadian border.

An earlier alinement of Interstate 87 through Westchester had been far to the west, near Route 9, skirting the shore communities of Tarrytown, Ossining, and Peekskill. But this was rejected because it would be longer and more expensive.

When 87 is finally completed, the Route 87 signs will come down from the thruway between Elmsford and Newburgh, a symbol that the State has qualified for and received the 90-percent Federal aid under the national interstate highway project for the new portion of 87.

PLANNED FOR ALMOST 10 YEARS

Interstate 87 has been on the drawing boards now for almost a decade. In that time, it has spawned more confusion and raised more wrath than any other 29-mile highway in the history of Westchester.

Nonetheless, despite the chaos wrought by public hearings, private surveys, court actions, protest marches, and bickering governmental bodies, advances on the road have been achieved.

Between Katonah and the northern terminus for 87, most of the construction is substantially finished. At its southern end, between Harrison and Armonk, the task of building the highway is well underway.

It is only between Armonk and Katonah that there are no steam shovels, no road crews, no redtasseled surveyor's stakes. There, the countryside does not resound with the roar of change, because for this, the middle zone of a $57 million road, there exists no agreed-upon blueprint, only proposals.

TWO ROUTES OUTLINED

The Federal Bureau of Public Roads has studied two possible routes for the midsection of 87: the Chestnut Ridge route which would destroy forever the Byram Lake Valley and the so-called westerly route which would roughly parallel Route 128 between Armonk and Bedford Hills.

Last year, in the decision which was later withdrawn, the Bureau of Roads endorsed the Chestnut Ridge route and instructed the State departments of public works to proceed with the planning phase in preparation for actual construction. The Federal approval was based upon figures compiled in 1961 which declared that the Chestnut Ridge route would be seven-thenths of a mile shorter and $4.3 million less expensive.

But even if the 1961 figures are substantiated, these differences alone should not be allowed to constitute the basis for preference, in the view of State and county officials, as well as conservationists.

BACKS WESTERLY ROUTE

In a letter to Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton dated November 28, 1962, J. Burch McMorran, State superintendent of public works, states in no uncertain terms, "These factors are of little significance in relation to the improved service afforded by the westerly route. * * * I wish to cite again the fact that when we recommended a shift of Interstate 87 easterly from the Route 9 corridor, we made possible an estimated savings of $57 million and 6.3 miles in distance. This change was approved by the Bureau of Public Roads on December 29, 1960.

"To insist now that the only alignment that can be approved in the middle county corridor must reflect additional reductions in cost and mileage—the outweighing advantages of the westerly alignment notwithstanding—appears narrow, arbitrary, and grossly unwarranted."

The westerly route has come under fire in recent months by North Castle residents who fear it would destroy the $350,000 Anita Louise Ehrman Pool and Recreation Center. The recreation center is the laudable gift of the Ehrman family to the residents of North Castle.

CAN SPARE EHRMAN CENTER

The immediate misgivings felt by those residents is understandable, but the westerly route can be modified to avoid any real damage to the recreation center. In a report commissioned by private clients, engineer Charles H. Sells of Pleasantville will recommend to the State DPW that the northbound lane of westerly 87 be shifted about 80 feet more to the west, thereby avoiding destruction of the pool.

The southbound lane of the divided highway need not be shifted at this point, and no additional houses will be taken, as some have charged. The distance between the north and southbound lanes will still be 80 feet, which is 20 feet more than recommended minimum.

If the Sells recommendation is acceptable to the Bureau of Roads, 87 will leave a minimum of 60 feet of level ground between the pool and the bottom of the highway. slope. By sparing the pool and avoiding any increase in property damage, the Sells recommendation to alter westerly 87 would appear to terminate the issue of the Anita Louise Ehrman Pool and Recreation Center.

"STRIP" DEVELOPMENT

In following the westerly route, closer to existing development along the Saw Mill River Valley in the Mount Kisco area, the interstate route would also preclude a "strip" type development along Route 172, which runs east from Mount Kisco north of Bryam Lake and would intersect 87.

If 87 were built on the easterly alinement, Mr. Schulman feels, Route 172 would inevitably develop with commercial and other structures strung out between Mount Kisco and the interstate highway. This would not only further mar the countryside but would involve expensive sewers and other utilities.

Mr. Schulman, when it appeared that the Chestnut Ridge route was settled upon, even recommended that if that route were used there would be no interchange with Route 172, even though such an interchange would appear to be desirable to serve Mount Kisco.

STATE URGES SPEED

The State, too, became resigned to the easterly alinement, and at one point urged speed in proceeding with the route, which would be built with 90 percent Federal funds.

After vainly submitting the westerly proposal on two separate occasions for Federal approval, the department of public works wrote to Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, saying, "We further reviewed the situation and are still of the opinion that the westerly alternate route best fulfills both present and future needs of the area.

"However, in the interest of securing approval of the entire route * * * and of proceeding with detail designs * * * and further, in appreciation of our mutual desire to accelerate construction on the Interstate System, we request early approval of the easterly alinement which appears to be the only location you can justify."

The State believed, even as it submitted the Chestnut Ridge route for approval, that the westerly alinement would best fulfill both present and future needs of the area. It believed then, and probably still does today, that the westerly route, by passing closer to the commercial center of Mount Kisco, would be of a greater service to the locale.

One month earlier, the department of public works declared, "The westerly alternate services existing commercial areas and provides for future commercial growth in the same corridor. The easterly (Chestnut Ridge) line is glaringly deficient in this respect and its use for an interstate route would surely violate the cultural, esthetic, and conservation features of the immediate area."

"It is our judgment that the westerly alternate alinement will best service the social, cultural, and economic requirements of Westchester County and the needs of the Interstate System generally; that it will conform with the established character and pattern of land use in the county; that it will provide communities with important new traffic service; and that it will assist communities in their individual planning for growth along residential and/or commercial lines."

OBJECTIONS TO WEST ROUTE

There are, of course, sincerely voiced objections to the westerly proposal: it would displace more residents and destroy more homes in Armonk; it would cut through the edge of Dellwood, the Moral Rearmament retreat near Mount Kisco; it would crush the 46-acre Cornelia Van Rensselear Marsh Sanctuary in Mount Kisco; and it would waste approximately $300,000 spent by the State in designing the Chestnut Ridge route.

Yet, in constructing a westerly 87, these setbacks do not begin to compare with the enormous benefits obtained for the whole of the county.

The Federal Bureau of Roads has seen fit to reconsider its earlier approval of the Chestnut Ridge route. It may be beginning to realize what the county and State planners have known all along: that the westerly route is the best route for commercial growth and local services, conservation, and recreation.

Germ Warfare Dangers—A Real Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very interesting and exceptionally well-written article in a recent edition of the Boston Globe by Mr. Herbert Black of that fine publication, setting forth the recent comments by Dr. Robert M. Goldwyn and Dr. Victor Sidel, outstanding young doctors and medical specialists of Boston, pointing out germ warfare dangers.

Dr. Sidel is director of preventive medicine at Massachusetts General Hospital and Dr. Goldwyn, associate in surgery at Peter Bent Brigham and Beth Israel Hospitals.

These very able, distinguished, young doctors point out that use of chemical or biological weapons would hit hardest among the young, the elderly, and the infirm.

They also define various chemical agents toxic to man, animals, and plants, excluding explosives, smoke, flame, and incendiaries.

They refer in their article to living organisms, or their toxic products, whose uses cause death, disability, or disease in man, animals, plants, and food supplies.

I happen to know Dr. Robert M. Goldwyn very well. He is a dear, admired friend of mine and the son of Dr. Jacob Goldwyn, of Worcester, Mass., noted psychiatrist of that city and Mrs. Polly Goldwyn, a woman of great charm, talent, and ability, originally from my hometown of Clinton, Mass.

This tremendously gifted young man, who graduated summa cum laude from Harvard College, and from Harvard Medical School, is a very distinguished scholar and surgeon, a young man of great promise, and I believe that Dr. Sidel is also a young man of high training, competence, and great promise, who, like Dr. Goldwyn, ranks high in his profession.

In any event, their work, as emphasized in their recent paper, is commendable and extremely vital, because we must make sure, as best we can, the sooner, the better, that neither nuclear substances, nor chemical or biological agents, are utilized in warfare, or allowed in any way through experiments, or in other ways, to pollute our atmosphere and destroy human life, animal life, plantlife, and work havoc and desolation in the world.

To the extent that this article, the work of these distinguished, young medical doctors alerts us to the dangers of chemical and biological warfare in timely fashion, it is up to us to take the pertinent warnings that they have given us to heart and intensify our efforts for proper controls.

Few objectives could be more urgent; few more immediate; few more challenging.

We have tried again and again to seek suitable controls, instead of the entirely feeble and inadequate machinery that we have today, little better than none, to prevent the use of toxic and nuclear destructive weapons in warfare.

But we cannot achieve this crucial goal by our own efforts alone. Only Russia and her satellite group can possibly remedy this situation by joining even belatedly in our proposed control agreements and conventions, and I hope that they take this action sooner rather than later, when great destruction may be wrought and unimagined horror and desolation may be visited upon the world.

We have ultimately Red China, too, to consider in our search for these controls, but the penetration of the hard-core Marxist armor of that nation is a very formidable task.

But let us persist in the struggle for rationality and sanity in ridding mankind of the ghostlike shadows of extinction that hang over the world like a black pall.

Surely somewhere in the rocky facades of monolithic totalitarianism there must be some fissures through which the light of reason can penetrate into the minds and hearts of the leaders of great nations now seemingly unmoved by the glowering shadows of impending doom.

If the pointed warnings of these talented young scientists are duly heeded in every nation, starting with our own, perhaps hope will replace despair; perhaps men can again act like human beings and outlaw all destructive and toxic substances in warfare, lay down their swords of extinction and set up an enduring peace.

I highly commend Dr. Goldwyn and Dr. Sidel upon their very scholarly and timely paper and wish them well in their endeavors to cast light upon the dark ideological recesses that menace the existence and the progress of the human race on this earth.

The article follows:

Two Hub Doctors Raise Issue—Germ Warfare Dangers Cited

(By Herbert Black, Medical Editor)

Physicians everywhere were urged today by two Boston doctors to question the moral and even practical justification for use of chemical or biological warfare.

Such warfare is likely to be used on civilian populations and could cause epidemics of disastrous proportions, warned Dr. Victor W. Sidel and Dr. Robert M. Goldwyn.

They said physicians have a special responsibility because they may be asked to develop these weapons and they would have to treat the victims of them.

They protested what is sometimes called the "humane aspects" of many of the biologic and chemical agents, declaring that "once the Pandora's box has been opened, military commanders will select the most lethal weapons."

Sidel and Goldwyn, members of the executive of Physicians for Social Responsibility, a Boston-founded national group, declared that any condoning of bacterial or chemical weapons would seem to be a tragic reversal of medical progress and a rejection of the Hippocratic oath.

"Many of the biologic weapons," they said in the New England Journal of Medicine, "can trigger afflictions that physicians have labored for centuries to eradicate."

Drs. Sidel and Goldwyn trace the origins of chemical and germ warfare from the poisonous arrows of ancient Asia and Western Europe, through World Wars I and II to the defoliating and crop-destroying substances and the irritating, but nonlethal tear and nausea gases employed against the Vietcong.

They define chemical agents as those chemicals toxic to man, animals and plants, excluding explosives, smoke, flame and incendiaries.

Biological weapons they defined as "living organisms or their toxic products whose use causes death, disability or disease in man, animals, plants and food supplies.

Chemical agents toxic to man are listed in six categories, three nonlethal and three lethal. The nonlethals include irritants such as tear gas and agents that cause coughing and nausea.

They also include vesicants (blistering agents like mustard gas). These can be particularly damaging because victims may remain in poisonous atmosphere until severe damage is done.

The third non-lethal chemical is the hallucinogen. The most frequently discussed of these is LSD, the odorless, tasteless and colorless chemical that can cause psychological reactions and psychoses. The drug could be introduced into water supplies or possibly placed in food.

(LSD is the drug with which some college students in the United States have been experimenting. Doctors Sidel and Goldwyn point out that a danger in this drug is that persons taking it either knowingly or unknowingly may be unaware of their altered behavior under its influence.)

The lethal agents described are gases that attack the nerves, the lungs and certain enzymes. Nerve gases, the authors say, are the newest, the most effective and the most likely to be used.

They are described as colorless and odorless organic phosphates which enter the body either as gases via the lungs, or as liquids through the skin. High concentrations of these can kill on a single inhalation.

Listed also were those agents that result in the concentration of abnormal fluid levels in the lungs. One of these, prussic acid, is used for executions in gas chambers.

As for biological weapons, an important feature must be to find protection for civilians because of the insidious nature of airborne organisms.

Masks or filters in ventilating systems will provide some protection. Decontamination is a protective measure, the doctors said, "but it is not easy to achieve." So far there are few vaccines against airborne bacteria and medical treatment would be hard to carry out.

Dr. Sidel, who is director of the preventive medicine unit at Massachusetts General Hospital, and Dr. Goldwyn, associate in surgery at Peter Bent Brigham and Beth Israel Hospitals, emphasize that use of chemical or biological weapons would hit hardest among the young, the elderly, and the infirm.

The doctors, both on the faculty of Harvard Medical School, declared physicians must carefully evaluate their attitudes toward their rights and duties both as citizens and doctors in regard to the development of such weapons and their possible use.

Alabama Industrialists Oppose Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are concerned about the fiscal policies of the Johnson administration. The deficit spending theory is open to serious question. It has never worked in creating permanent prosperity and it could lead to a complete breakdown of our economic system through runaway inflation and a continued erosion of the dollar.

Federal spending and deficit financing was ably discussed at the annual Washington meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama by Mr. John V. Van Pelt III, vice president, finance and controls, Vulcan Materials Co., of Birminghac, Ala. Mr. Van Pelt's report follows:

Federal Spending and Position on Capital Gains

(Statement in the tax field presented before the Alabama congressional delegation, January 24, 1966, by John V. Van Pelt III, vice president, finance and control, Vulcan Materials Co., Birmingham, Ala.)

The Associated Industries of Alabama has stated its position in prior years that it is opposed to continued deficit spending. Last year it was pointed out that the administrative budget does not tell the true story, since total spending, including that against prior year appropriations and spending from trust funds, has exceeded receipts in every fiscal year since 1962.

In 1965 the administration proposed, and the Congress approved, a variety of programs which will, over the future, add to the load of expenditures. In certain instances money to instrument these programs has not been appropriated. Additionally it has developed that our involvement in Southern Asia is placing new, and fantastic, demands on the Treasury. While it might have been theoretically possible a year ago to produce a budget balance, under present conditions that objective would hardly be realistic. The best we can hope to do is to minimize the imbalance between receipts and expenditures. However, this situation makes it even more important that every effort be made to curtail expenditures that are not immediately necessary.

Surely the citizens of the United States do not want a managed economy, with price and wage controls, nor do they want rampant inflation. The only way such a managed economy can be avoided, without accepting inflation as a way of life, in the face of the demands of an enlarging military commitment is to drastically curtail artificial stimuli which might otherwise increase levels of economic activity. Appropriations have already been made for many programs, and in some instances to fail to make additional appropriations for programs already in operation might create future costs that would make such actions uneconomic.

However, there are many areas where it is still possible to minimize the level of expenditure. Poverty programs can be downgraded, urban renewal and mass transportation programs delayed, and hospital modernization deferred. Proposals that have strong inflationary impact such as the extension of minimum wage laws, both in scope and level, should be sidetracked. Expenditures for foreign aid, and other State Department programs, particularly in places such as Rhodesia, should be critically reviewed.

We are not advocating, at this time, a tax program that would drain off excess purchasing power. It is felt that a responsible fiscal program on the part of the Congress can protect the country from the devastating effects of inflation. For those who feel that it would be inhuman to cut back on some of our social programs, let them contemplate that the proposed recipients of benefits under medicare programs passed in 1965 would lose far more than those benefits in terms of lowered purchasing power if we permit an inflation to affect the cost of the basic necessities of life.

The Associated Industries of Alabama does not advocate any specific program but does point out that the level of Goverment spending should be so devised as to at least be brought into close balance with receipts during this period of tremendous economic activity.

There are a few specific items in the field of taxation which should be noted. Associated Industries of Alabama has repeatedly urged that Congress recognize the inequities inherent in double taxation of corporate earnings. While the credit against tax in respect of dividends was only a token move in this direction, for some reason this was opposed by the Treasury Department and was written out of the Internal Revenue Code in the Revenue Act of 1964. This association feels that that action was a move in the wrong direction.

At present there are only two generally applicable elements of relief against double tax on corporate earnings. One is in subchapter S of the code, and the effects of those provisions are of such limited application that the great body of U.S. citizens which owns equity securities suffers from discrimination. The only practical relief available for these individuals at the lower levels of income is in the exclusion from income of the first $100 of dividends. The more affluent holders of equity securities are often in a position to find means of avoiding this double taxation from other sections of the code which are related to combinations, liquidations, or various special exemptions. Efforts by the Treasury Department to plug the avenues followed by such individuals only tend to make our tax laws more chaotic.

Associated Industries of Alabama is opposed to proposals that would lead to the imposition of capital gains taxes on differences between cost and market values of assets donated to charitable institutions or upon assets included in estates at date of death. In the first instance, there would be a significant impact upon the level of contributions made to religious and educational bodies which would lead either to a curtailment of their activities or in the latter case to reliance upon the Government for support.

In the latter instance, particularly in the smaller and medium sized estate, the tax take would in many cases be substantially increased and result in an inadequate residue being left for an aged spouse. On the other hand, in the case of the larger estate the impact would be proportionately less severe, because the tax imposed would in a large part serve to reduce the amount of estate tax to be paid.

In summary, these remarks suggest that the Congress must avoid in its fiscal programs anything that would tend to push us further on the road toward inflation, recognizing that we are committed on a major military venture. This is not an attempt to debate the objectives of a Great Society, but merely is designed to assure that we have a democratic society left when we can return to a period of normalcy.

Mutual Radio Survey on Vietnam Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today I received the Mutual Radio national survey on the opinion of the American people in the way they have supported the President in his handling of the Vietnam situation.

The high percent who feel the President has worked diligently and is continuing to serve the cause of peace is very heartening. I am happy to present this survey so that all my colleagues may have the benefit of its information.

The survey follows:

NEW YORK CITY, February 3.—Nearly two-thirds of the American men agree that President Johnson has done all he can to settle the Vietnam war through negotiations and that bombing should be resumed, including Hanoi and other targets not bombed before.

This was revealed on Mutual Broadcasting System's 25-minute evening news review, "The World Today," in a special report by George Hamilton Combs.

The report was based on a national survey conducted for Mutual by Sindlinger & Co. In charge of the survey for the network was Raymond T. Anderson, Mutual's director of research.

The Sindlinger survey follows:

On January 27, 28, and 29 we conducted another national study on attitudes and opinions on Vietnam. In summary, here is how the Nation currently responds to the Vietnam situation.

President Johnson has done all he can to settle the Vietnam war through negotiations:

[In percent]

	Male	Female	Total
Agree	61.1	53.6	57.2
Disagree	12.3	13.2	12.8
No opinion	26.6	33.2	30.0

Opinion on resuming bombing as before Christmas:

[In percent]

	Male	Female	Total
Agree	64.6	41.3	52.5
Disagree	8.0	16.3	12.3
No opinion	27.4	42.4	35.2

Opinion on including Hanoi and other targets not bombed before:

[In percent]

	Males	Female	Total
Agree	63.1	27.2	44.5
Disagree	11.9	17.9	15.0
No opinion	25.0	54.9	40.5

Opinion on sending as many ground troops as are required:

[In percent]

	Male	Female	Total
Agree	67.0	50.9	58.7
Disagree	15.2	13.5	14.3
No opinion	17.8	35.6	27.0

Attitude of choice selection on Vietnam situation:

[In percent]

	Male	Female	Total
1st choice is go all out and defeat Hanoi	44.6	24.0	33.9
2d choice is to prevent takeover of South Vietnam	27.9	32.6	30.3
No opinion on either choice	27.5	43.4	35.8

As the above shows—for all questions almost 3 out of every 4 males had an opinion, whereas among females the no-opinion level was much higher. This is usually the case on questions of this nature.

When attitudes and opinions are projected to all individuals who expressed a response to each question, here is how the findings tabulate:

Base: 100 percent or 124,294,000—all individuals 18 years and older; or 86,984,000 had an opinion on whether President Johnson has done all he can to settle the Vietnam war through negotiations; 81.8 percent agree, 18.2 percent disagree.

Opinion on resuming bombing as before Christmas:

[In percent]

	Male	Female	Total
Agree	64.6	41.3	52.5
Disagree	8.0	16.3	12.3
No opinion	27.4	42.4	35.2

Opinion on including Hanoi and other targets not bombed before:

[In percent]

	Male	Female	Total
Agree	63.1	27.2	44.5
Disagree	11.9	17.9	15.0
No opinion	25.0	54.9	40.5

Opinion on sending as many ground troops as are required:

[In percent]

	Male	Female	Total
Agree	67.0	50.9	58.7
Disagree	15.2	13.5	14.3
No opinion	17.8	35.6	27.0

Attitude of choice selection on Vietnam situation:

[In percent]

	Male	Female	Total
1st choice is go all out and defeat Hanoi	44.6	24.0	33.9
2d choice is to prevent takeover of South Vietnam	27.9	32.6	30.3
No opinion on either choice	27.5	43.4	35.8

As the above shows, for all questions almost three out of every four males had an opinion, whereas among females the no-opinion level was much higher. This is usually the case on questions of this nature.

When attitudes and opinions are projected to all individuals who expressed a response to each question, here is how the findings tabulate:

Base: 100 percent or 124,294,000—all individuals 18 years and older; or 86,984,000 had an opinion on whether President Johnson has done all he can to settle the Vietnam war through negotiations—81.8 percent agree, 18.2 percent disagree; or 80,582,000 had an opinion on resuming bombing—81 percent agree, 19 percent disagree; or 73,975,000 had an opinion on including Hanoi and other important targets not yet bombed—74.8 percent agree; 25.2 percent disagree; or 90,712,000 had an opinion on sending more ground troops to Vietnam if required—80.4 percent agree, 19.6 percent disagree; or 79,879,000 had an opinion on what our choice was in Vietnam—52.8 percent say we should attempt to defeat Hanoi, 47.2 percent say we should simply prevent the takeover of South Vietnam.

ROBERT E. MCCUMBER,
Public Relations Director.

A Treasure Worth Conserving—Oil Shale Deposits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an editorial published in the January 21, 1966, issue of the Lamar Tri-State Daily News, Lamar, Colo., gives strong support for Senator DOUGLAS' bill, S. 2708, to preserve this country's oil shale deposits.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TREASURE WORTH CONSERVING

Estimates of the size and value of the oil shale deposits in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah continue upward, staggering the imagination of the layman. This week the U.S. Geological Survey issued a report stating that there is sufficient energy stored in these deposits to meet the needs of the world at the present rate of consumption for the next 18,000 years.

Resources of this magnitude should be conserved for the benefit of the people and not allowed to become the pawn of private interests which gain title by dubious means and exploit the reserves for their personal or corporate welfare. Title to thousands of acres of oil-shale-rich land is now the subject of litigation and it is incumbent upon those who represent the public interest in the courts to put forth their utmost effort to not only prevent any depletion of the share which should go to the people and to militantly battle to recover such assets as may have been put in jeopardy by previous lack of devotion to the public interest.

New Start for Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House an article that appeared in the highly respected journal, the Economist, of London, February 5, 1966.

The Economist has rubbed some of the gilt paint off the administration proposal. While recognizing the legitimacy of a broad attack on urban problems, the Economist recognizes the fact that the President's assault is only a minor one in terms of possible achievement, but is a major assault in terms of attempted arrogation of power unto the Federal Government in the guise of a helping hand.

As the Economist also notes, there is little reason to doubt that as long as the program is under Housing and Urban Development Department auspices, that demonstration cities will have to submit programs for social renovation. In short, the "commissars" will also be social planners and social intriguers. This sort of thing is unnecessary. On February 7, I announced my intention to seek an amendment of the "demonstration cities" legislation to replace the "Federal coordinator" or "commissar" with an information officer, pure and simple. I intend to press this effort.

I want the cities of America to get their carrots without also having to swallow fishhooks.

The text of the Economist of London follows:

NEW START FOR CITIES

The attack which the President wants to launch on slums and urban blight recognizes the weaknesses in existing efforts to deal with the ills of the cities; these have been uncoordinated and spread too thin and have been too slow moving to have much impact. Individual projects have been widely scattered. What Mr. Johnson now proposes is a pair of demonstration programs. The largest is to show what can be accomplished for big, rundown tracts in the centers of cities when all the resources of government—local, State, and Federal—and of private bodies are concentrated on the task. For this he is asking $2.3 billion, over 6 years, almost as much as Congress authorized last year for 4 years of urban renewal programs all over the country. Some 60 or 70 cities, of varying sizes, are expected to win the privilege of being the guinea pigs. In addition there is a small program of incentives to reward some 20 or so metropolitan areas which show that they can plan successfully for the future—and which are prepared to put their plans into effect.

The demonstration cities will have to submit schemes for the renovation, social as well as physical, of substantial areas; the President spoke, in his housing message, of transforming the complete environment of as many as 100,000 people at one go—a tacit admission that up to now central business districts have hogged too much of the urban renewal show. Now the provision of housing for poor people and those of moderate means—along with the schools, community centers, health clinics, parks, and playgrounds which they need—will take pride of place. In each city there will be a Federal coordinator who will hold the purse strings and will be responsible for seeing that Federal resources are meshed together. The Federal Government will shoulder most of the public cost. In return, Mr. Johnson, as is his custom, will expect visible results, fast; the cities should be "masterpieces of civilization" and must not be allowed to rot.

For all the President's anxiety for results, the money will not start to flow until July 1967, when it is hoped that the present budget pinch will have eased. Congress will be asked to appropriate only a few million for planning before then—a modest beginning which will make it easier for it to swallow a commitment which has almost unlimited capacity for growth. Already the New York Times is pointing out that New York City—or Chicago—or Los Angeles—could swallow up the whole $2.3 billion. However, what will exercise Congress most when hearings start next month is the proposal to create Federal coordinators. Are they to persuade or to command? Congressman FINO, a Republican from New York, prophesies gloomily that there will be not a nickel for cities that do not bow down to the new "Federal commissars."

Budget Cuts Hit School Milk and Lunch Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, several items in the administration's 1967 "guns and butter" budget deserve very careful congressional scrutiny. For some inexplicable reason, the programs insuring milk and lunches for schoolchildren have been especially hard-hit by senseless reduction of funds.

According to the proposed budget, $19 million is slated to be deleted from the school lunch program. Another "saving" is made at the expense of the special milk program which is cut from $103 million to an estimated $21 million. These reductions of $19 and $82 million, respectively, are both unsound and unjustified by the facts and nature of the programs they will drastically curtail. Providing milk and lunches for school-age children have been important, efficiently executed, and well administered programs receiving well-deserved praise and effecting sound nutritional benefit to the Nation's schoolchildren.

I urge the appropriate committees examining this facet of the budget to take every step necessary to ascertain that the special milk and school lunch programs do not become the victims of irresponsible budget cuts.

Strategy of Silence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, State Controller Alan Cranston, of California, recently issued a statement on the strategy of silence on the civil rights issue. His statement is both timely and significant; and presents a great challenge to all who believe in human rights. The statement follows:

BEVERLY HILLS, October 26.—State Controller Alan Cranston reported today that California's political leaders are being showered with advice to adopt a strategy of silence on the civil rights issue.

Cranston said without qualification that he does not subscribe to that strategy now nor will he in next year's election campaign.

"The guarantee of constitutional rights and equal opportunities for all citizens is an issue as vital to the progress of California as it is deeply rooted to my own sense of conviction," he said.

"I will act to advance that guarantee and speak out to advocate that equality whenever or wherever my efforts may be helpful."

In a luncheon address to the Women's Democratic Club of Beverly Hills and the Brent-Air Democratic Women's Club Cranston said that "the strategy of silence was conceived in a climate of fear flowing out of the violence in Watts."

Elected officials and potential candidates of both parties, he added, "are being urged to do nothing, say nothing and think nothing about racial discrimination.

"We are warned constantly about the alleged intensity of a 'white backlash' in California," Cranston disclosed. "We are told by many self-styled political professionals to sweep this social problem under a rug of platitudes until after next year's election."

Cranston cited two of many recent examples of the "widespread view that political necessity dictates a stance of silence by elected officials."

The first, he related, was a letter he received from a Republican friend which said in essence:

"DEAR ALAN: * * * I saw the news story in which you called for calm concern and understanding for the causes and implications of the Watts riots. * * * I agree with everything you said, but please don't talk about this any more because it will cost you votes in the suburbs * * *."

The second example, Cranston said, was an informal conversation he had with a veteran Democratic campaign worker:

"He told me that I should not use the word 'justice' in any public statement. He said seriously that the word carried too many negative implications for the Californian anxious about 'the Negro problem.'

"The day in which the concept and the word of 'justice' becomes off-limits for public officials is the day in which we are lost as a free people and a democratic society," Cranston declared.

The State controller emphasized that California—with its "excellent record in civil rights"—has no basis for shame, and that its people—with the firm and sensible leadership of Governor Brown and other Democratic leaders—have no cause to fear the future.

"But we must resist the pleas for expedience, timidity, and silence by those with little appreciation of California's record of progressive civil rights legislation and with little faith in the basic decency and sense of fairness of the vast majority of our people.

"Civil rights is not simply a legal issue. Equal opportunities for all citizens cannot be guaranteed by laws alone. This issue is also linked directly to economic conditions, law enforcement problems, moral considerations, and social attitudes.

"This challenge will not disappear if we ignore it. It is there. It is complex. It is difficult. It demands positive attention, responsible action, and calm public discussion."

Additional excerpts of Cranston's address follow:

"Civil rights has been the predominant domestic public issue of the past decade. It will continue to be a prime social challenge throughout the next.

"California can be proud of its achievements to date, in such areas as voting, education, employment and public accommodations. We stand high compared with all other States in our record on civil rights. But today our need is not to be reminded of how well we have done, but rather how much there is yet to do.

"The fundamental question now is: Shall we continue to make democracy more of a reality for all citizens? Our response will reflect the maturity of our State. The tragedy of Watts should in no way diminish our efforts on many fronts. For even while we move to assure equal opportunity and protection under law, so must we meet all violence and disregard of law with swift and firm action. The two principles are compatible. They are different sides of the same coin.

"Our society is built upon a legal system which provides:

"First, an arena for the peaceful resolution of issues and conflicts.

"Second, rules of conduct and the means of enforcement.

"Third, procedures of redress for those against whom civil wrongs are inflicted and whose constitutional rights are abused.

"Social order depends substantially upon how well this system operates, and upon our own conscious efforts to maintain it. The greatest burden of freedom is the responsibility to preserve it; freedom is responsibility. The two are indivisible. Where one ceases, so does the other.

"If we stand idle while any number of individuals are denied political expression, a decent education, economic opportunity, an equal protection of the laws, the system will fail to fulfill its purpose—and public disorder will eventually ensue.

"Such disorder will drastically impair everyone's pursuit of happiness and undermine the security of every citizen's life and property.

"It is not enough that a significant majority of us enjoy the guarantees of the Bill of Rights, the equal protection of law—in short, our civil liberties and rights. If they do not exist for some of us, they exist in fact that much less for all of us. That is the ultimate importance of civil rights as a practical issue today.

"During this United Nations Week, we are more aware that our response is of concern not only to California and our Nation, but to all the world. America's greatest influence internationally is not military strength or economic wealth. It stems from our standards of excellence, justice and the individual freedom and dignity.

"Today, two-thirds of the world's population is colored. The majority of this country is a minority in the world. If we deny the minorities of our country the opportunity for an excellent life, the security of justice and the fulfillment of individual freedom, we can never earn the trust and respect of the world's majority. We cannot advance freedom and build the conditions of peace throughout the world when we are unable to secure freedom for all American citizens. It just cannot be done.

"Defeat of the Communist threat abroad will never be achieved while racial discrimination persists at home. And our pledges and promises in the forums of the United Nations will sound shallow unless we achieve a deeper realization of freedom and justice in every community and neighborhood of our State and Nation."

What Does Term "GI" Stand For?

SPEECH
OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, few people will recall what the initials "GI" stand for, since they were first heard in the American idiom 25 years ago. Those of us who can recall the oversized—or worse still, the undersized—shoes, moth-eaten horse blankets—wrap leggins and olive drab longjohns cut by the Klan costumer, cannot forget that these letters stood for "General issue."

General issue meant that somewhere, hidden away in the loft of the War Department, a descendant of Rumpelstiltskin drew a mental picture of the average American male.

This average American male was put together like a patchwork quilt. The Army clothing specialist took the feet of a Kentucky backwoodsman, the shoulders of a Texan, the thighs of an Oregon tree-topper, the calves of a Tennessee ridgerunner, one arm from a North Carolina cottonpicker and the other from a south Brooklyn straphanger. He put them together and added a waist band modeled on the Lincoln Highway and this became the general issue of clothing which was handed to freshmen recruits of the class of 1940. This class was truly average because it was both underage and overage.

The motivation of this calculated misfitting was a bit of pure military psychological genius:

The enlistee who put on his Army uniform for the first time looked into the mirror and could not wait to get to the front where he could dig a foxhole and get out of sight to cover his shame.

The Army, however, was not without compassion. It, too, recognized that general issue left the soldier far short of being one of the world's 10 best-dressed men, or for that matter, even a competitor in a Watusi-Burundi fashion contest.

It demonstrated this compassion by covering the whole collection of sags, stretches, seams and scratches with a magnificent great coat. This great coat, complete with brass buttons that turned green on the 17th of March 1918, was belted in the back midway between the shoulders and the hem for a very definite purpose. Since its collar covered the man's head and its hem reached to his heels, by noting the belt in the back and the middle row of buttons in the front, you could determine: (a) where the middle of the man was and (b) which end to feed. It also served a very practical purpose: In the event the man tripped on the hem in front, his buddy could grab the belt in the back to save him from falling down.

Looking back at the $21-a-month Vanity Fair costume of 1940 and the exquisite models of today with green berets, shiny boots and tinted fabrics from pale blue to lustrous suntan, one can surely say that Mr. McNamara must be doing something right.

I think today we in the House are doing something right.

We are not only recalling what the Nation's GI needed 20 years ago when we reported the first GI bill, we are recalling that many of us are in the Congress today because of the benefits of the GI bill. I realize this may not be the best reason for reinstating its benefits in the minds of some.

However, no one can deny that the GI bill of 1946 was the most magnificent, effective, the most fair and equal measure ever propounded by any legislative body in the history of man.

It made sense then and it makes sense today.

It makes sense as an adjustment to make up today to the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of our Nation some measure of the time and opportunities they lost while serving in the Armed Forces. It makes sense because everyone who enrolls in a program under this bill will emerge a better educated, better living and better taxpaying American.

It makes sense because it requires no complicated bureaucratic administration or direction. It simply puts the money where the man is so that he can enroll in a school or college of his choice. I am gratified as one who acknowledges his debt to the GI bill to be one of the sponsors of the bill before us today.

This is truly a general issue bill. The issue, however, is not between those who support and those who oppose it, because there can be no sensible opposition to this bill. Rather, the general issue is that those who serve us in war and times of national need will not be deprived of the benefits they rightly deserve in order to attend to their own needs in years to come.

The clothing did not fit in 1940, but this bill fits the frame, the posture and strength of our day. I strongly advocate its immediate passage as a memorial to those who will not be on hand to share in its benefits and as a meaningful commitment to those who will return and have a right to expect our grateful appreciation and support.

Retain Popular Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I have begun to hear, and I assume my colleagues in this House also have begun to hear, the peoples' reaction to the proposal that Congressmen be elected for 4-year terms. One of the most influential newspapers which circulates in my District in Illinois is the DuPage County Register, whose executive editor is Charles Hayes. He has written on the subject, and I believe his reasoning deserves the close attention of all Members of Congress.

RETAIN POPULAR CONTROL

Attention has been focused on the role of Congress as the result of President Johnson's proposal to elect U.S. Representatives for 4-year terms, the election to take place during presidential election years.

The chief argument for the change is that it would free Congressmen from frequent reelection campaigns and therefore give them the time and peace of mind needed to become more effective legislators.

This sounds good in a textbookish sort of way. But a second look at the proposal reveals it would do more harm than good.

Men who are good legislators will be good no matter how long their terms, and those who are bad won't be cured by giving them longer tenure. Perhaps they would become even worse.

The aim of freeing Congressmen for legislative activity can be achieved just as well by giving them greater clerical and research help.

The fatal flaw in the President's proposal is that it would remove Federal Government even farther from popular control. Congressmen find it difficult enough now to assert their independence of the White House. If Congressmen were elected only in presidential election years, they would be still more beholden to the President.

A popular check on the Federal administration every 2 years is not too often in these days of fast-moving events. Four years would be too long an interval.

The effective Congressman does not fear going to the voters frequently. Part of his job is to know what his constituents are thinking and to inform them how he is voting and why. This activity is not a waste of time, but rather is a positive good.

Two-year terms for U.S. Representatives should be retained.

Building Is Donated to War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the January 25 edition of the Jacksonville, Fla., Times-Union contained an interesting article telling of a building being donated to Jacksonville's war on poverty by the Catholic diocese of St. Augustine. It is typical of a growing participation throughout the United States in the antipoverty campaign by all segments of our community life, public-spirited citizens, local government and our religious organizations. I ask unanimous consent that the story be included in the RECORD.

FORMER CONVENT—BUILDING IS DONATED TO WAR ON POVERTY

The three-story building on the southeast corner of Ocean and State Streets has been donated to Jacksonville's war on poverty by the Diocese of St. Augustine.

Formerly used as a convent and an orphanage, the building contains 45,000 square feet and is valued at approximately $160,000.

The announcement was made at last night's first annual meeting of Greater Jacksonville Economic Opportunity (GJEO) by Catholic Charities Executive Director John J. Lenihan in behalf of Archbishop Joseph Patrick Hurley.

GJEO President Arvin K. Rothschild hailed the contribution, noting that the building would serve as an ideal headquarters for the antipoverty war.

Gordon Bunch, executive director of GJEO, said the building also would be a valuable asset in aiding the organization in matching Federal funds.

Antipoverty projects costing more than $1.9 million have been implemented in Jacksonville and are awaiting funds from the Government, Bunch told the meeting of officers, directors, and employees of GJEO last night.

The meeting at 2616 North Myrtle Avenue concluded with the reelection of Rothschild and Vice Presidents W. W. Schell, Jr., and Claude J. Yates and Treasurer Daniel A. Naughton.

Mrs. Pansy H. Mattair was elected to succeed Mrs. Thad Moseley as secretary.

These officers will constitute the GJEO executive committee, along with Phillip Gibson, Frank Hampton, Mrs. Elizabeth Mathews, William B. Mills, Rev. Robert H. Wilson, and James E. Workman, Jr.

Forty-five members of the board of directors were elected to serve 1-, 2-, and 3-year terms.

Federal Woman's Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that Dr. Ruth Gill Van Cleve, Director of the Office of Territories of the Interior Department, is one of six women chosen to receive this year's Federal Woman's Award on March 1.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have had the opportunity to work with Mrs. Van Cleve during the last 3 years. She is outstanding in her field, competent and versatile, and commands the respect of every member of my committee. There could be no woman more deserving of this recognition and honor than Ruth Van Cleve.

I would also like to bring to your attention the names of the other five women who are to be honored at a special banquet on March 1. They are Fannie M. Boyle, Stella E. Davis, Jocelyn R. Gill, Ida C. Merriam, and Irene Parsons.

I am including in the RECORD a portion of an article which was printed in the Washington Post of February 7, concerning these distinguished women.

LAWYER

Ruth Gill Van Cleve, director of the Interior Department's Office of Territories, is responsible for the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific (Marshall, Marianas, and Caroline Islands). A Mount Holyoke graduate with a law degree from Yale, she numbers among her achievements, helping to establish the Trust islands' first elected legislative body and an educational television project for Samoan schoolchildren. She is married to a lawyer, Harry R. Van Cleve, Jr., General Counsel of GSA. They and their three children live in Alexandria. Mrs. Van Cleve was promoted to her present post, highest held by a woman in the Interior Department, by President Johnson.

Diplomat

Stella E. Davis, U.S. Information Agency desk officer for East and South Africa, is responsible for U.S. Information Service programing in politically active nations south of the Sahara. She has served as public affairs assistant in Addis Ababa and as director of USIS programs in Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, and Zanzibar. She organized a program to bring Tanganyikan students to the United States and has arranged cultural programs in several African countries. Twice during her career she has taken time out, once to attend Mount Holyoke, once to learn the Swahili language. She lives in Washington.

Hearing Examiner

Fannie M. Boyls is the National Labor Relations Board's only woman hearing examiner and one of only six women examiners in Federal service. She received degrees in arts and law from the University of Texas and joined the NLRB as a review attorney in 1937. She presides over hearings and renders decisions in cases involving unfair labor practices. During 1965 she was selected by the Civil Service Commission to rule on challenges to the listing of persons eligible to register and vote under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. She served in Alabama and Mississippi. As an NLRB lawyer she has frequently been loaned to regional offices to prosecute cases which established new board principles or resulted in Supreme Court decisions.

Astronomer

Dr. Jocelyn R. Gill, as Chief of In-Flight Sciences, manned space programs, is working on getting Americans to the moon—and safely back. She plans, selects and implements scientific experiments for Gemini flights and is participating in the selection of experiments for the Apollo lunar program. She received her master's degree in astronomy and astrophysics from the University of Chicago and her doctorate in astronomy from Yale. She has taught astronomy, math and physics in colleges and universities and was visiting lecturer for a year at Wellesley. Since joining NASA in 1961 she has worked on unmanned flights, and the manned Mercury series, as well as the Gemini and Apollo ventures in mankind's scientific search for knowledge about outer space.

Economist

Dr. Ida Craven Merriam, Assistant Commissioner for Research and Statistics of the Social Security Administration, has helped to formulate plans for social insurance and economic security in the United States and abroad, including a stint as a technical expert in Thailand. After receiving her bachelor's degree in history and economics from Wellesley in 1925, she went on to a Ph. D. in economics from the Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government, by way of the University of Chicago. She has served as an assistant editor of the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, has taught at Connecticut College for Women and has developed statistical and research activities for the social security system since its beginning in the New Deal.

Administrator

Veterans' Administration Personnel Chief Irene Parsons has responsibility for 170,000 employees. This is the highest position ever held by a woman in the VA and the highest personnel position held by a woman in the Government. She received her bachelor's degree in business education and administration in 1941 from the University of North Carolina, and while employed by the VA studied public administration at American and George Washington Universities, receivng her master's degree from GW last year. She has also taught high school and served as a lieutenant in the U.S. Coast Guard. She began her VA career in 1946 and was supervising automatic data processing personnel operations throughout the Nation when promoted by President Johnson.

A Kansan Votes Against 4-Year Term for Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER L. MIZE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as the debate is waged, both formally and informally, over the issue of extending the term of a Representative in Congress to 4 years, I wish to call attention to a letter on the subject which I received from Donald R. Collins of Topeka, Kans. Mr. Collins makes a strong case for keeping the term as it is, and I heartily subscribe to the logic of his reasoning.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Mr. Collins letter appear in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *January 22, 1966.*

HON. CHESTER MIZE,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MIZE: While there are many things to be said for increasing Congressman's terms from 2 to 4 years, I must cast my vote against this proposed change.

By definition a Representative is an elected official who represents. He is the last link between a simple, uninfluential citizen and that vast faceless and nameless mass of political protoplasm on Capitol Hill. He is, in fact, the only link remaining in today's age of great societies and magnificent bureaucracies. I, for one, do not wish to give up my privilege of choice for an additional 2 years. Sometimes I think I would like to have a new "representor" every year.

You must realize this is not a personal indictment. I am afraid many people who are in sympathy with my position will hesitate or refuse to write their Congressman for fear of jeopardizing their relationship with him over this issue. I hope, if you have an opportunity, you will remind your colleagues that the constituents they fail to hear from in this matter may be just as important as those they do hear from.

Our Constitution has been altered so rapidly and drastically of late that I feel almost ludicrous in making this next statement, but I feel it pertinent. Our constitutional authors did not idly throw that document together. I feel sure they spent considerable more thought on each article than our supreme justices have spent on every decision they have made on constitutionality in the last 5 years. In any event, I feel sure their selection of 2 years for a Representative's term was by design. They also knew that the Representative was the average citizens voice, ears and emotions in Congress. And, like me, they did not feel that a period of 4 years between the choice of a Representative allowed the citizen enough flexibility in representation.

If you have reached any firm thought or yet have a position on this proposed change, I would be interested in your views. Perhaps you will devote a portion of one of your reports to this?

Best personal regards,

DONALD R. COLLINS.

Edward J. Lynett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 6, 1966, Edward J. Lynett died in the city of Scranton, and we have lost in him a man who will be remembered by many generations to come. He was known throughout the country as the editor and publisher of the Scranton Times, but he was known in our community for far more than that.

He was, indeed, the editor and publisher, and had been for 20 years. This is a newspaper which goes back to 1895, when the first publisher was also an Edward J. Lynett.

He was a civic leader. It would be difficult to enumerate all of the civic activities in which Ed Lynett played not merely a role, but a leading role.

He was a religious leader. He was so outstanding a member of the Roman Catholic Church that he received a Papal knighthood in recognition for his service. He was a philanthropist. It would be difficult, again, to enumerate all of the charities which were the recipients of Ed Lynett's generosity, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that many people will mourn his passing because of his generosity in their behalf.

Better than any words of mine, are the words of the two papers in Scranton which have memorialized Ed Lynett beautifully. I am inserting the editorials from the Scranton Times and the Scranton Tribune in the RECORD so that all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives may know what manner of man Ed Lynctt was:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times, Feb. 7, 1966]

Edward J. Lynett

It is with sorrow-laden hearts that members of the big family of Times workers—from the top executives down to those employees at the foot of the ranks—are carrying out their tasks in getting out today's edition of this newspaper. For they have not yet recovered from the shock they suffered yesterday in the unexpected death of Edward J. Lynett, Times editor and publisher.

His health, true, had not been the best for some time. But there had been reports of an improvement in recent days. Thus it was that the news of his passing came as a grievous blow to all of us who had worked with him and for him on the Times.

For Edward Lynett's relationship with those who make up the Times family was a warm and close one. He was, naturally, accorded the respect due him as the editor and publisher, but when we spoke of him as "the boss," it was in terms of affection. He was the boss, to be sure, but he was more friend than employer. There were few, if any, employees of the Times whom he could not—and did not—call by their first names. He knew their personal problems. And they knew that his help and counsel were always theirs for the asking. Words, accordingly, don't come easily as we try to say what is in our hearts and minds on this sad occasion.

Mr. Lynett was truly the worthy son of a distinguished father, the late E. J. Lynett, dead now these 23 years. Newspapering came to him naturally; it was in his blood. As was the case with his late brother and sister, William and Elizabeth, Edward had the benefit—through his father's wise direction—of early training in the field that was to be his life's work. As a youth he worked in each department of the Times, familiarising himself with its operation and its role in the daily production of the paper. This training continued in the years following his graduation from college in 1928. Thus it was that he was well equipped for his duties when in 1937 he became assistant general manager; in 1943, on the death of his father, assistant publisher and in 1946, on the death of his brother, William, editor and copublisher. With the death of his sister in 1959 he became editor and publisher.

In his direction of the Times since then, he had maintained the principles and high ideals enunciated by his father when the latter took over a struggling publication in 1895 and by these principles and ideals made the Scranton Times a great newspaper.

Mr. Lynett was an outstanding citizen of his native city, his State, and his country. Thus the loss which we feel is also their loss. For Mr. Lynett looked upon his responsible position—his resources, his newspaper, his prestige—chiefly in terms of his obligations to the community. He looked for opportunities to help it. The story of his charity—shared wholeheartedly by his devoted wife and family—probably can never be fully told publicly, for many of his benefactions were known only to the recipients. But there is an abundance of tangible and impressive evidence hereabouts of his and his family's generosity. No worthy appeal, it can be said, ever found a deaf ear in the person of Ed Lynett.

In other ways he saw and met his responsibility to this area and its people. He put his personal influence and the support of his newspaper behind every movement to improve the economic life of our community. He lived long enough, fortunately, to see his efforts in this direction begin to pay dividends to our people.

His dedication to the cause of education was demonstrated in many ways. He served in 1955 as general chairman of the campaign to raise $1.5 million for the expansion of the facilities of the University of Scranton. He had contributed of his energy and resources to the growth of Marywood College. He had served for a number of years as a member of the board of trustees of Pennsylvania State University. By appointment of President Harry S. Truman, he served for several years as a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis.

A stanch Democrat from the time he attained his majority, his chief concern was that those entrusted with the party leadership never lose sight of its principles, its interest in the ordinary man and its goal of good government. He never sought positions of power for himself but was given many honorary roles.

A Catholic who served his church and his religion faithfully, Mr. Lynett was again generous in his benefactions. He had received several of the high honors which the Roman Catholic Church usually reserves for its most distinguished laymen.

To recite the many honors which had been conferred upon him would require far more space than is available in this column. Suffice it to say that he wore his honors easily and gracefully. He was modest and self-effacing to the extreme.

We who knew him so well and cherished his friendship so dearly have some appreciation of the sorrow that has come to his devoted wife and their fine family. We will mourn him and miss him almost as much as they will. But we will all find solace in the realization that Edward J. Lynett, in a busy life ended too early, left his imprint on this community. His everlasting monument will be the remembrance of all he did for Scranton and its people.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune, Feb. 7, 1966]

EDWARD J. LYNETT

In the death of Edward J. Lynett, our city and area have lost a first citizen, a leader of magnitude, a man of eminence yet a man essentially modest and unpretentious.

As editor and publisher of the Scranton Times, Mr. Lynett extended a family tradition in publishing and public service initiated by his father and advanced by his brother, the late William R. Lynett, and his sister, the late Elizabeth R. Lynett. In so doing, he gained for himself a place of distinction in national and State journalism.

Mr. Lynett's involvement in the life of the community was total. No movement of worth or value, no project of desirable ends, no program holding the promise of benefit to the city and region and betterment for the welfare and interest of the people was denied his active and generous support.

Indeed, virtually every community effort in the fields of civic improvement, educational expansion, charity, health and welfare included in preliminary planning and detail solicitation of the counsel and advice of Mr. Lynett.

At various times the community chest and later the Lackawanna United Fund; the University of Scranton and Marywood College, the chamber of commerce, community-oriented drives for industrial rehabilitation and other necessary and laudable goals looked to Mr. Lynett for active leadership and gained his aid in achieving successes.

Mr. Lynett had a vigorous interest in politics and was unswerving in his support of the Democratic Party. He was a friend of the party's highest leaders and was honored by the party. He participated actively in Democratic National Conventions and was a press observer at Republican National Conventions.

The manifold charities of Mr. Lynett and his works as a Catholic layman earned for him papal recognition and the affection of institutions, religious orders and organizations he assisted.

Mr. Lynett's death has had a definite impact on the community he loved and served. The loss is saddening. The publishers and employees of the Scranton Tribune extend sincerest sympathy to Mrs. Lynett, her daughter and sons.

Family Housing Cut Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a recent article which appeared concerning military housing.

Most Members of the House are aware that the Department of Defense has deferred construction of all family housing approved and funded for the Armed Forces in the fiscal 1966 budget.

This cutback involves $160 million that had been specifically earmarked for 8,500 units of family housing which the Defense Department told us was urgently required.

Now, the new fiscal 1967 Defense Department budget has been presented to the Congress, and we find that the housing program has been cut again. Not a single unit of military family housing is planned in the coming fiscal year.

Since I know that many Members of the House are deeply concerned about the cutback, and would like to be informed as to what the future holds, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the Journal of the Armed Forces which discusses the "deferral" action, the fiscal 1967 budget omission, and other current military family housing developments which have taken place within the Department of Defense. I believe all Members will find the information of interest.

FAMILY HOUSING CUT AGAIN

(By Louis Stockhill and Michael Hornberger)

No new military family housing is included in the fiscal 1967 budget, and all other construction programs throughout the Armed Forces will be sharply reduced during the 12-month period beginning next July.

The Defense Department's fiscal year 1967 MilCon (military construction) authorization request is due to go to Congress next month. It will ask for only about $1 billion in new construction authority.

This is a cut of almost 50 percent, compared with the $2,049 million program initially requested for the current fiscal year. The present program, however, already has been pruned of $630 million—including the entire ($160 million) family housing program, some $33.5 million for bachelor officers quarters, about $34.5 million for medical facilities, and almost $200 million that had been slated for troop housing, schools, chapels, messhalls, etc.

As had been predicted, by the Journal, the new, fiscal 1967 military budget, unveiled this week, contains no housing construction funds.

Commenting on the fact, the Budget Report states:

"Although we have not yet met the full need for military family housing units, the substantial costs of military operations in southeast Asia dictate a deferral of authorized and funded new construction in fiscal year 1966.

"For the same reason, the 1967 budget does not provide funds for the construction of additional units."

A House Armed Services Subcommittee chaired by Representative Philip Philbin, Democrat, of Massachusetts, will call DOD officials to the Capitol soon to question them about the housing cutback. The construction was sought by Secretary of Defense McNamara on an urgent basis.

Meanwhile, in an obvious stopgap move to ease the morale implications of the housing cutbacks, the Pentagon announced that it will seek congressional permission to lease 6,075 additional housing units for military families.

The DOD announcement was a masterful public-relations tour de force. It began with a paragraph stating that "Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara announced approval today of a plan to seek congressional authorization that would provide 13,075 privately owned leased housing units for military families."

The next paragraph continues, "This would almost double the existing authority for 7,000 leased quarters."

Not until the third paragraph does the press release note that the action would provide only an additional $6,075 units of leased housing. It notes that DOD housing experts estimate that these units "are the equivalent of approximately $100 million in new construction."

The release does not say when they would be obtainable and available for occupancy by military families, if Congress granted the authority.

Housing experts on Capitol Hill indicate that even if the authority should be granted it might produce a far smaller number of units than the Pentagon says it plans to lease, for the simple reason that there are legal restrictions on leasing units in certain areas and these might be some of the very areas where the greatest military demand exists.

The DOD press release also notes that the Department's family housing program for the next fiscal year calls for expenditures in excess of $500 million for operating expenses, leasing, maintenance, and other costs.

This sounds good, on the surface, but the amount does not involve "construction" funds, and looks rather pale alongside the total family housing program requested in prior years. The fiscal 1966 total family housing budget estimate was $735 million. In fiscal year 1965, it was $631 million. And, in fiscal 1964, the amount approved by Congress was $637 million.

The Pentagon press release said "Secretary McNamara emphasized simultaneously that Congress will be asked to continue the authorization for construction of 8,500 military family housing units."

In other words—as the release did not say—the Secretary will ask permission to retain authority for 8,500 units which Congress already has approved and funded, and which he (the Secretary) has decided not to build at this time and not to build in fiscal 1967, but which he hopes to build sometime in the future.

The release quotes the Secretary as saying, "As soon as feasible, we shall push forward vigorously, as we have done during recent years, to build thousands of required new military family housing units."

The DOD press release ends by recalling that the Defense Department has requested authority and funds to construct 53,756 new family housing units over the past 4 fiscal years, but that only 31,750 have been approved by legislative action.

Inasmuch as the legislative action which resulted in the congressional cuts was confined almost solely to the Senate, and in view of the fact that the House repeatedly has fought for Secretary McNamara's housing requests, the press release comment cannot be expected to generate pleased reaction among members of the House Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

And, it could produce some unhappy moments for Defense witnesses who are certain to be reminded that the 31,750 units eventually approved by the Congress have now been further reduced to 23,250 units by the action of the Defense Secretary, himself.

The 23,250 units which have been or are being completed ad up to less than 28,756 units sought by Secretary McNamara in 1962 and 1963, alone.

Although the Pentagon chief personally carried the housing fight to Congress and fought for the construction on an urgent basis (earning high praise in the process), his present decision to defer further construction is viewed at the Capitol as a device designed solely to improve the overall appearance of the Defense budget.

Congress will hardly be able to overlook the fact that two-thirds of the $620 million savings which the Secretary has pruned from the overall construction program is matched by the supplemental budget request for $415 million to provide additional economic assistance to the people of Vietnam.

Military family housing normally does not create a great stir on Capitol Hill, but this year it could boil up into a major controversy.

A Federal System or States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, almost unnoticed by the majority of the American people, the New Frontier and the Great Society have slowly changed our Constitution. We are fast losing the concept of a union of sovereign States to the concept of a strong, all-powerful, and completely dominant Federal Government. This was the subject for a thoughtful report to the Associated Industries of Alabama, by Mr. Pehlham Rowan, treasurer, Southern Electric Steel Co., of Birmingham, Ala., which I include as a part of these remarks.

Federal System and/or States' Rights

(Statement in the public affairs field, presented before the Alabama congressional delegation, January 24, 1966, by Pelham Rowan)

Certainly, it is recognized without debate that our American constitutional system of government has proven to be basis for the development of our great country. As Mr. Justice Harlan, of our U.S. Supreme Court has said: "Unless we are prepared to consider the diversified development of the United States as having run its course and to envisage the future of the country as that of a welfare society, we will do well to keep what has been called 'the delicate balance of Federal-State relations' in good working order."

It has become rather matter-of-fact to speak of the Bill of Rights and the 14th amendment as the guarantees of personal liberty, but the structure of our political system in the diffusion of power between Federal and State authority serves the same end in protecting the people from an all-powerful central authority.

This takes on added significance as the size of the Federal bureaucracy continues to grow. This, if we may say so, is indeed an inflation—a vast inflation of Federal power. The dangers of policies without measurement, of little or no effort in applying objective tests to measure the effectiveness of public economic policies and institutions, are all the worse when the Federal Government sails so many economic seas without chart or compass, seemingly, to tell where it has been, what it can do, where it is going, or how much it will cost.

In 1957, the revenues to the States from the Federal Government were roughly $3½ billion, or about 18 percent of their total revenues. By 1963, the figure had risen to 7⁸⁄₁₀ billion, or 23 percent of their general revenues. Are we heading for a time when half the revenue of the States will come from Washington in the form of grants of various kinds? Doesn't the almost insatiable appetite of the Federal Government for new ways and means of spending for this and that socioeconomic project run directly counter to the delicate balance of Federal-State relations which must be kept in good working order? Are we too late when a grandiose scheme is even considered to dole out to the States the Federal surplus tax revenues for financing projects that the States may wish to promote?

Again, as stated by Mr. Justice Harlan, is it too much to ask that the solutions to the many problems facing our Government require "objectivity, understanding, patience, willingness to reckon with the just demands of history, and, above all, steadfastness to the orderly processes of our system"? We think not.

We call on each of you to carefully consider any proposal which would tend to further diminish and ultimately destroy rights which belong to the various States.

A Fatal Constitutional Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial written by Mr. William V. Krause, editor, the Peabody, Kans., Gazette-Herald, which points up a growing concern among many citizens throughout the Nation.

The editorial follows:

A Fatal Constitutional Weakness

Sometimes we feel like a lonesome bird crying in the winds against what seems to us to be the obvious, planned, and steadily progressing disintegration of a system of government and a system of living that has proven to be the most successful and rewarding in the history of the world. Thus, we are pleased and relieved when someone agrees with us, giving us a little more confidence that what we think is right really is right.

A respected political leader whom we heard speak last week made the point that the executive and the judicial branches of the Federal Government recently have been taking upon themselves more authority than is intended in the constitution, thus destroying the historic and vital balance of powers between the three governmental branches.

We have deplored the rising authority of the executive branch for years. However, that breach of practice is not nearly so dangerous as the recent improper assumption of power and authority by the Supreme Court. The executive branch in the person of the

President does indeed have much greater authority and power than did Presidents of 35 and more years ago. However, Congress can still slap a President down and the Supreme Court can declare a law he rams through a rubber stamp Congress to be unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court, on the other hand, apparently can do anything it pleases. The Court was set up a body to review legal matters and interpret laws to assure that the other two branches did not forget the constitution and ignore it is lawmaking. However, no one seemed to foresee that the Court itself might take on lawmaking and law-changing duties and in so doing as effectively wreck our Government and our American system as could the most irresponsible legislative or executive actions.

The Supreme Court may well have stumbled on to the fatal flaw in our great Constitution and the Government founded upon it. Seemingly, the Court is limited only by the good judgment of its members, and the present Court has shown a tragic lack of responsibility and understanding of the importance of both its role in Government—and the unparalled requirements for restraint.

Out of Date Since Henry VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal today in a most interesting editorial points to the similarities between federal serfs of medieval times and the future of Americans under the Great Society's oppressive welfare by proxy. The spirit of freedom, responsibility and initiative was lacking in the Middle Ages, and if this administration continues to dictate more and more of our daily decisions, our precious liberty will be restricted much as theirs was though in a far more subtle manner.

Should the diminution of individual responsibility and initative continue under the stifling influence of bureaucratic control, the Great Society may become as relevant to today's needs as that of Henry VIII.

Under unanimous consent, the editorial, "Forward to Feudalism," follows:

FORWARD TO FEUDALISM

Aware of the pitfalls in historical analogy, we nonetheless submit that the apparently prevailing mentality in this country today can no longer be called modern or forward-looking but is growing positively medieval.

Here, for a particularly lurid example, is a high-powered commission on technology, setup by Congress and boasting prominent names like Thomas J. Watson, Jr., and Walter P. Reuther. It recommends that the Government provide a basic annual income for every family in the United States. It further recommends that the Government become an "employer of last resort" for people who can't find jobs elsewhere.

These, of course, are only a couple of the innumerable manifestations of a welfarism run rampant, a welfarism divorced from the humanitarian principle that a community must care for its genuinely needy. It is not humanitarian at all; contemporary welfarism denies personal responsibility and seeks to transfer it to the hands of the few men holding national power, thus narrowing the range of individual decisions and obligations.

With a remarkably similar viewpoint, medieval society required the manor to provide for his serfs. Their lives were wretched, they were bound to the manor for life, but you can't deny they had such guaranteed economic security as feudal times could provide.

Obviously that was no path to progress, economic or otherwise. Quite the contrary. It was only after the serfs began escaping to work as freemen in the cities that a firm base could be built for the rise of the merchant-middle class and the eventual flowering of free-enterprise economics. By no coincidence, political freedoms were deeply entwined with the development of economic liberty.

Well, we won't stretch the analogy, except to note a pair of points. A future society, no matter how advanced technologically, which is first coddled and then controlled by governmental authority is going to be a highly disagreeable one in which to live. And a people thus softened is unlikely to retain its energy, prosperity and place in the world.

Nor do we pretend to be able to descry the precise outlines of the new feudalism, if that is where America is headed. Plenty of signs already suggest a 1984 type of demoralized despotism, notably the spread of peepingtomism in government and industry and the increasing Federal intrusions into the individual's personal life.

But it needn't be a competely brutal tyrannny. One of Tocqueville's profound insights about what might happen to democracy was a vision of a soft tyranny: A supreme authority that actually was kindly disposed, wanting to take care of the people and, of necessity, regulate their every move. The only trouble is that the people would be treated like, and behave like, sheep.

Whether or not such is the utopia our guaranteed-incomers and the rest want, they certainly seem to be trying to bring it on. They have made a drastic and intellectually unwarranted leap from a perfectly proper concern for the less fortunate among us to a vast sentimentalism which would sweep away some of Western man's most prized values. In their surging sentimentalism, they forget how easily liberty can be lost in excessive dependence on government.

Only a few years ago the current welfarist thinking would have been deemed unacceptable by the American people. Today there seems little in the way of an effective counterforce; it's as though many people had about given up and decided it's useless to try to get out from under the smothering baby-blanket of Governmental solicitude.

We hope there is still time to stop the march toward neofeudalism before it becomes a full flight. If there is to be much hope, however, more people will have to be willing to stand up to all those inside and outside of Governmeent who would fashion our future in the image of a dismal past.

To Repeal Certain Provisions of Law Relating to the Printing as House Documents of Certain Proceedings

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Missouri has adequately explained this bill.

Time after time, when these requests are presented, to appropriate funds and authorize printing of these proceedings and annual reports, the question arises as to the justification for doing this at public expense. Each time it seems to be the consensus of the committee that it is not justified. They do not seem to desire, and rightly so, to choose one particular organization or another to be the one denied what has been done in the past—that is, printing of these reports at public expense.

I think the approach of this bill is the proper approach, to set broad policy affecting all of these organizations, instead of choosing one or the other, and to stop this practice which I think is wasteful of public funds. Therefore, I support this bill and hope that it will pass.

Acceptance of Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on Saturday, January 29, 1966, to attend the 45th Anniversary Luncheon of the Women's National Republican Club, Inc., at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York, at which time the charming "first lady" of the House of Representatives, Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON, was presented with an award for her outstanding accomplishments over the years as a statesman, patriot, and mother.

Mrs. BOLTON's response, with its ingredients of warmth, humility and wisdom, should be made available to all Members of the House.

It reads as follows:

Madam Chairman, fellow members of this Women's National Republican Club, guests, and friends:

I am sure you know how deep is my appreciation of the honor you have given me today. It will be a red letter day always. I wonder if you can understand how utterly humble I feel. Just to be alive is such a privilege—to be subjected by life to the disciplines of illness, of anguish, of mental and physical suffering, and moments of ecstasy is about all one could ask of life. Yet to me has been added the great privilege of serving this wonderful country of ours for, lo, these many years.

Think what it has been to me to have been able to experience the realities of the Second War. I spent 6 weeks in our hospitals in England and some 3 weeks in France, and reported to the Army both my criticisms of the medical and nursing care and my commendations. To have gone to Russia in 1945 and again in 1959, and so been able to compare conditions—to have made the long trek in Africa which opened State Department minds to its importance—and now to be sitting in at the two-party leadership meetings—truly I am privileged indeed.

Surely there has never been a darker or a stranger moment in history than this time in which we are living. From my heart I believe that the future of our country and the entire free world is in our hands. Within and without our borders we are faced with grave, far-reaching problems. We are being propelled rapidly into a period so fantastic that our imaginations are just beginning to glimpse the edge of what lies ahead.

This past year has been a strenuous one for the Congress and for all America, and 1966 promises to be even more so. Each one of us has an investment—or call it a small share—in what lies ahead. Only as we invest carefully, diligently, faithfully together can we preserve the freedoms for which our predecessors paid a high cost. Only as we assume our responsibilities can we hope to keep this Nation strong.

I do thank you from my heart for this day which will send me back to Capitol Hill with more courage, greater determination to uphold freedom in the world and gratitude for the knowledge that this group of Republican women stands firm in its determination to keep this Nation true to its ideals. Fifty States, but one Nation under God in whom we trust.

Job Skill Centers Approved by United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, all of us recall the shocking and terrible Watts riots of last year. Two of the main causes underlying the human revolt out there against almost all forms of constituted authority were the lack of jobs and educational opportunities. This is where the Johnson administration has decided a main assault under the banner of the war on poverty should be aimed. There is progress being made out there. As proof of this fact, I cite an article from the January 21 edition of the Los Angeles Times, entitled, "Job Skill Centers Approved by United States." This article tells of the establishment of three job skill centers to train unemployed individuals in Watts, East Los Angeles and Pacoima. The funds for these projects will come jointly from the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Vocational Education Act, which foresighted Congresses have passed and extended.

Under unanimous consent I insert this article in the RECORD.

JOB SKILL CENTERS APPROVED BY UNITED STATES—950 TO TRAIN AT PACOIMA, WATTS, EAST LOS ANGELES IN $4.5 MILLION PROJECT

(By Jack Jones, Times staff writer)

Three job skill centers to train unemployed persons in Watts, East Lost Angeles and Pacoima will be set up soon under a $4.5 million project approved Thursday by two Federal agencies.

The program, described by Arthur Morgan, State department of employment area manager, as "the most ambitious yet by a considerable degree," involves cooperation by a Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce job-placement task force to assure industry will have jobs waiting for graduates.

Training will be offered at the three centers—to be established "hopefully within 90 days" by the State department of education—for such jobs as:

Auto mechanics, clerk-typists, hospital orderlies, nurses' aids, welders, machine assemblers, pressers, household and appliance servicemen.

TRAINING FOR 950

Initially, according to Gerald Parrish, regional director of the U.S. Employment Service, the Watts center will train 500, the East Los Angeles center 350, and Pacoima 100.

Morgan said the plans call for possible expansion in the next fiscal year to 4,000 in Watts, 1,500 in East Los Angeles and 500 or 750 in Pacoima. "Fugures will be raised or lowered as the need indicates," he added.

Approval of the ambitious job-training program, which largely carries out a key recommendation of the McCone commission, was by the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Each will provide about half the necessary funds under provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Vocational Education Act.

Announcement of the multiagency campaign to ease the unemployment problem in Los Angeles' poverty areas was made jointly in Washington, D.C., by the four Congressmen whose districts will be affected—Representatives AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., EDWARD R. ROYBAL and JAMES CORMAN, all Democrats.

SPONSOR OF PROJECT

The California State Employment Service will sponsor the three-center project.

The Watts center, largest of the three, will receive $2,387,300 for its initial 500-trainee session. East Los Angeles will get $1,565,830. Pacoima will get $587,770.

Locations and starting dates are to be announced.

Morgan said H. C. (Chad) McClellan's chamber of commerce committee, which found hundreds of jobs for Watts area residents after the August riots, will seek cooperation of businessmen so industry will know graduates meet their needs and enrollees can be confident jobs await them.

Agriculture and the Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the major worries of the administration and the Congress since 1958 has been the balance-of-payments deficit which faces the Nation. Officials of the United States have struggled with the problem for several years and it appears improved but not yet under control.

One section of the economy that has contributed much to the effort to halt the continual outflow of dollars has been agriculture. Exports for dollars of agricultural products reduces the amount of dollar outflow and improves the country's balance-of-payments position.

Without the effort by American agriculture to expand exports of the products of the American farm in the last 7 years, the balance-of-payments deficit would have been more than a billion dollars larger than it was. Had the export of agricultural products for dollars ceased in 1958 when the balance-of-payments problem began to be acute, our total balance-of-payments deficit for that period would have been more than twice as large as it was.

Table 1 compares the balance-of-payments deficits to exports for dollars of U.S. agricultural commodities for the years 1958 to 1965. The figures do not include exports of agricultural products under Public Law 480, sales for foreign currency or foreign aid exports.

It should be pointed out, that due to the efforts of American agriculture, exports of farm commodities has expanded every year since 1959, except for 1965 when a slight decrease was noted.

Exports of products from American farms have proved to be a major weapon in the struggle to decrease U.S. balance-of-payments deficits.

In sharp contrast, the record of certain sections of the American economy are less favorable. U.S. industries import more materials than are exported by about $49 million in 1964; U.S. financiers invested about $5.6 billion more overseas than were invested by foreigners in this country with $2.1 billion of this in short term investments.

Table 2 indicates the amounts of deficits incurred in selected transactions.

This indicates a total of more than $20 billion in deficits as a result of industrial purchases and foreign investments.

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of balance-of-payments deficits and agricultural exports for dollars, 1958–65*

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Net deficit	Agricultural exports
1958	$3.5	$2.8
1959	3.7	2.5
1960	3.9	3.2
1961	3.1	3.4
1962	3.6	3.5
1963	3.3	3.5
1964	3.1	4.5
1965	2.6	4.5
Total	26.8	27.9

TABLE 2.—*Net trade deficits incurred in selected overseas transactions, 1958–65*

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Industrial materials	Direct investment	Short-term investment
1958	0.12	1.18	.31
1959	.20	1.37	.08
1960	.03	1.67	1.35
1961	.04	1.60	1.55
1962	1.21	1.65	.55
1963	.80	1.88	.73
1964	.05	2.15	2.07
Total	2.45	11.50	6.64

An Editor's Random Thoughts by Leland G. Ishmael

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

An Editor's Random Thoughts

(By Leland G. Ishmael)

The following tribute was paid to A. H. Bibb, who died last week, by F. C. Sowell on his "What's Happening" program over radio station WLAC last Sunday morning:

"On Friday I attended the funeral of one of the old 'Doughboys,' who (under President Woodrow Wilson and General 'Blackjack' Pershing, helped save the world for democracy in World War I. We never tired of telling of his experience on the battlefields of France. It was hard going, but this man never regretted a moment of it.

"He marched to victory under the American flag, and it was the Stars and Stripes that covered his casket before his body was returned to the dust from which it came. I am speaking of my old friend, Allie Bibb, whose 'Gosling Branch' column in Pete Ishmael's Dickson County Herald I have quoted so many times over the past 20 years.

"Allie loved his country as much as any man could, and his fellow countrymen (those who knew him) loved him for his never failing kindness, his unchangeable friendship, and his devotion to the highest principles of conduct.

"The Sowell family visited in the Bibb home, 'On the Branch,' every year for several years just before Christmas (that's where we went to get our Christmas tree), and enjoyed sitting in front of the big log fire with Allie and his brother, Emmett, listening to allie's sage philosophy.

"Everybody 'On the Branch' will miss Mr. Bibb for a long time to come, and so will I. As the minister said, 'In his final years, he was perfectly content to live by the side of the road, and be a friend to man.' "

Creative Federalism and the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, discussions over programs of our Government frequently get lost in cliches, and the old arguments of liberal versus conservative policies seem more and more out of date.

The January issue of Fortune magazine points out that President Johnson's program is directed in every case toward expanding the role of private enterprise. The Great Society is helping sustain a viable economy, not launching out with new Socialist schemes, as some critics charge.

I would like to include at this point in the Record the text of this article:

"Creative Federalism" and the Great Society

(By Max Ways)

As the huge program enacted by Congress in 1965 moves into action, U.S. history is making a major turn from the politics of issues to the politics of problems, from an emphasis on need to an emphasis on opportunity, from struggle over the redistribution of what we have to the less crude and more intricate decisions about what we might become.

Salient features of the new package include aid to education, medicare and expanded Federal activities in the health field, urban renewal and scores of other efforts to improve the physical environment. Since many of these topics have a long and embattled past in public discussion, some observers try to force the present programs into the mold of yesterday's debates. They see the new programs simply as another surge in the drive begun 30 years ago to expand the Federal Government's share of total power in order to right social wrongs. When the Johnson program is put into that context, liberals automatically applaud it and conservatives automatically denounce it. Both are missing the point.

They fail to recognize that a fundamental break with the welfare-state trend occurred when this society made a different assessment of its own vigor. A new confidence in opportunity began to be reflected in politics 15 years ago and was a factor in both of the Eisenhower elections. Although John F. Kennedy's 1960 campaign included appeals to the older kind of politics, his statements and policies as President seldom moved back toward the assumptions about U.S. society that characterized his party's dominance between 1933 and 1952. Lyndon Johnson even more explicitly has founded his administration on the premise that U.S. society in general is exceedingly lively, increasing its rate of innovation and expanding its range of opportunity.

Two events early in Johnson's administration indicated his commitment to this premise. One was the way he argued the case for the income tax cut that Kennedy had proposed. Both Presidents, and especially Johnson, made it clear in the tax debate that they regarded the private economy, and not the pump of Federal spending, as the main engine of economic growth. The second event was Johnson's Great Society speech at Ann Arbor in May 1964. In some quarters this address has been misread as a threat to impose upon the United States' future a Federal Government blueprint of what the Great Society ought to be.

But this interpretation is contradicted by the speech itself and Johnson's subsequent policies and words, including his 1964 campaign speeches. At Ann Arbor he was expressing, in his capacity of national leader, a bolder view of the prospect before the Nation, the widening range of choice presented to all its people and all its institutions, public and private. Toward the end of the speech, he suggested that the Federal Government would have an important part to play in the quest for a better future. Neither then nor later, however, did he intimate that the Federal role in the decisions ahead would be dominant or that Washington could supply the superior wisdom.

Along with the new assumptions of vigor in U.S. society came a new way of organizing Federal programs. At Ann Arbor and on five public occasions since then, Johnson has used a phrase, "creative federalism," that has not received the attention it deserves. Federalism means a relation, cooperative and competitive, between a limited central power and other powers that are essentially independent of it. In the long American dialog over States' rights, it has been tacitly assumed that the total amount of power was constant and, therefore, any increase in Federal power diminished the power of the States and/or the people.

Creative federalism starts from the contrary belief that total power—private and public, individual and organizational—is expanding very rapidly. As the range of conscious choice widens, it is possible to think of vast increases of Federal Government power that do not encroach upon or diminish any other power. Simultaneously, the power of States and local governments will increase; the power of private organizations, including businesses, will increase; and the power of individuals will increase.

Creative federalism as it is now developing emphasizes relationships between Washington and many other independent centers of decision in State and local government, in new public bodies, in universities, in professional organizations, and in business. This characteristic of the new programs is part of a rather belated application to Government of the organizational habits developed by modern business. While everyone has been watching the influence of Government policies on the economy, the impact of the economy's strength and its mode of organization have been quietly altering the way the Government works. Tens of thousands of professional and managerial types, in and out of Government service, are shaping and executing Great Society programs. This is as it should be, for professional and managerial men are preeminently oriented toward direction choosing and problem solving within a complex framework of many centers of decision.

This new outlook in Washington is the deepest reason for the reapproachment during the Johnson administration, between Government and business. The two still have and will always have different responsibilities and aims. But they are beginning to use the same working language, depend on the same kinds of people, and get at tasks and decisions in the same way. More than administrative style is involved in this Washington shift. The whole framework of U.S. politics is changing.

THE OLD POLITICS AND THE NEW

Many observers have noted disparagingly that the Johnson program—with the significant exception of civil rights—does not generate much public "excitement." Those observers are conditioned to expect a certain kind of political excitement that arises when classes or other broad groups in a society—each armed with principles of ethics, justice, constitutional law, or ideology—clash over whether government power should be used to achieve or retain a group advantage. The 20th century, at home and abroad, has produced so many exciting political conflicts of this sort that they have come to be considered as the whole of politics and even, perversely, as desirable.

The Johnson program's relative lack of this sort of exciting conflict should be read as a clue to its fundamental novelty. Civil rights, the single domestic issue that today creates the familiar kind of popular excitement, points up the contrast between the old politics and the new. The drive for Negro equality invokes principles of justice and ethics in demanding that the weight of Government be employed to do for one large group what society itself has conspicuously failed to do. Government can do little for Negroes as a group without hurting (psychologically, if not materially) many whites most directly affected by such measures as school desegregation. When Government must decide how far it will go in taking cherished advantages from one group in the course of helping another group, an exciting political issue arises.

Most issues of the 1930's had this same characteristic of taking from group A to give to group B. Indeed, a class redistribution of income and power was one of the stated aims of the New Deal. Thirty years ago belief was widespread that the U.S. economy was mature, that a large and increasing proportion of all social initiative would have to be exercised through the Federal Government, that the hope of progress lay in the enlarged Federal power to take from the economic royalists and give to the underprivileged. In the struggle arising from such beliefs the political positions called radical, liberal, and conservative jelled into their present meanings.

The Johnson program does not fit any of these molds. Except for the special case of the Negro, every group is now believed capable of advancing under its own steam. Consequently, the old welfarist arguments for Government intervention lose some of their force and urgency while the newer problem-solving approach comes to the fore.

Medicare, when it was first seriously debated in the 1940's, was presented with an emphasis on what the young owed to the old and especially, on what the fortunate owed to the unfortunate. Today the viewpoint has shifted. It is now recognized that this society as a whole has a problem of paying for the greatly enlarged medical services now available to the aged; medicare is put forward as a device to deal with the problem. Similarly, the programs to improve education, clean up rivers, beautify highways, and reduce air pollution are not struggles between broad social groups. And they are not ideological issues. They are efforts to deal with problems by a society that is becoming increasingly confident of its problem-solving ability.

Specific Federal programs derived from this new approach may be good or bad, valuable or wasteful, disruptive or constructive. Each will certainly require close public scrutiny of its conception and execution. There will be plenty of chance for criticism and opposition when we learn to look at these programs in the context of the new politics. But effective criticism and opposition will not develop from the old yammer for or against any extension of the Federal Government's scope.

WILL THE PARTNER STAY JUNIOR?

Those Washington officials now busily setting up the programs like to describe the new roles for the Federal Government with the phrase "junior partner." An easy cynicism, bred of past conditions, is quick to suspect that this junior partner means to enlarge his scope until he takes over the shop. But an examination of the new programs in detail shows this cynicism is misplaced. These programs are so designed that they will work only if the senior partners—i.e., elements of the society other than the Federal Government—continue to grow and innovate vigorously. If that hope is disappointed, the Federal junior partner, instead of increasing his power, will be in trouble with the electorate.

Because the Washington junior partners are aware of this danger, creative federalism includes a deliberate policy of encouraging the growth of institutions that will be independent of and, in part, antagonistic to the Federal Government power. Almost every part of every new program transfers Federal funds to some outside agency. Nothing will be achieved if the recipients—universities, State and local educational authorities, hospitals, medical schools, and poverty-program councils—merely become subservient arms directed by the central Federal power. Tension between Washington and other independent centers is required by the whole body of experience out of which the notion of creative federalism comes.

This way of doing things entered the Government by osmosis from corporate management. Big corporations have been getting bigger, but executives are increasingly and justifiably impatient of outside criticism that, using the language of 50 years ago, attacks corporations as monolithic concentrations of power in a few hands. From the inside of any great corporation it is obvious that top management spends a great deal of its time trying to enlarge the responsibilities and strengthen the initiative of other power centers within the corporation. Such policies are pursued in the face of certain knowledge that the multiplied and strengthened power centers will develop troublesome tensions with top management and with one another. Top management does not pursue this polycentric policy out of altruism or masochism. It does so because the complexity of modern knowledge, reflected in the complexity of organized action, demands that much of the decisionmaking be decentralizeed.

Not only is a high degree of local autonomy required but, even more significantly, a high degree of professional autonomy. Engineering decisions have to be made by engineers. Accountants, architects, artists, and xerographers acquire similar "States rights."

Yet it is not correct to assume that the overall trend in modern organization is toward decentralization. Complexity has two sides: while specialization decentralizes, interdependence centralizes. The art of modern management consists largely in discovering what to centralize and what to decentralize, and in constructing the channels through which information and decision, generated at many levels, flow. An old-fashioned "captain of industry," an industrial absolutist of the Henry Ford type, would be driven screaming into the night by the restraints and complexities of modern corporate "federalism." But it works.

Those business executives who still see in recent Washington trends only a further expansion toward "absolute government" are as blind as those critics of Big Business who go on mouthing warnings against "monolothic" corporations. These business executives are doubly blind, because in the new Federal patterns they do not recognize their own children.

The new patterns first entered Washington at the point where the connection between Government, advanced business and science is most intense—the Defense Department. During World War II, teams of analysts began to apply techniques of "operations research" to military decisions. In the postwar period this approach spread to analytical comparisons of "weapon systems" by methods that worked back from battlefield value to factory cost. Secretary of Defense McNamara made the Pentagon a link in an informational and decisionmaking process stretching from White House policy decisions through prime contractors to thousands of subcontractors. No one can calculate whether the vast activity we call "defense" is more or less centralized than it was in 1960; and the answer, if we had it, would not be very important. What matters is that the total system has a more rational and a more effective way of relating the parts to the whole. There is a conscious, unceasing effort to insure that any given decision will be made at the most appropriate place—high or low, in Washington or out—and on the basis of the best information.

Poverty War Funds Are Guarded by Agencies, Says Cincinnati Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a reporter, Margaret Josten of the Cincinnati Enquirer, has written a seven-part series on the antipoverty program in Cincinnati. Today, I include the fifth part of her series to illustrate the kind of reporting that helps inform the public about the various antipoverty programs at work in our communities under the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

POVERTY WAR FUNDS ARE GUARDED BY AGENCIES, SAYS CINCINNATI CHIEF

(By Margaret Josten)

Maybe it's a testimony to the Internal Revenue Service, quips antipoverty czar R. Sargent Shriver, but there's been little "fudging around" with cash allotted to the war at home.

Look at the institutions getting the money to spend, adds Cincinnati's chief poverty fighter, John E. Hansan. He lists the YWCA, the board of education, the federation of settlements—all agencies never so much as tinged by graft.

"I would ask whoever says this money is being misspent to come in and look over the list of institutions receiving it," Mr. Hansan declares. "Let them see who controls these agencies."

He then mentions what he calls a double guarantee that there'll be no dipping into the till.

The city finance department handles all the cash independently—paying bills, dispensing cash, helping to devise the proper accounting procedures for the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, which, to date, has been a hard taskmaster.

Once the OEO has funded a program through the Community Action Commission, of which Mr. Hansan is executive director, budget lines cannot be changed by more than 10 percent without permission from OEO. Only OEO can approve equipment purchases above $500.

"This causes hardships and delays, but it is a protection," says Mr. Hansan, whose principal job is to coordinate the work of agencies sponsoring antipoverty programs.

Last spring, as Mr. Hansan tells it, a Federal agency involved in the war on poverty sent auditors to Cincinnati to survey the CAC's accounting system. One of their recommendations was that petty cash—which amounts to $25—ought to be kept locked in a steel box.

They did this because Mr. Hansan showed them where he kept CAC's petty cash—in his billfold.

"When I worked in the West End (for Seven Hills Neighborhood Houses), I never left a nickel in the office. It was broken into regularly. So I decided then that it would be easier to take personal responsibility for petty cash."

Now CAC has a little steel box for this money.

"No money can go to an individual or to a private corporation," Mr. Hansan explains. "We can't give away food or clothing. Everything goes to public or private nonprofit organizations with programs to combat poverty at the source."

Are salaries too high?

Agencies get ideas for antipoverty programs, then submit proposed budgets to the CAC. There Mr. Hansan and his staff take a close look at salaries proposed for professionals and nonprofessionals before making recommendations to the OEO.

"All salaries are based upon current salaries paid in the Cincinnati area for comparable work," says Mr. Hansan, showing a list of the pay received for work with such organizations as the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the National Federation of Settlements, the Cincinnati Board of Education, the Children's Home.

Usually the original request is pared down by CAC. Then it goes to Washington where it may be pared even further.

The OEO's community action division, headed by Theodore M. Berry, former Cincinnati vice mayor, is in charge of this operation, among other things.

The way Mr. Berry's office keeps a tight hand on allocations is best illustrated by what was given the Small Business Development Center recently set up here.

The request for SBDC was $172,000, including $139,700 for personnel. But the actual grant was for $152,100, including $86,570 in salaries.

These are some of the salaries being paid:

A recreation director with a bachelor's degree, $5,200; a vocational counselor (retired Army officer), $8,500; a director of a neighborhood service center with a doctor's degree, $11,000; an assistant director of a center, $9,000; a neighborhood organizer, with 2½ years of college, $6,000; an assistant project coordinator, $7,500; a project coordinator with a master's degree, $9,500.

Part-time workers also are given the "going rates." For instance, a dentist in the school dental program gets $7.57 an hour; a home economist gets $25 a day; a librarian gets $5.95 an hour for 10 hours a week.

Do Democrats get preference in these jobs?

Mr. Hansan bristles at this question. "Republicans or Democrats are free to come in here and look up the patronage," he says.

"We couldn't care less about politics. We're only interested in doing the job."

"The poor are not Republican, Democrat, or charterite," he adds.

"If a Negro is hired, chances are 80 to 90 percent that he will be a Democrat. It's the same with most poor people."

He points out again that it is the agencies which actually control the money spent. "Their boards are more Republican than Democrat," he notes.

On Seeing America First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a feature of the annual New Year's edition of the Alliance, Ohio, Review was a 40-page section devoted to seeing America first. This section, devoid of any advertising, was the contribution of Mr. Merrick Lewis and the Alliance Machine Co., evidencing Mr. Lewis' interest and support of our efforts to remedy the balance-of-payments program by keeping tourist dollars at home. I know of no similar contribution by anyone in this country.

Recognition of this distinguished public service has gone to Mr. Lewis from the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable John T. Connor, whose letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1966.

Mr. MERRICK LEWIS,
President, Alliance Machine Co., Alliance, Ohio.

DEAR MR. LEWIS: The special supplement in the January 4, 1966, edition of the Alliance Review of Alliance, Ohio, entitled "See America First," has been called to my attention, and I wanted you to know how favorably impressed I was by this important effort.

I have been heartened, indeed, by the response of industry to help solve the problem of our balance of payments. Your contribution in the form of the very impressive supplement which was published in the Alliance Review is another example of the voluntary cooperation which is so essential to meet our vital national problems. Please be assured that your efforts are appreciated.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

The Export of Donated Commodities Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, to assure a fair share of the flour export business for the port of Buffalo, N.Y., under the Agency for International Development program through the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, I am today introducing a bill to provide a method for designating U.S. ports for export of donated commodities abroad.

The new method will replace the present practice of permitting the milling companies to designate the port or ports in their quotas with respect to offers by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service to purchase wheat flour for export.

Under this proposal, the Secretary of Agriculture would designate the U.S. ports from which such donated commodities would be exported.

In making these port designations, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to give special consideration to promotion of the general welfare and economic health of existing grain handling and processing facilities, and related industries, at ports of the United States.

The Secretary of Agriculture would also be required to seek full utilization of existing facilities, resources, and manpower in the United States in order to safeguard domestic economic development.

The Secretary would be further required to take appropriate steps to insure a pro rata division of the annual export tonnages of donated commodities among existing U.S. ports on a geographical basis—such division to be directed toward community and other self-help activities designed to alleviate economic distress and unemployment.

Strong and healthy ports contribute greatly to the growth and development of their respective areas.

At the present time, we have an appalling situation in the port of Buffalo with regard to the exportation of wheat flour under the AID programs of the Federal Government. Buffalo is the leading city in the world in the manufacture of flour. The Federal Government will ship upward of 24 million tons of foreign aid foodstuffs abroad, and Buffalo's allocation of this program is less than one-half of 1 percent.

A port such as this should be able to ship a minimum of 100,000 tons of flour annually under Public Law 480, which provided that the Department of Agriculture must approve in writing each individual booking and charter consummated as to flag of vessel and rate.

The inability of ports, such as Buffalo, to receive their equitable share of federally subsidized export business has created pockets of poverty. This situation, under the provisions of my bill, will be reversed if a fair share of AID flour can flow through these ports to overseas destinations.

Commander's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, nowhere can one find greater loyalty to country or civic responsibility than amongst the membership of our veteran organizations. These men and women, for I would include the ladies auxiliaries, believe in a strong America—one that can maintain that freedom that has meant so much to all of us.

Service to God and country is ever paramount in their minds. This month of February, the American Legion has started a drive to remind us that we are a people of God.

The February issue of the Wendell Willkie Post Legion News, of Akron, Ohio, of which I am honored to have membership, has a very fine article on this subject. This message from the pen of Post Commander Milford R. Hoover illustrates the dedication of the veteran organization membership to the greatest moral standards.

I would commend this article to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatiyes. It follows:

COMMANDER'S MESSAGE

DEAR COMRADES: February is the month in which the Legion highlights Americanism. It is also the month in which we observe the birthdays of Abraham Lincoln and George Washington. Throughout the Nation, "service to God and country" is further noted.

We of the American Legion, like all good Americans, are concerned by conditions which threaten the well-being of our land and our loved ones. In our pursuit of peace, we find ourselves in a war which we are not permitted to win.

Armed strength alone will never conquer communism, for it must be rooted out of the minds and hearts of millions of men. We know that commissions and investigations will never restore integrity among officials, because honesty is a moral virtue which a man must cultivate in his own heart. Strict enforcement of laws will never teach our young people the difference between right and wrong. For, in the final analysis, peace, honor, and justice are the spirit, and only in focusing our attention on spiritual values can we expect to restore peace to the world and honor and justice among our own people.

The American Legion has launched a nationwide effort to bring all Americans closer to the Creator who has blessed this country so bountifully. Few Americans will deny that God exists. But many say, in effect, that God and His moral law do not matter. In their point of view, God and morality have no connection with business or politics or the professions. Because the American Legion strongly believes that religion has a very vital place in American life, it has spearheaded this nationwide endeavor to encourage regular church attendance, daily prayers, reading of the Bible, and the religious instruction of children.

This is a program in which Americans of every creed can take part. The Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths all remind men of their obligation to worship God. There is no ambiguity about this.

Locally, you and your new member prospect can join with Legion members and their families. This can be a very effective sales tool for your one new member.

It is the veterans and their families—now numbering half the population—who have the greatest stake in the future. American veterans fought to preserve, among other things, freedom of religion. A freedom that is not exercised is soon lost. The American Legion urges Americans everywhere to use the freedom of religion which is theirs for the honor and glory of God. And the God Who all men adore will bless us for it. This country of ours was founded on spiritual values. In these values—and not in our economic, political, or military might—lies the real greatness of America.

Yours in comradeship,
MILFORD R. HOOVER,
Commander.

Nebraska a Leader in Resource Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, most of my life I have lived in rural Nebraska as a farmer and rural businessman. I have always had the highest regard for the almost unbelievable progress of our agriculture and its contribution to our economy. Equally strong is my regard for resource conservation.

Recently nothing has disturbed me more than the depth of the public's misunderstanding and its apathy toward the conservation and development of our natural resources of soil and water.

We are all resource users. We need food, fiber, water, and land to live on. In addition, we want roads and superhighways, airports, and shopping centers, factories, and new housing developments.

We want places to hunt and camp. We want to go swimming, fishing, boating, and picnicking. We want scenic vistas through which we can motor.

The basic requirement for all of this is land and water. And we do not have an inexhaustible supply of either one.

Fortunately, a few dedicated groups are concerned with our resource future. Among those I have firsthand knowledge of are the local soil conservation districts and the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service that assists them.

Nebraska has one of the most progressive soil conservation district operations in the Nation. In 1950 it became the ninth State to be completely blanketed by districts. Since 1957 the State has moved to strengthen the Nebraska Soil and Water Conservation Commission and assume a greater share of the responsibility for resource planning and development.

We, in Nebraska, know the penalty of land abuse and misuse, for erosion has cost us an estimated one-third of our topsoil. The farmers and ranchers are understandably erosion-conscious, and have made a determined attack against the despoilers of our land.

These landowners, cooperating with local soil conservation districts, have adopted soil and water conservation measures at a higher rate than the national average. Nebraska has been a leader in the building of terraces, the construction of waterways, irrigation, land leveling, and range management.

It is also a leader in the small watershed project approach to resource conservation. At present Nebraska stands ninth in the Nation in the number of watershed applications made and seventh in the number of projects approved for construction. Through these projects local sponsors not only curb destructive floods and erosion problems, but also develop municipal water supplies and public recreation areas.

The efforts made through local soil conservation districts benefit all of us, and I commend them for the progress they are making.

Project Head Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the RECORD an excellent statement by the president of the American Society of Denistry for Children on Project Head Start:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF DENTISTRY FOR CHILDREN REGARDING PROJECT HEAD START

(By Dr. Richard E. Jennings)

"Dental diseases are one of the most common problems of childhood. Many children do not receive the care that they need either because the parents are unable to obtain treatment or because they do not know that treatment is necessary. This neglect is particularly pronounced in the important years between the time when the child's primary molars erupt (at about 3 years of age) and when he enrolls in school.

"Project Head Start has played an important role in calling attention to the neglected dental needs of deprived children in the preschool ages. The program has been effective in promoting parent and child education about better dental care. The American Society of Dentistry for Children commends the work that has been accomplished by Head Start and urges that it be expanded and improved.

"It is the recommendation of the society that every child in the program receives a dental health kit which would include a toothbrush and toothpaste. Parents and children should be given dental health education with particular emphasis on proper toothbrushing methods. Furthermore, every effort should be made to encourage and, if necessary, provide followup treatment for correction of the major dental defects discovered in the children examined who are enrolled in the program.

"Failure to obtain proper dental care can lead to premature loss of teeth, poor eating habits and other serious consequences early in life. As a result, many children will have lost the opportunity to have a normal dentition before they are old enough to play any part in the decision as to whether or not they are to obtain care. The Detroit area Project Head Start under the direction of Drs. Alfred E. Seyler and John Stone of the University of Detroit, demonstrated that with proper organization and support of the local dental society, the accomplishments envisioned by President Johnson can become a reality for the less fortunate and could well serve as a model for other communities.

"The American Society of Dentistry for Children believes that Project Head Start has helped improve the lot of pre-school children and that it can play an even more significant role in the future."

Race and Politics in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, our very able State Controller of California, Alan Cranston, on January 15, 1966, delivered one of the most profound and significant addresses on the relationship of politics and race relations that I have heard. A partial text of his address, delivered to the Negro Political Action Association of California endorsing convention at Bakersfield, Calif., follows:

It sometimes seems like such a long time ago but as you so well know, it was only a very few short years ago that a handful of amazingly courageous young people startled a complacent world with a determined demand for "Freedom Now" in southern California.

The movement they launched—and that you have carried forth—pricked and probed the complacent consciences of millions of Americans, both black and white, in places high and low.

And attitudes were changed, and laws were written—and as a result, freedom, genuine freedom, for all in America became a brighter possibility than ever before.

But, as we also know so well, there is more to it than just freedom, which after all should be taken for granted in our democracy

There is the matter of representation—and of full participation.

And so, as the civil rights movement so graphically demonstrated your desire for freedom now, I think your convention today dramatically demonstrates your desire for representation now—and more importantly, your desire to participate fully in the great problems and decisions that affect us all, foremost as Americans and as Californians whatever our color.

Let me say, simply and sincerely: I am with you exactly 100 percent.

Yet, not so strangely, I regret that all this is still unfulfilled in the year 1966 and in the State of California. But it is a fact of life—and it is the facts of life that must be dealt with.

A few weeks ago, a white sportswriter advised the great Jim Brown, the Cleveland Browns' superstar, to pipe down about civil rights and stick to football. "I've never looked on you as a Negro," the sportswriter said.

"That's ridiculous," Brown snapped back. "Look at me, man. I'm black."

Frankly, as a partisan California football fan, I have usually thought of Jim Brown as an evil spirit cloaked in white—the color of the uniform he has worn when I have watched him rip through our Rams and 49ers for long gains. But, I think I know what Jim Brown means. I know you do.

Yet I still believe the time is coming when the color of a man's skin will become as important as the color of his eyes, or the color of his hair—or, as in my case, how much hair he has at all.

When the attorney general of Massachusetts announced for the U.S. Senate the other day, the Boston newspapers considered the fact that he is a Negro so unremarkable that this fact appeared far down in their stories.

I think white voters are coming to realize that just as there is no Negro or Mexican or white approach to a screen pass or off-tackle slant, there is also no Negro or Mexican or white approach to the problems of, say, smog, or traffic congestion, or the pollution of our rivers.

For better or for worse—and I for one think it is infinitely for the better—we are all in this together.

I don't happen to feel this way, either, because I'm simply or sentimentally pro-Negro, or pro-Mexican. I guess I am just pro-human beings—all human beings.

Over the years, as you know, I have fought for civil rights programs—but not simply because they benefit only a few groups of people, but because they have also been best for all of America.

In the same manner, I have battled through the years for decent fair housing laws—not merely because it is in the best interets of a minority, but also because anything else would be morally wrong and not in the best interests of all of America.

And I have consistently called for a number of years for a genuine, all-out war on poverty—not just because it will aid the poor and hopeless of any particular color (for it also aids segregationist rednecks) but because it will give every American, and America itself, a needed measure of dignity.

Yet, there are voices in America—and you have heard them—saying, "Hold it. We have gone far enough. Or too far."

Ronald Reagan, for example. He said the other night that he sees no need at all for any further civil rights legislation, implying, at the same time, that he didn't care very much for what we have now.

In fact, he said he thought the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was carelessly and too quickly written. I suspect what he would really like to do is to take another 100 years to edit the thing before it's the law of the land.

Well, I am positive Ronald Reagan would have said the same thing in the 1860's as well, about the Emancipation Proclamation. Actually, I sometimes wonder what century he is living in.

I confess I have a slightly different approach—and it is this:

As long as there is one America, whatever his heritage, who, through circumstances not of his making and beyond his control, lives in indignity, in injustice and in inhumanity, I will fight for the program to wipe out forever the conditions making such an outrage possible. I count upon your help again this year. And I hope I will get it.

I doubt if I will get one single vote in November because, by accident of birth and something I had absolutely nothing to do with, I was born a Scotch-American.

Yet, though it may be hard to realize today, that fact would have been a big factor in my election or defeat not too long ago in many areas of America.

Don't get me wrong. I recognize that you must emphasize race and nationality now—as the civil rights movement has—so that in a hoped-for near future both race and nationality will be irrelevant in elections as well as in life.

I hope that your association will sustain the attention of the politicians, the press, and the people on the great, urgent issue of civil and human rights.

The issue of civil rights is not a pleasant one to many people. And people don't like to face the unpleasant.

If you and we relax our efforts for a moment, I am afraid, we'll see this issue swept under the rug or dropped to the bottom of those lists of political and social priorities.

You will have to work hard and act hard to sustain and intensify the attention of California on the issue of civil and human rights. Frankly, you need to keep at me and every other official in California on this issue.

For no matter how angry I get about discrimination, no matter how determined I am to work for equality of opportunity, no matter how dedicated I am to the struggle for jobs and dignity for all—your concern and involvement are always more, much more. To be blunt, you and your brothers and fathers have been victimized. I and mine have not.

If your convention here makes some headlines, that's fine. If your organization makes me and other State leaders sit up and take notice, that's fine. If your programs force a lot of people to stand up and be counted, that's fine.

And if your endorsements make the people of California realize that you're tired of getting a few crumbs and that you want a thick slice of the political loaf, that's fine.

I am not offering any advance, blind approval of your endorsement or endorsements. I will make my own judgments on the merits of the men who run for office. What I do want you to know that I think you are right to meet, right to organize and right to make your force felt politically in California.

And so I wish you the best for your convention. But with that, I express a further hope: That someday soon we will be successful in California in making ours the truest democracy on earth—where religion and color and race and national origin will be irrelevant;

So successful that you will not have the need to have a convention like this again.

Coin Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, despite all of our efforts to overcome the shortage of coins, business establishments in my congressional district still find it impossible to secure an adequate supply.

I was shocked to learn that there are dealers in coins who apparently acquire and hoard large numbers of same and offer them to banks and business firms at a premium. I have an advertisement from a firm in New York offering to deliver, air express collect, $1,000 in nickels for $1,020. The premium asked on dimes is the same but a $47.50 premium is demanded for half dollars.

Persons engaged in this business are contributing to the shortage by withholding coins from circulation.

No American bank or business should need to pay a profit to anyone else in order to get coins.

I am today joining the senior Senator of Ohio in the sponsorship of legislation to make it a crime to profiteer in coins for monetary use. The bill will not affect numismatic activities, but it will provide stiff penalties for buying and selling coins for monetary use. I hope it will receive prompt consideration.

Editorials Agree Loyalty to Country Should Be Standard for Arlington Burial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the decision by the Department of Defense not to allow the burial of a convicted Communist agent in Arlington National Cemetery is the subject of three editorials from Florida newspapers which I am happy to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, Jan. 27, 1966]

NONE BUT THE TRUE

It is sad when a national hero falls from the pedestal his brave actions accelerated him to, but sadder still when he never lives to regain himself.

Such, apparently, was the case of Robert G. Thompson, convicted Communist Party leader, whose widow now wants to bury his ashes in Arlington National Cemetery.

Thompson was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross in 1943 for heroism in New Guinea while serving as a staff sergeant.

After the war his actions were a different matter. In 1949 he was convicted of conspiring to teach or advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence.

For that conviction he served 5 years and 1 month in Federal prison.

According to regulations, a person otherwise eligible for burial in a national cemetery will be barred if he has been convicted of a crime or crimes which results, among other things, in a sentence of 5 years or more.

According to records, Thompson drew a 3-year sentence after his conviction, but had 4 years tacked on to that after he had fled and was captured.

While it seems that this man, no matter what his war record was, would still be ineligible for burial in Arlington simply on his criminal record, the mere fact that he was convicted of this nature of crime compounds his conduct.

It is difficult for some of us to fathom the reasons of a man who could risk his life for his country at one time and turn traitor later.

The fact remains, however, that this is Thompson's record. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, anything he might have accomplished during World War II was nullified when he later sought to sell out his country.

His burial in Arlington would be an affront to those brave men who went before him.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, Jan. 31, 1966]

UNITED STATES NEED NOT HONOR THOSE WHO BETRAY IT

Defense Department regulations which prohibit the burial in Arlington National Cemetery of any person who has been sentenced to a prison term of 5 years or more, has prevented the widow of a top American Communist from making a protest against our foreign policy and mocking the sacrifice of thousands of U.S. servicemen.

The widow of Robert G. Thompson, 1 of 11 Reds convicted in 1949 of conspiring to teach or advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, had requested that his ashes be interred today in Arlington National Cemetery. Arlington has especial status in the eyes of the world because it is in the Nation's Capital and is the resting place of many national heroes.

Mrs. Thompson wanted her husband buried with full military honors with the exception of the final, traditional rifle volley. She said her husband, who was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross while serving in New Guinea during World War II, was entitled to the burial but that she wanted the volley omitted as a protest against U.S. military activity in Vietnam.

Undoubtedly, the Nation ought to remember the heroism and service of men like Thompson but it can not overlook their fall from grace and their illegal activities which constituted a threat to the Nation and ideals and which they once defended with vigor and integrity.

The Nation has discovered the proper way to remember such men. Benedict Arnold, our first traitor of note, was a brilliant young officer who was wounded in the service of his country long before he betrayed it. The sacrifice is noted by a monument to his wounded leg in New England and a blank plaque at West Point. Thompson and his ilk can expect no better treatment from the land and people that they have denied in preference to a godless dictatorship.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, Jan. 31, 1966]

A Chilling Thought

Representative Charles E. Bennett is due much of the credit for the Defense Department's decision to bar the burial of a convicted Communist leader in Arlington National Cemetery.

The Journal's stand on the disputed interment of Robert G. Thompson, a hero in World War II only to be convicted of actions constituting treason a few years later, was made plain last Thursday, the same day the Defense Department made known its decision.

We agree with Congressman Bennett's distress that a man with such a blemished record might be buried among the brave men who gave their lives for their country.

What is even more distressing is that the Government's regulations were not more implicit, at least enough so for the Defense Department to be able to act without a lengthy opinion by the Attorney General of the United States. Bennett now plans to see that this is rectified.

The long-established practice, as Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach put it, of the Defense Establishment has been to deny anyone the right of burial in Arlington National Cemetery who has "been convicted of various * * * crimes * * *."

This presumably refers to ordinary lawbreaking acts. How much more it would seem that this should apply to acts against the U.S. Government.

One of the more repugnant aspects of reporting the situation was the comparison made by one television reporter to a section of Arlington being set aside for Confederate veterans who, according to his words, "also attempted to overthrow the Government."

It is such an astounding accusation, that the cause of the Communists should be compared with the cause of the South, we cannot really see how it merits the dignity of an answer.

If anyone equates Communists with Confederates, who sought not to overthrow the Government, but simply to withdraw from it, either American history books have failed drastically or there is far more fuzzy thinking in this Nation about Communist intentions than we have dreamed of.

And this, in itself, is a chilling, terrifying thought.

Tom Monahan, Father and Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, a much deserved tribute appeared recently in the "Sports Vista" column of one of America's greatest sportswriters, editors, and speakers, Arthur B. McGinley, to the great Tom Monahans, father and son, of Bristol, my home city. Father Tom has gone, but son Tom carries on in the great tradition of his dad. A third Tom Monahan, grandson of the first of these Toms in Bristol, is adding new luster to the name as a sportscaster on television channel 30. The tribute is from the typewriter of William A. "Bill" Garrett, formerly of Bristol, who now is with the Gannett Newspapers Washington bureau. Bill was a good friend of Tom I, as he is of Tom II. His article also mentions a mutual good friend here in the House, the gentleman from Connecticut, Representative Emilio Q. Daddario, whose First District included Bristol until redistricting took effect last year. I submit the McGinley column, with much pleasure, for insertion in the Record:

The Sports Vista

(By A. B. McGinley)

Bill Garrett, formerly of Bristol, former member of the Hartford Times news staff and now with the Gannett Newspapers Washington bureau, writes much of today's column.

His topic is the Tom Monahans of fame as Bristol High School coaches and this is timely since the Connecticut Sportswriters Alliance is awarding its coveted gold keys tonight—and the late Tom Monahan, the father of the duo, was a proud holder of a gold key.

Here is what Bill Garrett has to say of this well-liked father-and-son duo:

YOUNG TOM A REINCARNATION

That old spitting-image phrase, "like father, like son" must have been coined with Bristol's Tom Monahans, father and son, in mind. Old Tom, who died some years ago after a succession of athletic productions at Bristol (now Central) High that set the Connecticut sports world on its ear, is sort of reincarnated in young Tom, who fills his dad's old chair in the Bristol school picture. The latter is not Tom, Junior (dad was Thomas M., son is Thomas R.), but generally he reminds all who knew the elder Monahan of the justly and widely famed father.

This was the case when young Tom, as hirsutely unadorned as old Tom was, appeared recently at sessions of the American Football Coaches Association in Washington—I was happy to be there as a warm friend of all the Monahans. One Tom has all the attributes and finesse of the other. Bristol was indeed fortunate to have old Tom, and is as fortunate to have young Tom.

With Southington's Joe Fontana and others, Tommy had a lot to do with setting up the glittering tribute to Dan Jessee of Trinity, new AFCA president. With Tom at the big coaches' event was Wally Utke, the great former Bristol High athlete developed by "Father Tom," who turned out enough stars in his time to create a new firmament.

Wally, bothered by a hard cold, had a sports goods exhibit at the AFCA meetings with Dick Alban, a onetime Washington Redskin luminary. Bristol's Joe Riley was invited too, but couldn't make it. He isn't a coach, but he knows more coaches than most coaches do, and constantly is on the sportive go.

Congressman Mim Daddario, who so long flashed over small college and pro gridirons with such brilliance, had a long chat with Tommy. Among Mim's good friends are numbered such Monahan products of yore as Sugar Hugret and Dikes Hall, with whom Mim played with the old Hartford Blues. Mim also got to reminisce with his old Wesleyan and many other colleagues and friends, on both college and high school levels. He patted Joe Christian, University of Connecticut's contribution to the college baseball hall of fame.

There was general agreement that Daddario, who made little All Americas all over the place, would have made it to football's big time too, had today's major leagues been flourishing. Many an AFCA coach drooled just at the thought of having another Daddario coming along—and picking his school for enrollment.

What is little known in Connecticut, or remembered, is that the late Tom Monahan didn't even possess a college degree and there were times when educational purists challenged, or were set to challenge, his lack of "qualifications." A teaching certificate, that is. (Young Tom is a Columbia grad.)

Monahan used to have to get time off at the New Departure plant, where he was a straw boss, to coach his first Bristol High teams. He came out of Somerville, Mass., like so many others who have brought high credit to sports. At one time in public relations with Hank Brophy at New Departure, I occasionally "shot the breeze" with Tom out on the shop floor. Then later, as a newspaperman, I was to interview the old master many times, and to build up a great affection for him.

Despite his educational shortcoming, Tommy eventually was linked with a raft of rumors that he was being offered a college coaching job—including, I recall, one at Trinity. Tom could have done the job, any job in the field, with high distinction and probably considerable success.

Young Tom, the college grad, says: "It was my dad who had the brains." And he did. But Tom II has a headful of 'em too. He is not only a chip off the old block; he is the old block. And, man, how he looks it.

Political Bloom of 1964 Seems To Be Fading From Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, if what the British term by-elections are any indication, the administration has been slipping badly in the year since the 1964 elections. Republicans have, in fact, won most of these by-elections.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial by Walter Trohan on this subject in the Appendix of the Record:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 30, 1966]

Political Bloom of 1964 Seems To Be Fading From Johnson

(By Walter Trohan)

Washington, January 28.—There are indications that the political bloom of 1964 has gone off Lyndon Baines Johnson. In most of the elections since his thumping 16 million vote Presidential victory margin, the Republican Party has scored victories or gains.

In South Carolina Representative Albert Watson, who had been elected as a Democrat with no opposition, resigned and then ran and won as a Republican by a vote of 55,614 to 24,774 in a special election.

In Virginia a Republican gubernatorial candidate, A. Linwood Holton, lost to Miles E. Godwin, Jr., a Democrat, by 198,000 to 225,000. However, 75,000 votes went to a conservative candidate, who may have robbed the more liberal Holton of a victory.

In New York, John Lindsay, liberal Republican, won by a narrow margin over Abraham Beame, Democrat, to give the Democrat machine its first loss in 36 years. The conservative party polled almost 13½ percent of the vote. Former Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, won handsomely over Owen McGivern, Democrat, for the New York Court of Appeals.

In a California contest for a House vacancy Republicans didn't win, but gained 11 percentage points. In two Mississippi mayoralty races, Republicans won where Democrats had previously been unopposed.

CANDIDATE SCORES WELL IN CLEVELAND

In Akron, Ohio, a Republican won the mayorship easily where in previous years members of his party had been trounced decisively. In Cleveland a Republican candidate for mayor didn't win but scored a respectable vote where Democrats had been without opposition in 1963.

In Philadelphia Republicans won the district attorney's office, which they had lost decisively in 1963. In Toledo Republicans won the city's first mayoralty race. In New Britain, Waterbury, and Stamford, all in Connecticut, Republicans won the mayoralty races. The first two cities were traditional Democratic strongholds and in Stamford Republicans increased their 1963 margin of victory.

In New York Republicans regained control of the State senate. In Vermont where Johnson scored victories in 1964, Republicans increased their majorities in the senate and house.

The major Democratic victory was in New Jersey. Democrats increased their majorities in the State where the Republicans are led by Senator Clifford Case, a leading figure of the GOP leftwing.

Generally the party out of power can expect to make gains in Congress in the nonpresidential years. The Republicans did in 1938, 1942, and 1946.

Education Benefits for Veterans

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was attending Senate hearings on the nominations of Lincoln Gordon as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress and Jack Vaughn as Director of the Peace Corps when H.R. 12410 was brought to a vote yesterday. Unfortunately, I was not notified of this action and was not recorded in the final tally.

I was deeply interested in this legislation and had I been able to reach the floor in time I certainly would have voted "Aye."

H.R. 12410 provides benefits that are important not only to individual veterans of our Armed Forces but to the entire Nation. There is no greater investment in the future than one which provides educational benefits that will enable people to play a truly productive role in our society.

The bills offers servicemen of more than 6 months active duty since January 31, 1955, a program of educational benefits; home loan guarantees; job counseling and placement services; non-service-connected hospital and domiciliary care; veterans preference in Federal employment, and other important benefits.

I am delighted that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs acted expeditiously in considering this legislation and that the House passed it without a dissenting vote.

A Different Kind of Bird

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the policy of President Johnson was praised by Columnist Robert G. Spivack who said the President was not going to extremes, as some in either camp would like him to do. He is, in Spivack's words, "neither a hawk nor a dove."

The columnist believes the administration's "split-level approach, a simultaneous military and peace offensive," is the right approach.

Because many will want to study his sound judgments and analysis of a problem which is of immense concern to us all I offer the column to which I have referred for inclusion in the Record:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Feb. 2, 1966]

Watch on the Potomac: A Different Kind of Bird

(By Robert G. Spivack)

President Johnson is neither a "hawk" nor a "dove." He more closely resembles an owl.

Just how owlish will soon become apparent as we begin a new phase of the Vietnam war, what might be called its split-level approach, a simultaneous military and peace offensive.

The "doves" said the United States must "negotiate" with North Vietnam. When we offered unconditional talks and there was no response they said we must stop the bombing. When this didn't work they went silent.

The "hawks" said, "Don't negotiate," it just gives the enemy a chance to regroup and rebuild. They saw no value in trying to educate the rest of the world as to our purposes in southeast Asia as well as the Communist purposes.

The President, as he usually does, gave all sides a chance to be heard. Up to a point he took their various recommendations and followed them, just to see what would happen. But now the President is going to do what he does best, keep the pressure up and his own options down.

To understand Johnson you have to recognize that he practices a kind of political judo. If possible, you make an opponent knock himself out. That was the real value of the "peace offensive." It exposed Peiping and Hanoi as phony pacifists. Johnson gave them every opportunity to demonstrate their good will or their interest in the welfare of their own people, North and South Vietnamese alike.

The bombing lull went on not for 10 days or 20 days, but twice as long as even the most hopeful advocates recommended.

It also exposed the Achilles' heel of the U.S. antiwar movement. Many of the peace demonstrators forgot to demonstrate against Peiping and Hanoi.

Almost from the moment the administration began its peace moves, the Communist militarists responded in characteristic fashion, with new acts of terror against Vietnamese civilians. This was probably enough of a signal to the President to indicate that Hanoi would have to learn its lessons the hard way.

But Johnson was reluctant to follow the advice of the hawks because he is still not convinced that to save Vietnam we must destroy it. Hence his two-level approach: resumption of bombing against military targets in the north and putting the whole issue before the U.N. Security Council.

You get some idea of the skill with which the President is performing when you realize that the decision to turn the Vietnam issue over to the Security Council was made public on the final day that the French delegate was Chairman. Now there will be a Japanese Chairman. Aside from the likelihood that we will get a fair shake, the fact that the Chairman is Asian will not be lost on the other delegates.

The basic issue in southeast Asia still remains the conduct of Red China. The administration recognizes that Red China will soon be in a position to deliver nuclear weapons and could, in time, develop into another monstrous regime similar to that of Hitler.

Johnson is determined that Red China will not be allowed to grow into an Asian Frankenstein monster whose ultimate destruction would cost the lives of millions of Americans.

Youth Corps Assignment Terrific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Sentinel, in its January 25 edition, contained an interesting article entitled "School Dropout Thinks Youth Corps Assignment is Terrific."

We have heard a great deal about the successes and failures of the war on poverty. This is just another story of a growing list of the human success stories being compiled in the war on poverty.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the Record:

School Dropout Thinks Youth Corps Assignment Is Terrific

An 18-year-old high school dropout began working in the office of the clerk of circuit court here Monday in the pay of the Federal Government.

The dropout, Miss Helen Evans, was one of nine persons to begin working for the county under an $856,840 neighborhood youth corps project. Before the project is complete, as many as 900 persons could work for the county for 16-week periods.

"I think I'm going to like this," Miss Evans, of 720 West Vliet Street, said as she worked at filing records of alimony payments in their proper order.

Kenneth Deal, work and training projects director for the county, is directing the youth corps project under the economic opportunity act. He said four more persons would be placed in jobs Tuesday, with more being added as they are processed.

Some, like Miss Evans, will be placed in clerical positions. Others will work as custodians, park attendants, hospital attendants and other jobs.

"I hope I can learn enough so I can go out and get a job," Miss Evans said.

She dropped out of school in 1963 after finishing the ninth grade. Since then she took a 6-week course as a cashier-clerk at the vocational school, but found she didn't like the job that resulted from it.

She read of the job corps project in newspapers, she said, and inquired about it before being referred to the Youth Opportunity Center at 710 North 6th Street.

Miss Evens said that at first she was thinking of being a hospital aid, but then thought she would like clerical work better.

Now she will work 32 hours a week for 16 weeks at a pay rate of $1.25 an hour. The fifth day each week will be spent talking with a job counselor or seeking employment.

Deal said the purpose of the project is to place youths from 16 to 21, who are presently out of school, in various departments so they will learn job skills and develop good work habits.

The project is designed to handle three groups of 300 each for 16-week periods. Deal, however, said they might fall short of the planned number. The employment picture has changed from a year ago when the initial survey was made, he explained.

Francis X. McCormack, clerk of circuit court, said Miss Evans will be treated like any new employee and taught the office routine. He also will get another worker under the project.

"She will have more confidence the next time she walks into an office," McCormack remarked.

Looking Again at Munich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a good friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Edward J. Sloane, of Springfield, Va., in a letter to the editor of the Northern Virginia Sun, on January 29, 1966, made a very interesting comparison between conditions surrounding the so-called Munich settlement and what is happening today.

I should like to call this comparison to the attention of my colleagues:

Looking Again at Munich

Editor, the Sun:

Munich, 1938. A far-off time? Not so. Let us have determination that we are not now in such a period in relation to Red China.

Viewing the story of the Munich settlement from the vantage point of 1966 reveals the basic fact that "a threat to the peace of any country is a threat to ourselves." (Thus the conclusion of the notable historian of Munich, John W. Wheeler-Bennett.)

The democracies failed to face this truth. The Munich period was 5 years of futile good intention from January 1933 to September 1938. The ideal of peaceful change was pursued by the statesmen of Western Europe, intent on preserving the Versailles organization by legalistic means. They seemed to be motivated primarily from a sense of their own weakness, and torn by the guilt generated by the Versailles Treaty. The British lost touch with their own tradition of collective security. The French had lost their nerve. And, the combination was a pushover for Hitler.

The Nuremberg trial documents reveal German intentions during the 5 years of futile good intention by the British. Hitler was always announcing his intentions. (He knew that when you tell people in politics what you are going to do, they rarely believe you.) He had been telling the world what he was going to do. He announced to his high military staff meeting on November 5, 1937, that Germany would positively use force, whenever necessary to get living space. Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Ukraine would be invaded, if they could not be grabbed by negotiation. He was telling what he was going to do, from the first chapter to the last.

After November 1937 Hitler considered the German war machine ready for a tight schedule. His next key moves in readying the military were: the ousting of Marshal von Blomberg and General von Fitsch (halfhearted Nazis) and, the replacement of von Neurath (old school-tie type foreign minister) by von Ribbentrop (evil and maleable). Hitler and Keitel took charge of the military. At the same time, Eden was replaced by Halifax and Chamberlain announced to the Commons (March 7, 1938) that Austria, or any other country, could expect no help from the League of Nations. This final touch by the British, aided by their guilt complex on German self-determination, prepared Austria for the Hitler ax. Two years before, when Germany was relatively weak and Britain relatively strong, their guilt complex stopped the British from taking counteraction against Hitler when he moved into the Rhineland in definance of the Versailles Treaty. As late as May 1938 there was a brief display of collective security, when, following report of German plans for invasion of Czechoslovakia, Prague started mobilization. London, Paris, and Moscow announced support of Prague. Hitler backed down. After this last flicker of light, Hitler directed "Operation Green" be set up, providing for invasion of Czechoslovakia on October 1, 1938. The pace quickened (escalated, we say now) after May 1938. Step-up in agitation by the Sudeten-Germans resulted in a deadlock. Chamberlain in July sends Lord Runciman to Prague to negotiate between the Germans and Czechs. The British Runciman report supported the demands of the Nazi Karlsbad program for "self-determination." The London Times on September 7, 1938, went beyond Runciman and proposed cession of the Czech population and territory to Germany.

Hitler was then well aware of the possibilities. The Munich sellout (in those days they called it "Agreement") of September 30, 1938, was, in sum, a ratification of the British Runciman report, the Times editorial page, and the abdication of the broken President Benes (Czech) under pressure of Britain and France. (Of course, the United States just wasn't with it.)

After three trips to Germany, Prime Minister Chamberlain presented his plan for peace to the world. He returned to London and read extracts of Hitler's "Mein Kampf," for the first time. Operation Green went according to schedule.

Chamberlain's argument for Munich was "Peace for Our Time." This put his appeasement government into a box, because, if there was to be peace, then, rearmament was unnecessary. However, as Hitler increased his aggression, the supporters of Munich said it was an astute act of diplomacy by which Britain had "bought time" in order to complete her rearmament. But she did not rearm. A "galvanizing event" was necessary for the democracy to act. (We call it a "Pearl Harbor.")

The "galvanizing event" (or shock) happened when Hitler announced on March 15, 1939, that "Czechoslovakia has ceased to exist." On March 31, 1939, the "nice" British awoke to Hitler. Chamberlain introduced a draft bill.

In April, Britain declared support for Poland. In spite of Britain's ability to do anything but talk of Poland and France's lack of nerve, Hitler lost hope of another Munich. He now knew he must fight and that bluffing was insufficient to get what he wanted. At his meeting with his commanders, on May 23, 1939, he said: "There will be war. We cannot expect a repetition of the Czech affair. Our task is to invade Poland. I doubt the possibility of a peaceful settlement with England. We must prepare ourselves for war."

Russia was excluded from Munich, and later approaches were made to the suspicious Soviets which were too little and too late. We can speculate. If Britain and France had made in 1938 the advances to Moscow which they made a year later, would the result have been different? Naturally, the answer is unknown. The fact of history is, however, that with the Munich sell-out Soviet policy was radicially changed. Russia prepared for a time-winning pact with Hitler, who signed his death warrant.

We are best charitable in our judgment of the democratic leaders of the Munich period. We indulge in bitter characterizations of helpless actors in a modern tragedy. The fates had made it so. The players had worried out their parts. And so, to quote the English historian of Munich, Wheeler Bennett:

"Let us say of the Munich Agreement that it was inescapable; that, faced with lack of preparedness in armaments and defenses, with lack of unity at home and in the Commonwealth, with collapse of French morale, and with uncertainty of Russia's capacity to fight, Mr. Chamberlain had no alternative to do other than he did; let us pay tribute to his persistence in carrying out a policy which he honestly believed to be right."

The great ones, however, defy the fates.

Edward J. Sloane,
Chairman, the Northern Virginia Liberal Arts Commission.

Vital Report on Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have just received a report of great interest to every section of the country. I refer to the interim report of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada on the pollution of Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, and the international section of the St. Lawrence River. I urge every Member of the House to read this report. Pollution of our rivers, lakes and streams is not a local problem, nor even a regional problem. As this report makes clear—it is an international problem.

I wish to place in the RECORD the covering statement that accompanied the report. This statement, was written by the Honorable Matthew E. Welsh, the chairman of the U.S. section of the Commission. Mr. Welsh is the distinguished former Governor of Indiana:

INTERIM REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA, ON THE POLLUTION OF LAKE ERIE, LAKE ONTARIO, AND THE INTERNATIONAL SECTION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

The Secretary of State today sent to Congress the interim report of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada (IJC), on the pollution of Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, and the international section of the St. Lawrence River. The report, prepared pursuant to an investigation requested by the two Governments in October 1964, recommends measures which the IJC considers essential at this stage in dealing with pollution of these waters.

Due to the great interest in the subject and the urgent nature of the problems discussed, the report is being released before the respective governmental authorities have completed their studies and recommendations. When the study is completed, the United States will endeavor to reach quick agreement with the Government of Canada on the action to be taken in the light of the Commission's recommendations.

A final report of the Commission will be made to the two Government when the full investigation has been completed. Technical personnel of Federal and State agencies are assisting the IJC in its investigation.

In the interim report, the IJC recommended that the Governments of the United States and Canada, as soon as possible and in association with State and Provincial governments, take appropriate action to insure (a) sufficient purification of all municipal and industrial wastes before discharge into these waters and their tributaries to achieve the maximum possible removal of phosphates; (b) prohibition of the constuction of combined sanitary and storm sewers and initiation of a program of separating existing combined sewers in communities discharging wastes into these waters and their tributaries; and (c) an effective system of regular sampling of effluents discharged into these waters and their tributaries in accordance with programs approved by the Commission.

The Commission also recommended that the two Governments support fully the Commission's program of investigation and research—as outlined in its interim report and as subsequently developed—by the provision of the personnel and facilities required from time to time for its effective implementation.

The recommendation for phosphate removal was prompted by what is known as eutrophication of the lakes and accompanying heavy growths of algae which decay and use up the dissolved oxygen in the lake waters. Eutrophication is the enrichment of waters by nutrients. In the case of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, the nutrients in the form of phosphates are contained in sewage and some industrial wastes. The nutrients, acting as a fertilizer, stimulate the growth of the algae.

The Commission's report states that Lake Erie possessed a high degree of oxygen saturation in 1929, but that 1959 and 1960 surveys indicated an area of 1,600 square miles in which the oxygen concentration was 1 part per million or less. A 1964 survey showed a total of 2,600 square miles, 25 percent of the lake area, had an oxygen level of less than 2 parts per million near the lake bottom. An oxygen level of 4 parts per million is generally considered necessary to support fish life. Existing records do not show any critical dissolved oxygen depletion in the main body of Lake Ontario, the Commission report said.

In the U.S. portion of Lake Erie, about 53 percent of the municipal wastes from a population of 10 million persons receives secondary sewage treatment. Such treatment, which involves biological and chemical action, can remove up to 65 percent of the phosphates from the wastes. About 41 percent of the municipal wastes receives primary treatment, which is less effective, and 6 percent receives no treatment at all. In the Canadian portion of the lake, about 79 percent of the municipal wastes from a population of 1.2 million persons receives secondary treatment, 12 percent receives primary treatment, and 9 percent no treatment.

On the U.S. side of Lake Ontario, about 25 percent of the municipal wastes from a population of 1.8 million persons receives secondary treatment, 72 percent primary treatment, and 3 percent no treatment. On the Canadian side, with a population of 2.5 million, 82 percent of the wastes receive secondary treatment, 17 percent primary treatment, and 1 percent no treatment.

The Commission also reported that 63 sources of industrial wastes on the U.S. side of Lake Erie and 18 on the Canadian side have inadequate waste treatment facilities. No similar data was presented on Lake Ontario.

The Commission also announced it will carry out a three-part program of research and studies examining the pollution problems of Lakes Erie and Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. The first phase involves the collection of data on the extent, origin and location of pollution in these waters. Field studies are now underway. The second phase of the program will involve intensive study of the physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of the lakes and will include an assessment of any pollution abatement measures undertaken. A third phase of the program provides for long-term research on the behavior of the lakes in respect to pollutants and their dispersal.

The Library Comes First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the people of my 10th District in the State of Ohio, have commenced their own war on poverty by using the weapon of better education. One such instance is illustrated by Rio Grande College, a small liberal arts college of 700 students, located on the Western region of Appalachia. For many years Rio Grande College was well known more for their accomplishments on the basketball floor than in the classroom. Yet when money became available to erect a new building on the campus of Rio Grande College, the choice was made not to build a new gymnasium, of which they have none at all, but to erect a new $500,000 library with a capacity of 62,000 volumes.

The students, faculty, and administration of Rio Grande College are to be commended for their contribution to the future intellectual growth of southeastern Ohio. At the dedication of this new edifice, the Honorable Francis Keppel, Assistant Secretary for Education, addressed the gathering with a call to arms for similar building projects on college campuses across the country. I feel that my colleagues in the House will find his speech informative and inspiring and hereby request that it be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech follows:

THE LIBRARY COMES FIRST

(An address by Francis Keppel, Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at the dedication of the Davis Library, Rio Grande College, Rio Grande, Ohio, January 16, 1966)

We meet this afternoon in a new year to dedicate a new building. It is an occasion of pride and celebration for Rio Grande—and for all students, present and future, who will come here in search of learning. For this building, this new library, is truly central to the college and all its promise. Indeed, it could be the college if no other building remained.

With the dedication of Davis Library, you assert that the library comes first, and must come first, if the college is to serve its role in the education of youth. Through the leadership of President Christensen, the contributions of your friends and alumni, an assist from the Federal Government, and a considerable stretching of your budget, you have designed and built a magnificent new structure.

Today's dedication, moreover, demonstrates a lively sense of priorities. Rio Grande is now undergoing the growing pains and growing opportunities that characterize higher education everywhere in America. I am told that you need more classrooms, more dormitory rooms, more equipment for your expanding student body. On the map of your college campus, you have blocked in a space for a new gymnasium and marked it: "Proposed."

But the library is already here in reality—an admirable academic emphasis for the college of "Bevo" Francis, your eminent basketball star of yesteryear, who made it unprofitable for colleges elsewhere to think of beating Rio Grande with scores below 100. I hope you get your new gymnasium soon.

But while the gymnasium waits, Davis Library stands as the dynamic core of your college, as your promise of things to come. Rio Grande, founded 90 years ago, is now moving forward into the most challenging era for higher education in the Nation's history. This small college with its 600 students today—and expectations of twice that number a few years hence—is deeply involved in the future. And it is gallantly struggling to meet it.

This afternoon, I would like to speak briefly about libraries, about our Federal concern for their development throughout our educational enterprise. And then I want to turn to the growing importance of small colleges, to the indispensable role they play in higher education, and to our Nation's responsibility for assuring their future strength.

Rio Grande's new library clearly symbolizes the gathering strength of our small colleges. It represents more than a move from the library floor of an administration building into separate and ample quarters. With its study carrels and seminar rooms, its open stacks and reading patio, the library now becomes, as your president has called it, an "invitation to learning."

What you have achieved here can perhaps best be appreciated in contrast to the academic libraries of the not-so-distant past. As recently as 1938, Chauncey B. Tinker wrote of the typical college library as "a cold and dusty place, where books are locked away in stacks which the students cannot visit and which are too often presided over by a male or female dragon whose obvious aim seems to be to protect them from those who wish to use them."

Tinker went on to recall the college librarian who boasted that all his books except one were securely on the shelves, adding triumphantly: "I know where that one is—and tomorrow the library will be complete."

But today we are coming to see that no library can ever be completed—that the living library is where the books are off the shelves and being read, not on them and gathering dust—that the circulation of books is at least as important as their retrieval and that the role of the modern library is to provide a service, not cold storage.

These are the principles which, I am sure, will direct the use and enjoyment of Davis Library for years to come. They are also the principles underlying specific Federal acts for libraries which were passed by the 88th and the 89th Congresses.

The Higher Education Facilities Act provided $183 million last year in Federal grants and loans for library construction and improvement. These funds, added to $394 million raised by colleges and universities, are now financing the construction of 124 new library buildings and the expansion and modernization of 161 existing libraries. The Rio Grande library is among those assisted through this legislation. Most of these projects will be completed by next summer.

The Library Services and Construction Act last year provided $30 million in Federal grants for public library construction. Together with $70 million in State and local funds, this program is financing 363 public library projects.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, passed last year, provides $100 million this year to improve school library resources through the purchase of books and other instructional materials.

The Higher Education Act, passed near the close of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, authorized $150 million in grants to college and university libraries over the next 3 years for books and other materials; $45 million to train librarians and for library research; and $20 million for improvement of cataloging procedures.

Though Congress authorized these expenditures under the Higher Education Act, it did not actually set aside the necessary funds. The administration will request their appropriation this year.

But with all these new efforts in behalf of libraries, we are still at the launching stage and a long way from orbit. The librarians of the past may have been quiet custodians of silent domains. Their modern-day counterparts, however, are quite vocal. At a recent convention of the American Liberty Association, they were decidedly outspoken about where we are, and where we need to be.

They called for 390 million more books for the Nation's libraries, which now have about 600 million volumes. In higher education alone, they point out, the collections of more than 50 percent of our 4-year colleges and 86 percent of our 2-year colleges do not meet the association's minimum standards.

They called for 100,000 more trained librarians. There are about 70,000 throughout the country today.

They called for a host of innovations—computers for maintaining library records, a wide-ranging cooperative exchange of books and other materials among libraries, the development of facsimile transmission of library materials to any point in the country.

And they called, finally, for a grand total of $3.7 billion in Federal and State aid to bring the Nation's school, college, and public libraries up to the minimum standards required by their function.

The library, of course, is only one of the growing needs of higher education. I trust it will be met. I know it will be met if all our institutions set the priority upon libraries that Rio Grande exemplifies in this new building today.

And now let me turn to my second point—to the role of the small college in higher education, to its major importance at this particular moment in history.

Higher education today is undergoing a period of profound crisis—a time when virtually all resources are in short supply. We are short of classrooms and faculty, short of equipment and funds. We are short of everything except for students—more than 5 million enrolled today; perhaps twice that number a decade hence.

Our chief problem is not whether we can accommodate these exploding enrollments, but how we shall do so. Unless we do so with wisdom and flexibility of mind, we shall remain in danger of spreading ourselves too thin. We shall expand in quantity, but diminish in quality. We shall be offering higher education in name, but mediocre education in fact.

Far too often, in our search for answers to the big problems of higher education, we tend to think that bigness in itself is the only answer. We tend to overlook what must remain one of our most obvious solutions: the small college. Perhaps "dismiss" is a better word than "overlook," for the pessimists among us believe that the small college has a grand past but a dubious future.

If they are right, 60 percent of our university and college students attend dying institutions, the 9 out of 10 with fewer than 5,000 students, and thus classified as small.

I wish these pessimists could be with us this afternoon. Your devotion, your plans for the growth of this small college would surely convert them.

For here at Rio Grande, you are demonstrating that the small college is not an appendage to higher education, but lies at the very heart of the matter, that it offers an invaluable approach toward learning, that its special personality and flavor can distinguish it and all those who come here for knowledge.

The small college, in short, protects higher education against conformity and safeguards the diversity which has been the fundamental strength of American higher learning. The small college has been called, and proudly so, "a center of responsible heresy." I trust it will always uphold this banner of individuality, resisting the conventional or mass-approved or embalmed point of view.

Our national image of higher education is, and should be, a composite of images of individual institutions. No one institution—indeed, no one kind of institution—can be all things to all people. Each has its areas of emphasis and areas of strength. The small college, the large university, the junior college, the graduate school—each has its place in the total enterprise, enabling the individual to choose his course and go as far and as fast as he can toward his personal and intellectual development.

In these days of doubling and redoubling enrollments, many of our universities have grown as large as cities. Often they are just as impersonal. Of course, there is no reason why a huge university should not excel; but it does not follow that it is excellent because it is huge. It is equally true that there is no reason why the small college cannot distinguish itself; but again, it is not good just because it is small.

When excellence is maintained, however, it seems to me that the small college holds a distinct advantage over its outsize brothers in the atmosphere it provides for learning. Its professors and students are citizens of the same intellectual and social community. They meet and exchange ideas with a minimum of self-consciousness, unencumbered by barriers between faculty and student by the impersonality and anonymity that so often typify the huge institutions.

This closeness, this easy rapport and interchange offer a unique stimulus to students for the cultivation of imagination and the development of true individuality. These are the surest guarantees of freedom and diversity in higher education.

Assuredly we shall need these qualities more than ever before as we turn to the small college for the foundations of a new and monumental growth in higher education. We shall need the help of the small college in providing the opportunity to learn—in President Johnson's words—"to every boy and girl born in America up to the highest level they can take."

Your plans for the expansion of Rio Grande College in the years just ahead typify similar projects for the expansion, growth, and creation of public and private colleges all across the country. But I think your prospects are better than most. You have almost a century of traditional respect for quality to draw upon. You know that quality must be raised as quantity increases. And you have devoted and loyal friends and alumni to support your determination.

I wish that your determination and wisdom in the assignment of priorities characterized all our efforts to expand higher education. We turn now to the small colleges for a monumental task. But if we want them to succeed, clearly we shall need to support them with a major effort on the part of our communities, States, regions, and the Federal Government as well. The business of higher education today is truly the Nation's business. It concerns us all.

Many of our smaller institutions of higher learning are now striving desperately to reach high standards of quality, but lack the resources to do so. Hundreds of our junior colleges lack the teaching personnel they must have to meet the responsibility we are placing upon them.

Therefore, we must seek a new working partnership between our stronger, developed institutions and our developing colleges. The Higher Education Act, of which I spoke earlier, recognizes the need for this partnership and provides funds for the exchange between these institutions of faculty and students, the joint use of libraries and laboratories, the introduction of new curriculums, and other programs. The act also offers national teaching fellowships to enable select graduate students and junior faculty members to teach at developing colleges.

These Federal funds and programs offer no panacea. They provide seed money and, we hope, stimulus. But the only sure path to success is through the determination of our States and regions to form new partnership compacts among all institutions of higher education, whether public or private, endowed or land-grant, to strengthen higher education in all respects.

This is a task we should approach with high purpose and also with humility. We, as educators, have not set the pace for higher education. It has been set for us by our society and by our youth, whose expectations of us are great. Should we expect anything less of ourselves than to fulfill these hopes?

Here at Rio Grande, we assemble not only to dedicate a library, but also, I believe, in tribute to the role you have played in the past in education, and to your eagerness to seek new ways for the future. You have not waited upon Federal funds and programs to prescribe your plans or to generate your progress. You are helping to lead the way.

Rio Grande has been concerned from its earliest days with the training and the quality of Ohio's teachers. For 90 years you have been sending teachers into the schools of your State and region. Your graduates have instructed hundreds of thousands of young Americans.

Today, through your initiative and energy, you instruct us all that the expectations of our youth for higher education will not be disappointed, that our hopes for this Nation will be met, that we shall enter together the most exciling era in the annals of American education.

Henry Adams said: "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops."

And so may it be with this new library and with this small college, renewed for its appointment with greatness. May its influence and wisdom so far beyond this point in time, fulfilling tomorrow the vision you hold for it today.

One Way To Save More Than $100 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, last week columnist Hob W. Anderson commented sharply and critically on a situation that has caused me, and I am sure many of you, grave concern. In his column of February 1, which appeared in the Baltimore Morning Sun, Mr. Anderson pointed up the need for serious thinking about the possibility of setting up a feeder system of helicopters or other vertical-lift aircraft as a major shuttle service for passengers between Washington National Airport and Friendship International Airport and Dulles International Airport.

The columnist points out:

> With such a system in operation Washington National could be changed from a dangerous commercial airline field to a safe and convenient general aviation field and heliport.

This system would not only cost far less than the ill-conceived and impractical proposals to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to convert Washington National Airport for limited jet service but would also provide a stimulus for the increased growth and use of two of America's most modern airports: Nearby Friendship International and Dulles.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anderson's column follows:

A Feeder System for Two Airports

(By Hob W. Anderson)

The time has come for someone in authority to think seriously about the possibility of setting up a feeder system of helicopters or VTOL craft to take passengers in the Baltimore-Washington area to Friendship International Airport and to Dulles International Airport. The time is ripe because the Federal Aviation Agency is thinking about spending in the neighborhood of $50 million to modernize Washington National Airport to receive the 15 million passengers a year which it thinks will want to use the field by 1980.

It has been reported that a feasibility study conducted by Operations Research, Inc., recommended that the FAA spend $150 million on National. But the study says that the public will benefit by $150 million if National is kept open as a commercial field with medium-range jet service. The consultants arrived at this figure by estimating the average cost of traveling to Friendship or Dulles from various points in and around Washington. They multiplied this average cost times the number of such trips they expect will be made by the public up to 1980.

The figure of $50 million is what FAA officials estimate they might have to spend on National after thorough engineering studies are made. Nevertheless, the sum of $50 million is a large one, and when it is proposed for an unnecessary project it should give pause to every citizen who worries and wonders about where his tax dollars go.

If there were no other airports in the Baltimore-Washington area, the advisability of spending $50 million to modernize a dangerously located field such as Washington National would be dubious. Such a proposal becomes transparently inadvisable, however, in view of the fact that two of the most modern, most underused jet airports in the world are within a 12-minute helicopter flight of Washington National.

With two-fifths of the money the FAA plans to spend on National, it could set up a helicopter or VTOL feeder system that could shuttle 3 million passengers a year from Washington to either Friendship or Dulles, at a cost of $6 or less for each passenger. With four-fifths of the proposed expenditure of $50 million, a system could be set up to handle 7 million passengers, a figure equal to the total traffic at National last year.

These figures are based on estimates by the companies that either operate metropolitan feeder systems already, or are applying to the Civil Aeronautics Board to operate in this area. The network could easily be expanded to shuttle passengers from Baltimore to either airport, or from airport to airport. If demand were as great as the FAA seems to think it would be, helipads might even be set up at central suburban points.

With such a system, a Congressman could step outside his office and be at Dulles in 11 minutes or at Friendship in 12 minutes. A businessman in Arlington, Silver Spring, or another suburban area could go to his district's nearby helipad and be at either airport in about the same time.

With such a system in operation, Washington National could be changed from a dangerous commercial airline field, to a safe and convenient general aviation field and heliport. This feeder system, turned over to a private firm for management or even operated by the Government, is the logical way to deal with the problem of keeping airports away from people without keeping people away from airports. In time the system could only improve as the helicopters and VTOL craft available for the job became bigger and faster. The 15 million passengers which the FAA says would want to use Washington National by 1980 would then be divided between Friendship and Dulles, bringing total passenger traffic at each to about 10 million a year by 1980.

This passenger level would bring each airport up to about two-thirds of its potential capacity. It would not overtax the facilities at either, but it would make both airports bustling, viable centers of transportation. The airlines, languishing at lonely Dulles, would doubtless be delighted to contribute something to the cost of running a helicopter/VTOL feeder system which would pour moneymaking traffic into the huge Federal airport. With such increased traffic at both airports, schedules at both would improve markedly. A truly satisfactory variety of flights to nearly every point could be offered.

The question is, if all these benefits would accrue from the plan just outlined, why does the FAA persist in its attempts to modernize and expand Washington National? Nobody seems to know—but somebody ought to find out.

Philadelphia, the "Showcase" of Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that my home city, Philadelphia, has been held up as the showcase of urban renewal and has been credited with having the best city planning of any city in the Nation. During the past year or so a dozen national and international magazines, reporting on the problems of American cities, have pointed to Philadelphia as the outstanding example of what can be done to correct the mistakes and neglect of the past. In addition to these words of praise, there have been other honors bestowed on Philadelphia—such as awards for excellence in architecture and urban design. Most recently, the American Institute of Architects chose the Washington Square East urban renewal project for special commendation. The citation accompanying the award referred particularly to the successful blending of old and new buildings in this historic area of the city.

Within the Washington Square East project is a section known as "Society Hill," one of the oldest sections of Philadelphia, where many lovely old homes still remain. Like many older portions of cities, Society Hill suffered from deterioration and decay. When the area was being studied for renewal and upgrading, one underlying objective was set forth. The historic structures in the area must be preserved and restored. The Redevelopment Authority, citizens groups like the Old Philadelphia Development Corp., and the planning commission are all banded together to achieve this result. The Federal authorities provided sympathetic support and assistance.

Success of the project and its objectives is assured. A recent article in Business Week, entitled "Where Urban Renewal Brings History to Life," reports on what is happening in this historic section of America's most historic city. I would like to insert this article in the Record at the end of my statement.

These outstanding accomplishments did not just happen. They were made possible by the great leadership our city has enjoyed in recent years. First begun under Mayor Clark, then continued under Mayor Dilworth, our outstanding urban renewal and rehabilitation program has been brought to its present level of achievement by our great Mayor, Jim Tate.

Those of us who know how our housing and urban renewal programs work realize full well that the Federal aid is only one ingredient of success. The actual work, the imagination, and the initiative must come from the local level, and the degree of success achieved is dependent upon the quality of local leadership. Philadelphia is fortunate to have a mayor of the outstanding caliber of James Tate. His vision, his skill and his determination to make Philadelphia an ever better place in which to live and work is the key element in our city's progress.

The article follows:

[From Business Week, Oct. 23, 1965]

WHERE URBAN RENEWAL BRINGS HISTORY TO LIFE

Society Hill is providing homes for affluent and influential Philadelphians. It's a combination of the old city revived and towering modern units that help build a sound tax base.

A senior partner in a New York Stock Exchange member firm and former chairman of the exchange's board of governors is a busy man. But, despite the bantering of friends, Henry M. Watts, Jr., does not begrudge the 4 hours a day and more he spends commuting between his home in downtown Philadelphia and Wall Street.

Like growing numbers of affluent and influential Philadelphians, Watts has been caught up by the lure of what is probably the country's most unusual and most successful urban renewal development project—the 100 history-packed acres of Society Hill in Philadelphia's oldest section. What draws him there is his new home a colonial reproduction set among some 800 such reproduced and restored originals dating from the 18th and early 19th centuries.

In Society Hill, Watts is surrounded by living history, for the streets and alleys of what was once William Penn's "greene countrie town"—now being restored to their early American splendor—were witnesses to many stirring events of the Nation's colonial and early Federal periods. Independence Hall is just off to one side of the area.

Firm pattern

About $30-million of public funds and perhaps $165-million to $180-million of private money have gone into Society Hill, which in recent months has really begun to take shape as a sort of living Williamsburg or Old Sturbridge—with apartment towers to keep it in the 20th century.

Such men as Watts have laid out an average $30,000 to $40,000 to build copies of old homes or restore colonial and Federal houses of the area. Large developers have joined in: Alcoa Residences, Inc., has so far spent upward of $17-million on three 32-story apartment towers and some townhouses.

To assure overall unity of design, all building plans must conform to standards set by the city's redevelopment authority and the Old Philadelphia Development Corp.

About two-thirds of the Hill development—its official tag is Washington Square East—is rehabilitation, the rest new construction. At present, the whole project is about a third complete, with 1,300 apartment units and well over 100 new townhouses finished.

But there are still scars of less than a decade ago, when the section was a residential, commercial, and industrial slum, filled with dingy taprooms, subdivided and overcrowded apartments.

"The pattern of redevelopment has been firmly set," says William L. Day, chairman of Philadelphia's largest bank, the First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co., "though it may take several more years to complete Society Hill."

Part of a whole

The hammers, saws, and drills of Society Hill are not banging out a lonely tune. The reconstruction is part of Philadelphia's postwar urban renewal splurge, in which the city claims honors as:

First in the United States to establish a formal redevelopment agency, the redevelopment authority, and first to set up a renewal program.

First to complete a project under Federal urban renewal laws.

First to make land available for public housing through urban renewal, to incorporate industrial and commercial renewal with residential programs, and to relate these to a master plan for the city.

First to set up a conservation approach to renewal in a formal program of rehabilitating good old structures, demolishing only what was beyond saving.

In all this, Philadelphia has had an active, community-conscious business leadership, and pressure from community organizations has been strong. Perhaps the most powerful group of this type is the Old Philadelphia Development Corp., started in 1956 by 60 business leaders to oversee the city's execution of the plan for Society Hill. Banker William Day is now its president.

I. HOW HISTORY WAS REBUILT

Because of its concentrated historical heritage, Society Hill presented Philadelphia's planners with a special problem: How to preserve the history, with its lure for tourist dollars, while making the area an economically sound tax producer.

The answer was to combine old and new. Preservation of historically significant structures would go on simultaneously with construction of new homes and apartment houses. The common denominator would be design; that's why every structure, new or rehabilitated, has to be approved by the city and fit the tone and scale of the Hill.

Beginnings

The story of Society Hill goes back to 1948, when the city planning commission certified the project. Then the redevelopment authority started feasibility studies and detailed planning. In Philadelphia, urban renewal is basically run in tandem. The planning commission makes the large-scale project decisions, determining the general principles of land usage. The authority carries out the plans in detail, making house-by-house decisions, and it has the power to acquire land by condemnation.

In Society Hill, things moved slowly, for two reasons. Federal enabling legislation for conservation and rehabilitation of blighted areas was not passed until 1954. And since the project was a pioneering effort in combining rehabilitation with new building, it took time to work out procedures for developers. Meanwhile, speculators began to buy and property values climbed.

In 1956, the Old Philadelphia Development Corp., with its business leadership, came into being to push things along. OPDC—with an annual budget of $100,000, supplied by contributions from business—now acts as official consultant to the redevelopment authority.

Full speed

When the authority finally got going in the late 1950's, it moved fast. It acquired 31 acres in the rundown Dock Street area between 1957 and 1959, advertised for design proposals for that area in 1958, and by yearend awarded the tract to Webb & Knapp and another developer. Webb & Knapp bought the stock of the other company, but then sold out to Alcoa residences.

In 1959, the wreckers got busy, and the ancient, rat-infested Dock Street markets came down. Alcoa broke ground on the site in 1962 for 25 townhouses designed by architect I. M. Pei and the following year built its tower apartments. The rebuilders of the Hill had actually got going in 1961 at Hopkinson House, a $10 million privately financed apartment structure a few blocks along Spruce Street from the Alcoa development.

With these big developments humming, more and more individuals jumped in to restore old townhouses, or build new reproductions.

Toeing the mark

Normally, indivduals would go to the redevelopment authority or its agent, the Old Philadelphia Development Corp.—though they could also buy from private owners. In all, the authority now has acquired 54 acres in Society Hill, and plans to get 4 more next year.

About 40 acres in parcels dotted throughout the area remain in the hands of real estate companies or individuals. Old residents wanting to stay had to agree to fix up their houses as the authority specified. Those who wouldn't take the pledge were bought out.

Everyone—old residents, developers, individuals buying from the authority or from private owners— must abide by the authority's rigid standards. The authority is a county as well as city agency, and under a State law counties can compel private owners to adhere to redevelopment plans. So all plans must get the OK of the authority's advisory design board as to use, scale, and compatibility.

For a "historically significant" house of the Colonial or early Federal period, plans must also go to the city historical commission, which wants to get each house back to what it was in its best days. The commission will go so far as to permit modern plumbing, but such latter-day contrivances as elevators are out.

Theoretically, remaining private owners can set their own price on sales, but the levels established by the redevelopment authority tend to keep everybody in line. Speculation no longer is a factor.

II. PROSPERING COMMUNITY

While the past is very much present in Society Hill today, the keynote is acceleration. Just recently, the local residential builder, Solomon Bronstein, broke ground for the first thirty-three or one hundred and thirteen 3-story homes, to be priced around $32,000. Renewal experts forecast that in 5 years the Hill will boast well over 2,000 apartment units, 400 or so new townhouses, and close to 800 rehabilitated structures.

One measure of Society Hill's success is that private investment—a good yardstick in urban renewal—is running at $5.50 to $6 for every dollar of public funds, almost double the national 3-to-1 average, according to Bernard Meltzer, research director of a big Philadelphia realty company. That would put the investment of individuals and developers at $165 to $180 million. Some have spent up to $200,000 to restore a house.

Land values in the area have climbed from $150 a front foot in 1950 to the $400-to-$500 range now. First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust, not involved in the Hill 3 years ago, now calls it a good risk area.

Community

The "amazing amount of personal investment," as one banker puts it, helps to account for the Hill's strong community spirit.

There are, of course, drawbacks—such as high mortgage and insurance rates that have characterized the area until recently; and inflated property values, resulting from nearly speculation. William J. Eiman, of Menley & James Laboratories, an enthusiastic Hill resident, says there has been laxity in enforcing rehabilitation standards. Others complain that fixing up an old shell is much too complicated for an individual.

But Society Hill people would rather fight than switch, and fight they do. The most recent victory of Hill residents and OPDC was a decision to depress a section of the new Delaware Expressway between the Hill and the river.

Current Manpower Issues in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, last Friday at the Officers' Club at Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va., it was my great privilege to hear our colleague, the Honorable DAVID N. HENDERSON, of North Carolina, deliver a speech entitled "Current Manpower Issues in the Federal Government" to the Hampton Roads Federal Personnel Council. His audience included a large group of Federal personnel managers of Government installations who have the tremendous responsibility of implementing the laws which we, here in Congress, enact. Congressman HENDERSON, as chairman of the Manpower Subcommittee, of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, provided his audience with a speech which was both informative and interesting and I think our colleagues in the Congress would also like to have the opportunity of reading it. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include it herewith in the RECORD:

CURRENT MANPOWER ISSUES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(By Hon. DAVID N. HENDERSON, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the Manpower Subcommittee, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Before Hampton Roads Federal Personnel Council)

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, and fellow Government workers, I appreciate this opportunity to visit the Tidewater section of Virginia and to meet the friends and constituents of two of our most able Congressmen—PORTER HARDY and TOM DOWNING. It is always a pleasure to work with these gentlemen and I am sure you share my appreciation of their fine contributions for an efficient and responsive Federal Government.

It is an honor to me for you to recognize me as chairman of the Manpower Subcommittee and I treasure this opportunity to discuss some of the work of the subcommittee and to indicate our latest findings and reactions in the broad area of manpower management in the Federal Government.

AIMS AND INTEREST OF MANPOWER SUBCOMMITTEE

It has been my pleasure to have been a member of the Manpower Subcommittee for the past 7 years and to have been chairman for the last 3 years. The subcommittee was established in 1955 and has been active ever since in the utilization of manpower in the Government. Basically, the objective of the subcommittee is to improve the management of our personnel resources in the Federal Government and by so doing to provide the best possible services to the public at the least possible cost, to improve working conditions and promotional opportunities for Federal employees, and to guarantee to the American people the best possible defense posture.

Within recent years the subcommittee has been quite interested in such areas as: use of active duty military personnel in support-type jobs, the development of total labor costs, the use of contractors to perform work historically and successfully accomplished by Government employees, simplification of personnel administrative techniques, employee promotional opportunities, and employee productivity.

I especially appreciate meeting and discussing Federal personnel problems with management officials like yourselves. These occasions provide me with realistic pictures and opportunities to learn first hand of the problems that you face. In fact, since becoming chairman, it has been my operating plan to have the members and staff of our subcommittee visit as many Government field activities as possible and talk to both management officials and employee groups. It was my pleasure to speak to the Federal Personnel Council of North Carolina in December. We find this approach, with emphasis on cooperation between management and the subcommittee to be of key importance in our operations.

I would like today to share with you some of the current manpower issues in the Federal Government, reviewing these issues from two different standpoints. Let us first review recent changes in manpower management in the Federal Government and then review some of the problems that are in need of review and possible change.

EXAMPLES OF IMPROVED MANPOWER MANAGEMENT

From a positive standpoint, the Manpower Subcommittee has for a number of years served as a clearinghouse among the departments and agencies for the dissemination of examples of improved manpower management. Interesting and effective ways in which you do a job in your activity are sent to your home office and then on to our subcommittee. Just last week the subcommittee changed the reporting period from quarterly to semiannually. This, we feel, is more realistic and economical. Every 6 months we issue a consolidated report reflecting the latest examples of improved management. These consolidated reports are also distributed to the departments and agencies as well as to many libraries and schools across the country in order that the exchange of information will result in further improvements throughout the Federal Government. I am very much in favor of this because I want the public to know more about the fine work that is being performed by dedicated Federal employees. In my opinion, there is too little publicity of this type given Government personnel.

In reading our latest report, reflecting work you did in 1965 you will learn that the Department of Commerce by centralizing its procurement program will save almost $1 million a year. You find that the Small Business Administration has developed a technique for using housewives on a part-time basis which results in minimum labor costs and yet an improved service to the Government. Our report shows that out in California through the ingenuity of an employee of the Department of Interior, the movement of drilling rigs through the mountains of that State has been cut from 2 weeks to 2 hours by the use of helicopters.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT DEVELOPS TOTAL LABOR COSTS

Now let us turn to some other aspects of improved management in the Federal Government. In 1964 and 1965 the subcommittee held extensive hearings relative to the manner in which the Department of Defense determined its total labor costs. During the course of these hearings it was quickly determined that the military services were using interchangeably three main sources of labor; namely, the civil service employee, the active-duty military man, and the employee furnished by cotnractor. Two Assistant Secretaries of Defense, in their testimony before our subcommittee, indicated that top management, including the Bureau of the Budget, actually did not know to what extent military personnel or contractor employees were being used in support-type work in the Defense Department. As a result of our hearings and at the request of our subcommittee, Secretary McNamara established a blue ribbon, ad hoc committee to look at this problem of determining total labor costs.

The results of Secretary McNamara's effort have been quite evident. The Department of Defense is now well on its way in developing comparative costs between these three sources of labor. The Secretary is now being provided more data on the use of military and contractor personnel in the Defense Establishment.

ILLEGALITY OF CONTRACTS FOR PERSONNEL

Our subcommittee issued a rather strong report last March in this area and indicated that far too much emphasis was being placed on controlling the head count of civil service employees and too little on the total labor cost in the Defense Establishment. We went further and asked the Comptroller General of the United States to determine the legality of contracts by the Government with private firms to merely furnish people to work under the supervision of Government personnel.

The Comptroller General advised me last spring, concurring in an opinion of the General Counsel of the U.S. Civil Service Commission that contracts, such as I described above, were illegal and contrary to the Civil-Service Commission laws and regulations, the Veterans' Preference Act, and the Lloyd-LaFollette Act.

This decision was well publicized by our subcommittee and was given immediate attention in many areas of the executive branch. For example, Secretary McNamara has ordered that all such contracts be terminated not later than June 30, 1966. These contracts are now being phased out throughout the military services. This action according to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, will represent an annual savings in excess of $35 million to the taxpayer. Career civilian employees will replace 8,300 technicians who in the past have been furnished by private firms.

REPLACING MILITARY PERSONNEL IN CIVILIAN-TYPE JOBS

Over the years our subcommittee has seen, firsthand, numerous instances of active duty military personnel, trained for combat operations, performing such duties as: carpentering, painting, laying brick, drawing statistical graphs, chauffering cars, answering the telephone, operating office equipment, and many other nonmilitary assignments. With the Vietnam impact, the members of our subcommittee concluded that it was time to take a hard look at the number of military people performing these civilian-type jobs. As a result, I sent a letter to Secretary McNamara on August 4, 1965, questioning the continued drafting of young men inasmuch as we had thousands of men trained for combat but assigned to work in civilian-type jobs. And, may I add, President Johnson at about the same time also sent a letter to Secretary McNamara urging more effective use of combat-trained military people. This has now resulted in a program in the Defense Department whereby 74,000 military personnel, currently working in support-type jobs, will be replaced on or before December 1966, by some 60,000 civilians. We have been advised by Department of Defense officials that this program is definitely now underway and should not only save the Government many millions of dollars but also will improve our military posture.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY CHANGES

I do not want to give the impression that all of our work is confined to the Department of Defense—it just so happens that the Defense Department is by far the Federal Government's largest employer with the largest budget and as such draws a considerable amount of our subcommittee's interest and time. However, the Federal Aviation Agency last year, working closely with our subcommittee, reviewed over 110 positions being filled by contractor employees and as a result of this review abolished about 90 of the jobs and filled the remainder with their own employees at an annual savings of $3½ million.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION PLANS EMPLOYMENT CENTERS

I am also happy to note another area of improvement in our Federal personnel picture. At the present time there is no metropolitan area in the United States where the public can find in one centralized place, the number and type of job vacancies in the departments and agencies of the Federal Government in that labor market area. Through technological improvements and automation we have today at your fingertips, so to speak, all kinds of information except data relating to our most important resource—our employees. Chairman Macy has indicated to me that as a result of our suggestion he is going to establish employment centers in the larger metropolitan areas where centralized Government job vacancy data will be available.

There are at present some 670 boards of examiners, exclusive of the Post Office Department, operated by employees of the departments and agencies that use these boards. For example, in the Kansas City area there are 13 of these boards to service 12 Federal agencies. Chairman Macy has indicated to me that the Commission is going to reduce the 670 boards to about 60, to be located in the employment centers in the metropolitan areas. The boards will be run by full-time Civil Service Commission personnel.

I believe that this personnel administrative change will not only provide better service to the public but also guarantee a higher quality of applicants for the Government.

I wish now to discuss with you some of the current manpower issues in the Federal Government that are in need of change, and, I suspect that there will be some changes made in this session of the Congress in several of these areas.

CENTRALIZED CONTROL OF MANPOWER

Our subcommittee has noted the need for greater delegation of authority for handling employees. Managers of Government activities out in the field have frequently indicated that they lack enough authority. This has become increasingly evident because the Bureau of the Budget has initiated tighter controls over classified pay grades, average pay, and the number of civilian employees on the payroll. The subcommittee has frequently called on the Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Service Commission, as well as top management throughout the executive branch, to exercise more positive and realistic controls over pay grades. In fact, in 1958 the subcommittee warned the Bureau and the Commission that, unless they exercised tighter controls over pay grades, an inflationary spiral would result. All of you know that both the Bureau and the Commission failed for several years to tighten the controls with the result an inflationary spiral did take place. Now, all of a sudden you find a relatively tighter control being handed down from the Washington level. This obviously means less and less management flexibility at the field activities. Our subcommittee learned of a large service agency in the Federal Government where the regional directors must go through headquarters in Washington to make the slightest adjustment in their personnel staffing. In another instance, the manager of a Government facility with over 5,000 employees has spent an unreasonable amount of time trying to reduce the average pay grade at the facility from GS 8.4 to GS 8.0. I am, certainly, in favor of some control of our Government's manpower resources. But, I feel inclined to question the practicality of specific controls, such as I have indicated, unless such controls reflect the current and realistic experiences of local management officials.

MORE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES NEED TOTAL LABOR COST DATA

Even though the Secretary of Defense has taken an important step forward in the development of total labor costs in that department, I feel that there remains a significant weakness throughout many of the other departments and agencies resulting from a lack of data on total labor costs. Apparently, we, in and out of the Federal Government, have spent so much time in recent years worrying about the widely publicized increased civilian employment in the Government that at times we have overlooked the basic issue—total labor costs. In fact, time and again, we have witnessed pressure in many departments and agencies to maintain a tighter control over the number of direct-hire civilian personnel than over labor dollars.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET POLICY ON PERSONAL SERVICES

In my opinion, some degree of improvement can be achieved rather quickly in this manpower area by the following actions: (1) A revision of the Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60-2, which relates to contracting policies for personal services, and (2) a more realistic and flexible approach to personnel ceilings.

I would like to point out at this time that the Bureau of the Budget policy relating to the procurement of manpower for personal services has not been revised since 1959. The general impression of this current policy is that the responsibility is placed on Federal management to show why a job should not be contracted out. May I add that recently the Comptroller General in a decision relating to a specific case in the Veterans' Administration involving laundry services operations pointed up the fact that the current BOB policy was unrealistic and served to inflate Government costs.

In final analysis, one of the basic tests whether a job is to be performed by civil service employees or by contractor personnel should be the ultimate cost of doing the job. What does it mean to the taxpayer? There are, of course, many jobs that are an inherent part of the Government that must always be performed by Government employees, military and civilian. But, this is, of course, no excuse for not doing the most effective and efficient job possible, with the resources at hand.

HIRING OF RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

The law clearly specifies that retired military may be hired and may draw both the salary of the civilian position and the military retirement, subject to some reduction in the case of members of the regular services.

Further, the retired military may be hired the day following retirement, except by the Defense Departments, where a 6-month waiting period is required, subject to exception in justified cases.

We recognize the fact that retired military personnel are a good source of recruitment for experienced personnel for civilian positions at Defense Department installations. Here is where our primary interest in this matter lies—to see that all qualified applicants are given fair consideration and that the best are selected. We have seen many cases, in the past, where the "buddy" system has been the basis of selection. We feel that the integrity of the civil service system must be preserved.

Likewise, in the case of promotions, we are working to support the various merit promotion systems.

WAGE BOARD PAY PROCEDURES NEED REVISING

The pay procedures for laborers and craftsmen, commonly known as Wage Board employees, numbering in excess of 600,000 working for the Federal Government, are in need of revision. It has become increasingly difficult to explain to the public why the same job in the same city, but with a different Federal agency, should have different hourly rates of pay. I understand that there is as much as 80 cents an hour difference in the hourly rate of pay in the Washington, D.C., area for food handlers in Government hospitals. In place of a single wage board administering unified wage board pay procedures the Federal Government now has at least six to eight different systems. The Department of Defense actually has two distinct systems—the Navy, and the Army-Air Force. Such a duplication, aside from the lack of uniformity, places an additional financial burden on the public. I have been told by my staff that this fall the Federal Government conducted three different wage board surveys in the Seattle labor market area. In December, as subcommittee chairman, I indicated to President Johnson my approval of his program to improve the diverse wage board pay systems in the departments and agencies.

I think we can expect to see some changes in the wage board pay setting principles in the not too distant future, including a single wage board pay system in the Department of Defense.

SUMMARY

In summary, I would like to state that our subcommittee is receiving excellent cooperation from the majority of the departments and agencies in the executive branch. We have frequently noted a willingness on the part of management to make changes when changes were for the benefit of the public and reflected improved operating economies.

Our subcommittee is going to continue to review the manpower practices of the executive branch. I expect that our subcommittee during 1966 will devote considerable effort in review of such manpower areas as:

Effects of depressed or unrealistic civilian personnel ceilings. Wage board pay procedures. Use of contractor employees. Replacement of military with civil service employees. Hiring of retired military personnel into civil service jobs, and, requirements for additional supergrades.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I again thank you for this opportunity of exploring with you tonight some of the basic manpower management problems in this big, complex Government of ours. We accomplished a great deal in 1965 and with the cooperation of people like you, there should be even greater accomplishments in 1966.

Citation to S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc., Racine, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc., of Racine, through its waxes and other products, is one of the best known companies located in my congressional district.

Little known to many, however, is the fact that the Johnson Co. is also a leader in many other fields, primarily through the Johnson Foundation.

On January 17 this company was awarded the 1966 Institute of International Education—Reader's Digest Foundation Distinguished Service Award in International Education at a dinner in New York. Acceptance of the award was made by Mr. Howard M. Packard, the company's president. Congratulations are extended them for this honor.

In order that others might be made aware of this facet of humanitarian work by S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc., the complete text of the citational follows:

CITATION TO A CORPORATION FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

To S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc., of Racine, Wis., an American corporation whose support of international education through its foundation has far-reaching impact on world understanding, the Institute of International Education and the Reader's Digest Foundation present their award for distinguished service.

The company's long record of philanthropic interest in education dates back to the 19th century when Samuel Curtis Johnson, who founded the Johnson Co. in 1886, actively supported local church and youth groups and gave assistance to the Piney Woods Country Life School for Negro children in Braxton, Miss. His son, Herbert, carried on the tradition of service, and his grandson, H. F. Johnson, current chairman of the Johnson Co., established the first Johnson Foundation in 1937.

The company, which manufactures wax products and other chemical specialties, was the foundation's principal contributor. For 21 years, it conducted educational and philanthropic programs. In 1958, the Johnson Foundation was incorporated; Wingspread, the home of the Johnson family, was converted to an educational center; and the base of activities was broadened. Since then, the foundation has taken on a significant new dimension, particularly in its international programs which are designed to increase meaningful communication between the United States and its world neighbors.

The Johnson Foundation's statement of purpose declares it to be "an instrument for creative programs which serve man." Vital to this purpose is "the well-being of man in world society through the skillful use of his productive capacity, his constant growth in mind and spirit."

To achieve its goals, the Johnson Foundation directs its resources toward five broad areas of program activity: international understanding, educational excellence, intellectual and cultural growth, improvement of the human environment, and scholarship support.

Its work for improved understanding and tolerance among peoples of the world has motivated the foundation to convene world leaders for numerous conferences, in cooperation with other institutions. The foundation has also given grants to a number of organizations working in the area of international understanding. To encourage educational excellence, the foundation has made important contributions-to State and national institutions of higher learning. Grants have been made for conferences, meetings, symposiums, studies, library accessions and campus lectures. Supplementing these are scholarship programs enabling foreign undergraduate and graduate students and advanced scholars to study in the United States, study grants to members of the teaching profession, and fellowships for study and experience in the United States for persons of evident leadership capacity in other countries.

Intellectual and cultural growth and the improvement of the human environment are also concerns the foundation through its many programs which are guided by its vigorous president, Leslie Paffrath.

Because funds which support the present work of this outstanding foundation are provided by members of the Johnson family and are voted by the board of directors of S. C. Johnson & Son., Inc., IIE and the Reader's Digest Foundation believe that the corporation signally merits their award for distingushed service.

Where Does the Contempt Lie?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days the House will once again be asked to certify contempt citations offered by the House Un-American Activities Committee against two men and a woman who refused to testify in the open hearings in Chicago last May.

At the time of the hearings, the Chicago newspapers decried the proceedings. In an angry editorial the Chicago Daily News suggested that the matter at least be transferred to the Judiciary Committee "where hearings would be conducted more fairly."

With the contempt citations pending, this issue is now one which concerns the whole Nation. Today, the New York Times criticized the committee and the citations editorially. The editorial even went a step further. It condemned the smugness of a Congress which would certify the actions of such an irresponsible committee:

> The House—routinely, mechanically, irresponsibly—has acceded to every request.

It wrote:

> The House runs the danger of bringing itself and its own procedures into contempt.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD in the hope that all of my colleagues will have a chance to read it and think about it before they vote. It follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 8, 1966]

WHERE DOES THE CONTEMPT LIE?

The House of Representatives votes tomorrow on a resolution to cite three Chicago residents for contempt of Congress for their refusal to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The committee wishes to cite Dr. Jeremiah R. Stamler, who has won awards for his research as head of the heart disease control program of the Chicago Board of Health, and two of his associates. They were subpenaed to appear before the committee last May 25, as part of a series of hearings on communism in the Chicago area. The U.S. district court refused to enjoin enforcement of the subpena, but an appeal is now pending. More than 100 law professors have signed a letter stating their opinion that there is a reasonable prospect that the Supreme Court may uphold Dr. Stamler and his associates.

A contempt citation at this time would in no way clarify the important constitutional issues nor would it provide information for a committee of the House. A contempt citation is a serious action. Like a grand jury indictment, it is not definitive, but it begins a process of judicial action that can lead to fine or imprisonment and, at the very least, it damages one's personal reputation. When it cites for contempt, the House is exercising one of its gravest powers against a private citizen.

In the past 15 years the Un-American Activities Committee has asked the House to cite 129 individuals for contempt and the House—routinely, mechanically, irresponsibly—has acceded to every request. Yet only nine of these citations resulted in final convictions.

Last week's action against seven leaders of the Ku Klux Klan was typical. Members of the House freely admitted that they had had no opportunity "to study all these citations, the statements of fact, or the hearings from which these citations have come," as one Representative expressed it. Yet the Members shouted down a sensible proposal to refer the cases to a select committee for review and voted instead to send them on their way to the Justice Department.

There is neither necessity nor sound historical precedent for such conduct. The House runs the danger of bringing itself and its own procedures into contemp. That is a far deeper wound on the body of free government than any recalcitrant witness could inflict.

Some Things the President Did Not Tell the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence has for many years commented on the news from the Nation's Capital. His remarks are always worth reading and I especially recommend his comments on President Johnson's message on the state of the Union:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Jan. 20, 1966]

SOME THINGS THE PRESIDENT DID NOT TELL THE NATION

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—What President Johnson told the American people in his address to Congress last week was only part of the story that affects their pocketbooks and their future.

The omissions on some very important subjects can be enumerated as follows:

First. The President didn't tell why he wants to open up trade between the United States and Eastern Europe as well as the Soviet Union, notwithstanding the fact that the Moscow government is supplying arms and ammunition to help kill American boys in Vietnam.

Second. The President didn't mention that the current budget, ending June 30 of this year, will show a deficit of $6.4 billion but said that the deficit in the budget which begins July 1, 1966, and ends June 30, 1967, is expected to be what he describes as "one of the lowest in many years," or "only $1.8 billion." He didn't point out that these figures are, of course, based on estimates now as to what taxes will be collected. Mr. Johnson, in January 1965, predicted a deficit of $5.3 billion in the budget for the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 1966, but it now is official that the deficit will be $6.4 billion.

3. The President didn't tell the people what he meant when he said that "on a cash basis" the Federal budget next year "will actually show a surplus." He didn't explain that all the money received from social security—including a substantial increase in such taxes this year—should really be kept apart as a trust fund to pay benefits due taxpayers when they retire.

4. The President didn't explain how it happens that the after-tax earnings of corporations for the past 5 years "have been up 65 percent and last year alone they had a rise of 20 percent." He didn't mention that the total number of corporations in the United States increases with the population and that a numerical accumulation of profits does not tell the whole story.

The significant fact happens to be that the rate of return on money invested is not up to what it was 15 years ago.

5. The President didn't give the American people an explanation of what the effect will be of his proposal to make changes in the withholding system "so that Americans can more realistically pay as they go." What it means is that a larger amount will be withheld from an employee's earnings and paid currently to the Government so that the take-home pay will be less for many individuals.

6. The President didn't spell out what he meant when he said that he would ask Congress "to consider measures which, without improperly invading State and local authority, will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest." For he still wants to strengthen the power of unions and he continues to insist that the 19 States which do not have compulsory unionization will have to give up the right to protect the freedom of an individual to get a job without sacrificing his disbelief in trade unionism.

7. While the President spoke of the "insistent urge toward nationalist independence" as being "the strongest force of today's world," he did not mention that the strongest force really is the subversion and infiltration by the Communists from the Soviet Union and Red China in every continent.

8. The President did not denounce the aggressive steps of both Red China and the Soviet Union throughout the world. While he declared that the United States does not intend to abandon Asia to conquest, it is a fact that the Soviet conquest of Eastern Europe continues today without any significant protest on the part of the United States.

There are many other things dealt with in the President's speech on which the American people might well become informed.

Buffalo's Famed Wilcox Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, passage by the House yesterday of a bill to establish Buffalo's famed Wilcox home as a national historic site is a great step forward toward preservation of this priceless historic building.

It is also a tribute to the diligence, persistence and legislative know-how of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI]. For years Congressman DULSKI has fought to preserve this historic mansion. And I want to pay high tribute to him for his dogged and unflagging efforts.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include excerpts of an article I wrote for the Christian Science Monitor of November 3, 1963. The article recalls the exciting events of September 1901 which propelled the Wilcox home into a dramatic chapter of American history:

It was in the early hours of Friday, September 13, 1901, that Buffalo Attorney Ansley Wilcox, a friend of Vice President Roosevelt, was aroused from sleep in his home at 641 Delaware Avenue. An urgent message asked him to send for the Vice President.

President William McKinley, wounded a week earlier at the Pan American Exposition by an assassin's bullet, had suddenly become worse at the home of John G. Milburn, exposition president, four blocks north on Delaware Avenue.

"Then began," as Mr. Wilcox later recalled "a vigorous effort to annihiliate time and space. A telephone message to Albany put me, within 2 hours in direct communication with Mr. Loeb, the Vice President's secretary.

"He informed me that the (Tahawas) club where Colonel Roosevelt probably was at that moment was some hours beyond the end of rail and telegraph lines but that he would try to reach him quickly by a telegram to be forwarded by special messenger."

"Come at once!" Mr. Roosevelt read as he finally received the message.

Down the wilderness trail from the club a rickety old buckboard jolted through the night, skidding through a washed-out road, swaying past boulders and tree stumps, creaking through the silence of the forest.

"Too fast?" the driver shouted. The Vice President of the United States shot back: "Go ahead. Go on. Go on."

In Buffalo, at 2:15 on Saturday morning September 14, President McKinley's secretary, George B. Cortelyou, descended the broad staircase in the Milburn mansion and announced: "Gentlemen, the President has passed away."

Ansley Wilcox and George L. Williams met Colonel Roosevelt at Buffalo's Terrace Station when his train arrived at 1:30 Saturday afternoon. Up Delaware Avenue Mr. Williams' carriage raced to the Wilcox house followed by a galloping escort of cavalry.

After a change of clothes at the Wilcox mansion, Colonel Roosevelt hurried to the Milburn house, where he made a call of sympathy and respect on the family of the deceased President. By 3 o'clock he was back at the Wilcox house. Then without any preparation and almost without any announcement the members of the Cabinet arrived to administer the oath of office.

Present, as Mr. Wilcox recalled, were: Secretary of War Elihu Root, Navy Secretary John D. Long, Attorney General Knox, Interior Secretary Ethan Allen Hitchcock, Postmaster General Charles E. Smith, and Agriculture Secretary James Wilson. With them were Federal Judge Hazel; Judge Haight, of the State court of appeals; Senator Chancey Depew, of New York; and a few friends.

As Mr. Wilcox recalled later, "no one was formally invited or even notified of the ceremony. There was no time for it."

Colonel Roosevelt met the party informally in the library of the Wilcox home. Secretary Root, an old friend, calling him "Mr. Vice President," requested him on behalf of the Cabinet to take the oath of office.

Colonel Roosevelt, standing in front of the bay window on the south side of the room, answered simply but with great solemnity: "Mr. Secretary, I will."

After his response, Judge Hazel advanced and administered the oath to support the Constitution and laws. It was taken with uplifted hand. The written oath, which Judge Hazel produced in typewritten form on a sheet of ordinary legal paper, was then signed.

President Roosevelt then requested the members of the Cabinet to remain in office. The guests departed and President Roosevelt held his first Cabinet meeting in the library of the Wilcox home.

With that simple ceremony, the United States embarked on a new era in its history—a new era of buoyant optimism and vitality.

Peering out into the new century, the young, energetic President stirred the Nation with his ringing calls for action. In Chicago, he declared: "I preach to you then, my countrymen, that our country calls not for the life of ease but for the life of strenuous endeavor. If we stand idly by, if we seek merely swollen, slothful ease and ignoble peace, if we shrink from the hard contests where men must win at hazard of their lives, and at the risk of all they hold dear, then the bolder and stronger peoples will pass us by and will win for themselves the domination of the world."

Scorning "prosperity-at-any-price, safety first instead of duty first, the love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life," he advocated character, self-discipline, physical fitness, and courage.

Aware that the reduction of distances was thrusting the United States and the outside world together, President Roosevelt also realized that the United States had little time in which to revive, redesign, and reorganize its dream and get its defenses in order.

Said President Roosevelt: "Our Nation is that one among all the nations of the earth which holds in its hands the fate of the coming years. We enjoy exceptional advantages, and are menaced by exceptional dangers; and all signs indicate that we shall either fail greatly or succeed greatly.

"Here is the task, and I have got to do it."

That President Roosevelt did not fail and did succeed at the century's turning point helps to explain the Nation's domestic health and world strength today.

Orange County, Calif., Honors David Baker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the President in his state of the Union address made abundantly clear the importance of "a creative federalism to best use the wonderful diversity of our institutions and our people to solve the problems and to fulfill the dreams of the American people." The essential cooperation between officeholders on the city, county, State, and Federal levels has been the foundation of our system of government.

Since being elected to public office I have worked on numerous projects that could not have been brought to successful conclusion without the dedicated and talented help of various Orange County city and county officials. The working relationship between Orange County's local leadership and the county's State and Federal representatives has produced a working model that can easily set an example for the Nation.

Tonight the citizens of Orange County are honoring one of the men who really make the federal system work—David Baker.

Mr. Baker serves as one of the five members of Orange County's board of supervisors. In the fastest growing county in the Nation, Mr. Baker, working in concert with all levels of government, has been instrumental in meeting the myriad of complicated problems faced by the area. Orange County's success in effectively meeting the challenge of its phenomenal growth rate is to a great extent due to the creative and energetic talents of David Baker employing creative federalism.

Mr. Baker moved to Orange County in 1950 and soon was proving his skill in a position with the county's department of building safety. Ever interested in all aspects of community and civic life Mr. Baker has been active in the YMCA and the various Scouts' organizations, as well as being a charter member of the Orange County Chapter of the American Institute of Building Design.

Elected to the Orange County Board of Supervisors in 1962, David Baker quickly assumed a role of prominence. He has served as chairman of the board's committees on probation, building services, parks, fish and game, forestry-fire control, and the Coastal Projects Water Committee, among others. He also serves on the Inter-County Committee on Roads, and the Community Action Committee.

His farsighted vision in the area of regional development has been recognized by his southern California colleagues, for he serves as chairman of the Southern California Association of Supervisors' Committee on City-County Relations, and as the interim vice president, secretary-treasurer of the all-important Joint City-County Committee for Southern California Associated Governments Formation.

Mr. Baker has also been prominent in the County Supervisors Association of California, and the National Association of Counties, as well as recently serving as a panelist on Gov. Edmund G. Brown's conference on beauty.

Mr. Baker's tireless effort on behalf of the more than 1 million Orange County residents is evidenced by his recent trip to Washington to meet with me, Secretary Udall and numerous other Government officials in order to obtain additional recreational facilities for the expanding population of Orange County.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join with my fellow Orange Countians in paying tribute to David Baker. He is an outstanding example of talented, and vigorous young America. His service to Orange County has been guided by the principle that President Johnson so eloquently articulated when he said:

> It is the genius of our Constitution that under its shelter of enduring institutions and rooted principles there is ample room for the rich fertility of American political invention.

H.R. 12410

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of two wars—the Spanish-American War and World War I—I always have felt a warm closeness to the cause of the veterans.

Today I am glad to join with my colleagues in support of H.R. 12410 and in commendation of its author, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, the great and dedicated chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This good measure will provide educational and other readjustment benefits to the men and women of our armed services after the Korean war. Included in its coverage are those who now are engaged in the bloody conflict with communism in Vietnam. I know of no measure that possibly could be received by the entire membership of this House with a greater depth of approving sentiment.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that at this session of the 89th Congress legislation will be enacted giving to all the veterans of World War I a pension comparable to that which Congress in its wisdom and patriotic generosity some years ago voted to the veterans of the war with Spain.

The cruel fact is that many thousands of the veterans of World War I are unable to meet the high cost of living on pensions, many as low as $78 a month. Many without any pensions at all are in miserable need. These are the men and women who in their youth offered their all in the cause of the country of their affection. It is revolting to any sense of decency and contrary to any conception of common gratitude that they should continue to go unaided and unattended by the Republic they served.

I earnestly call upon the fine and virile organization of the Veterans of World War I to drive with all its strength for the enactment of its bill at this session of the Congress and to that drive I pledge my full support.

There was no such thing as a bill of rights for World War I veterans and they had a hard time getting back on their feet after discharge in 1919 and 1920. In giving my enthusiastic support to legislation for the returning veterans of World War II and the Korean war, and in supporting this bill with all my heart, I am not unmindful that there is still much to be done for the remaining veterans of World War I that in some measure could make amends for the neglect of the past. I urge the great Veterans' Affairs Committee to give its immediate and intensive attention to this end.

Mr. Speaker, I think it not inappropriate at this time to include in my remarks on H.R. 12410 my speech on June 26, 1958, when the House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, as follows:

> Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as the last Spanish War veteran in this body, I feel that my comrades in a conflict of six decades ago would wish me to speak. I am giving full and enthusiastic support to this bill. I commend the great Judiciary Committee for reporting out a measure calculated at long last to bring the veterans of World War I into their own organization with the dignity, prestige, and authority of a charter granted by the Congress of the United States.
>
> Illinois is proud that she is the birth State of the Grand Army of the Republic, which set the pattern of veterans of one war being banded in an organization to serve God, country, and the veteran cause as long as any of the veterans of that war remained alive, and then to go the way of all things human. In supporting this bill I am responding to the spirit of Illinois and the sentiment of her people.
>
> For many years after the close of the Civil War it was the Union veterans banded in the Grand Army of the Republic that carried in every northern State and in every northern city and village the banner of veteran solidarity and of the patriotism that has its highest expression in the veterans who have fought together in their youth for the country of their love.
>
> Then, while many in the Grand Army of the Republic were still alive and active, came the war with Spain and after that conflict the forming and the chartering of the United Spanish War Veterans. As the years passed and death thinned the ranks of the Grand Army of the Republic, the service of taking over fell to the United Spanish War Veterans.
>
> There had been a link between the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Spanish War Veterans by reason of the fact that many who had fought in the War of the States, both on the northern and on the southern side, fought again in the war with Spain. They were a little older in years but still young in patriotism. There were members of the Grand Army of the Republic who also were members of the United Spanish War Veterans. Each veteran organization had its own work to do.
>
> When World War I came the Grand Army of the Republic, to a large extent, had been replaced by the United Spanish War Veterans. The Grand Army of the Republic, even though its ranks had been dicimated by the passage of years, continued still to function, but it chores were passed on to the younger man who had fought in the war with Spain.
>
> The Grand Army of the Republic now is gone. It will be remembered with affection in all the years ahead and its history will be an inspiration to all the generations to come. Soon the United Spanish War Veterans will have gone its way, its camps closed, its books and records turned over to history and its last member resting in the grave of an American soldier, sailor, or marine.
>
> I am deeply moved to contemplate that the place of the veterans' organizations that have united those who served the Union in the Civil War and those who served in the war with Spain is to be taken over by a veteran organization chartered by the Congress of the United States, and memberships in which is confined exclusively to those who served in World War I and were honorably discharged at the completion of their service.

There will come a day, and it is not too long away considering that the average age today of those eligible is over 65, when the veterans of World War I of the United States will follow the way of the Grand Army of the Republic and of the United Spanish War Veterans. Then will come, I predict, the formation and chartering of the veterans of World War II and at a little later date the organization and chartering of the veterans of the Korean war.

This, Mr. Chairman, follows the American tradition and it conforms with the rule that persons of common experience and common interest are more efficient in their undertakings when they act in unison.

There were many veterans of the war with Spain who served in World War I, and their interest in the United Spanish War Veterans did not diminish when also they became members of veterans organizations that were open to qualified veterans of later wars.

The chartering of the Veterans of World War I of the United States will not in any way dampen the interest or diminish the loyalty of the veterans of its membership to the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in which great organizations they also may hold membership. I know that has been true in my case. I have been a member of the United Spanish War Veterans since the very earliest days, and I have been a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars during all the years of its existence, and there has never been a moment when my loyalty to one organization made demands upon my loyalty to the other organization. I was among the founders of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, and my loyalty to the United Spanish War Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars was only strengthened by my loyalty to the American Legion. My membership in the Veterans of World War I of the United States further strengthens me in my loyalty to these older organizations and in that devotion to country that every man and woman who has ever served in time of war finds is part and parcel of his being.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that when this bill comes up for passage there will be a rollcall in order that all Members may be put on record. I anticipate that every Member who is on the floor will vote for this bill. When they have done that, there is one further thing that they can do to make this a memorable day and prove fidelity to the veteran cause and friendship to the veterans of World War I, all of them now well on the march to the sunset. On the Clerk's desk is a discharge petition to bring to the floor of the House a bill granting to veterans of World War I a pension similar to the Spanish War pension. That petition has been on the Clerk's desk for many days, and there are not too many signatures. The reason I would say is that the Members of the House, engrossed in many legislative duties, have had good intentions but forgetful minds. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this reminder will play some small part in causing an immediate rush to sign the petition.

The veterans of World War I are no longer young. They now constitute the army of veterans that is passing on, just as the Grand Army of the Republic passed on and as soon the United Spanish War Veterans will pass on. Many of them are in need, and with each year as the disabilities of age multiply their need will intensify. We should not wish it said of our country that any of its servitors in time of military peril was left unaided in his age and in his distresses.

Why the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty Should Be Rejected

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of economics at Georgetown University and chairman of the National Captive Nations Week Committee, has written a scholarly article on the proposed consular treaty between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of the article, in which Dr. Dobriansky discusses three reasons for rejecting the treaty:

II. A DIPLOMATIC AFFIRMATION OF MOSCOW'S INNER EMPIRE

The second reason for rejecting the treaty is that it constitutes a diplomatic affirmation, a stamp of approval and acceptance of Moscow's inner empire. I'm aware of the fact that most Americans cling to the myth that the Soviet Union is Russia, that the U.S.S.R. is a country like ours, indeed, that this inner empire of many nations is a nation like ours. One superficial account of last August's episode misleads readers in this fashion: "If ratified, it would be the first bilateral treaty between the two nations." [1]

We can allow for such ignorance in an ordinary newspaper article, but for our leaders of state to believe that the U.S.S.R. is a nation is plainly unpardonable. If we should ever lose the cold war, it would be basically because of this fundamental gap in our understanding of the U.S.S.R. as an empire-state, a prisonhouse of many captive nations, the inner and basic sphere of the present Soviet Russian Empire. Despite other objectives and purposes, both Napoleon and Hitler lost hot wars in this area of eastern Europe because of substantially the same gap in understanding.

This fallacious notion of the U.S.S.R. as a country and other basic myths are reflected in the convention, which of course cannot but satisfy the propaganda and psychopolitical efforts of Moscow to the utmost. The treaty is founded on the mythical conception that the U.S.S.R. is a nation-state comparable in character to ours. American consulates in any of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. would tangibly reinforce this myth, needlessly abet Russian policies aimed at unifying this primary imperium, and thus nullify any leverage for peace we may have in at least recognizing the freedom goals of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

In the past 45 years the United States has committed many shortsighted errors bolstering and strengthening this inner empire of Soviet Russia. Ratification of this treaty would add another chapter to this sordid record. In a letter to Senator FULBRIGHT, the writer emphasized this point when he stated, "a blind ratification of the convention would form another chapter in our long, inept dealings with the Russians and expose us to the charge of being a nation of hypocrites when the President and others proclaim our "devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty. This treaty is a confirmation of Russia's imperio-colonialism within the U.S.S.R. and further evidence of our diplomatic ineptitude in the cold war, not to say our grave lack of understanding of America's prime enemy." [2] In terms of power and ambition, we delude ourselves if we think Peiping rather than Moscow is the prime enemy.

Before taking action on the treaty it would profit each Senator to read a recent official study prepared for one of the Senate's own committees on the empire within the U.S.S.R. "Western scholars of Soviet affairs," it observes, "agree on the imperial-colonial character of the U.S.S.R." [3] Commendable as it is, even this study doesn't cover all aspects of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in the U.S.S.R.. For succinct, deep insights into this inner empire each Senator would do well to read Adlai Stevenson's remarkable memorandum on the subject in the United Nations.[4] After reading these he would have to ask himself, "Could I, as a Senator, representing people in a democracy and Republic dedicated to principles of national independence and self-determination, vote for a treaty which explicitly and implicitly misrepresents a state and, in effect, places a stamp of approval on a tyrannical empire?" Each in his own conscience would have to answer this question.

This reason for not ratifying the treaty is basic to all others. It hinges on the most fundamental issue of the contemporary struggle—Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism versus freedom and national independence. It offers us another opportunity to fill in the gap of American understanding of the U.S.S.R. The first was Congress' Captive Nations Week resolution (Public Law 86–90) in 1959, which for the first time recognized the freedom aspirations of all the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Ratification of the treaty would contradict the very essence and spirit of that resolution. Also, Secretary Rusk and others argue that the treaty would improve communications between the two countries. Aside from the rudimentary fact that it is hardly within the purview of consular activity to communicate or negotiate between countries, what improvement in communications could be achieved between the United States and the many nations in the U.S.S.R. under a treaty which slights and ignores the presence of all but one of these nations? To our own detriment, the very opposite would be achieved.

III. LEGAL INVALIDITIES OF THE TREATY

A third substantial reason for rejecting the treaty is its numerous legal invalidities. If some of our lawmakers in the Senate still find the second reason difficult to grasp at this point, surely the legal contradictions and invalidities of the pact would fall more readily within their immediate attention. In a court of law any patent misrepresentation of parties to a contract or blatant contradictions to fact would be sufficient to throw the case out of court. The consular treaty is pitted exactly in this situation.

Throughout the text of the treaty one reads about "a national of the sending state." [5] This makes sense in the case of the United States, a citizen of a nation generally called about the world "an American." Who is the national of the Soviet Union? A Russian, Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Georgian, and so forth? If language and words have any meaning, a "national" is an individual member of a given nation. On the impregnable basis of all evidence provided by Moscow itself, the Soviet Union is no nation but

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

rather a so-called union of many nations. Legally, there is no such animal as a "Soviet national" other than a fictional image in the minds of some who wallow in the myths of the U.S.S.R. being a nation or anyone in the U.S.S.R.—worse still "Russia"—being a "Soviet," which is a council of workers and peasants.

Clearly, if some can extricate themselves from the unreasoned, semantic mess indicated here, they would begin to see that the convention contradicts the very essence of the U.S.S.R. Constitution, which though largely semantic is nonetheless a nominal compromise with the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. By this kind of misrepresentative language the pact violates also the authenticity of every official map of the U.S.S.R., and contradicts reams of official Moscow pronouncements on the multi-national composition of the U.S.S.R. In their desire to reap the psychopolitical advantages of the treaty the Muscovite rulers would prostitute anything and, as in everything else, accuse the other party of the perversions. By allowing this to take place we exhibit our own psychopolitical immaturity.

Further examples of legal invalidity are, in the case of the Soviet Union, provisions for "the national flag of the sending state" and "the national coat-of-arms of the sending state."[5] Of course, in objective circumstance there is no such flag or coat-of-arms for the U.S.S.R. Each republic has its own flag and emblem. The flag and coat-of-arms of the U.S.S.R. shown at any Moscow-established consulate in the United States would be another perversion of fact permitted by the legal invalidity of the treaty.

Speaking of legalities, no one has raised the question of accumulated legacies left by Russian emigrés and others in behalf of known or unknown parties in the U.S.S.R. How many millions of dollars is colonialist Moscow seeking to acquire under article 10 of the treaty? The Russians are employing every trick, including "the economic independence of the satellites," to build up their stock of foreign currencies; the treaty is another means. It would be interesting to see what the Department of State can furnish on these accumulated legacies. Mr. Rusk and others vaguely argue that the pact would abet "mutual understanding." With whom? The imperio-colonialists in Moscow? What of the various nations and peoples in the U.S.S.R.? How would all these allowed perversions and open risks mould our bonds of mutual understanding with them? In the long run, they will prevail, not the ruling Russian totalitarians.

IV. AN AMERICAN ASSIST TO RUSSIFICATION

The fourth objection to the treaty is that its provisions engender an American assist to Russification within and outside the U.S.S.R. The provision in the pact for the use of the Russian language to process the fictitious Soviet national is in every sense an inadvertent assist to the well-known Russification policies of Moscow.[7] In effect, here too we would be buttressing Moscow's colonialist policy of enforcing the use of the captor's language among the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

Here, too, before he casts his vote on the treaty it would do well for each Senator to scan another recent congressional study on cultural Russification and linguacide in the U.S.S.R.[8] Do we want to be placed in the position of confirming and abetting this vicious genocidal tendency further? It is bad enough that functional necessity compels us to accede to it on the ambassadorial level, though this could be rectified, too, by a diplomatic alternative of a more realistic nature.

With a premium on verbal generality Mr. Rusk and others argue for the treaty because it would normalize relations. What are they seeking to normalize? The inner Soviet Russian Empire, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, or Moscow's Russification policies? The treaty would abnormally relate us to these ugly phenomena in the seeming position of even accepting them as normal. Aside from the essential factor of comparative advantage in the cold war, what a political posture we are asked to assume by ratifying this treaty. The nation of the American Revolution and all the perennial principles this implies is urged in the name of normalization to place stamps of diplomatic approval on the worst institutional hallmarks of its basic enemy. Also, what is most curious is that those who talk loudly today about the liquidation of the Communist monolith, growing nationalism in eastern Europe, a world of diversity, and good Communists and bad ones are normally those who, for whatever reasons, stop at the borders of the U.S.S.R., the determining inner empire itself, with these supposedly new notions.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Murrey Marder, "U.S.-Soviet Treaty," the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1965.

[2] Communication, Aug. 4. 1965.

[3] "The Soviet Empire," Committee on the Judiciary, 1965, p. 166.

[4] U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, memorandum to U.N. delegations, the United Nations, Nov. 25, 1961.

[5] E.g. Consular Convention With the Soviet Union, pp. 8, 9, 10, etc.

[6] Ibid. p. 11.

[7] Ibid. p. 8.

[8] See "Nations, Peoples, and Countries in the U.S.S.R.," study of population and immigration problems, House Committee on the Judiciary, 1964.

After the Moon, What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the National Observer of January 11, 1966, asks the question "After the Moon, What?" and goes on to describe the options that are available in our current space program and its extension into the applications of the Apollo system to projects which will give a tangible return for our investment in the manned space flight program. This article clearly summarizes the potential problems and the prospects in our manned space flight effort as this country strives to make full use of the vast capability that we have developed since 1958. The article, by Peter T. Chew, follows:

AFTER THE MOON, WHAT?—SPACEMEN AIM TO MAKE SPACE WORK PAY

(By Peter T. Chew)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—By means of James Bondian radio transmitters inserted in the hides of whales, earth-orbiting astronauts may one day track them and determine their global migration patterns.

With radar, astronauts may be able to locate and track icebergs, even through heavy cloud cover and fog.

And it is a certainty that manned spacecraft will increase tremendously man's knowledge of the sea in general—the "sea state," or the height and lengths of waves, and of what directions the world's seas and currents are flowing at any given point in time. Astronauts may even be able to spot fish-feeding grounds with special cameras and other optical devices, and direct fishing fleets to them.

A FEW OF THE POSSIBILITIES

These are just a few of the ways that manned spacecraft may support oceanography alone, according to studies made for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) by the aerospace industry. Other studies envision astronauts producing worldwide agricultural, mineral, and fresh water surveys. Still other studies foresee manned communications satellites providing worldwide television coverage and serving as relay points for deep-space communications.

The aerospace industry hopes that such possibilities will answer the question: After the manned lunar landing, what?

Many space agency officials believe the United States must begin to answer the question this year. Otherwise, the enormous investment in manpower, launch vehicles, spacecraft, and ground facilities will "erode," as Robert C. Seamans, Jr., the Agency's Deputy Administrator, likes to put it.

In fiscal year 1967, which begins July 1, the Agency would like to make a downpayment on Saturn I-B launch vehicles and 3-man Apollo spacecraft for a 30-flight program that would begin in the summer of 1968 and run through the summer of 1972. The Apollo applications program, as it is called, would thus bracket the manned lunar landing itself, which is now expected to take place in the 1969-70 period.

Because the cost curve of the moon-landing program will start down as the huge Saturn rocket vehicles and custom-built Apollo space craft come on line, NASA believes it can conduct the applications program without exceeding the $5 billion-plus that now appears to be the Agency's share of the annual national budget. Mr. Seamans hopes to divert a few of the 12 Saturn 1-B's and 21 Apollo spacecraft from the lunar-landing program to the applications program if it appears they will not be needed for the lunar expedition.

The Apollo applications program would include manned earth-orbital missions of 45, 90, and 135 days, employing modified Apollo spacecraft and Saturn 1-B rocket vehicles. With the larger 7.5 million-pound-thrust Saturn 5's, 3-man lunar-orbiting missions of 28 days' duration will be possible, as will lunar surface explorations of up to 2 weeks.

The Vietnam war having cast a pall of uncertainty over the Agency's budget request—NASA has asked for $5.58 billion, which the Budget Bureau has reportedly pared to $5.1 billion—officials are not eager to detail their Apollo applications plans. (Nor do you hear much blue-sky talk in NASA headquarters these days about manned Venusian "fly-bys," or $60 billion manned expeditions to Mars.) When they do talk, they like to emphasize economy, and the practical results to be gained from earth-orbital missions.

"MODIFY WHAT WE HAVE"

"We plan to modify what we have and make do," says Mr. Seamans, the Agency's No. 2 man and overall program manager.

For example, the Apollo spacecraft can be modified to carry between 3,000 and 5,000 pounds of scientific and engineering experiments when flying manned earth-orbital missions. This will be possible because the spacecraft will not have to carry on such missions the heavy supplies required for the lunar flight.

Similarly, the Lunar Excursion Module or "LEM," which is part of the three-unit Apollo spacecraft, will also be able to tote sizable experiment payloads when flying in earth orbit. The LEM is that part of the spacecraft that is scheduled to disengage from the lunar-orbiting unit and carry two of the three astronauts down to the lunar surface, then blast off and return them to the spacecraft again. In earth orbit, the LEM will not require its heavy lunar-landing legs and rocket array.

One particularly interesting mission under consideration involves a manned earth-orbiting astronomical observatory. On this mission, astronauts will fly their Apollo spacecraft into a synchronous orbit over the equator at a distance of 20,000-odd miles. In such an orbit, the spacecraft appears to hover over the same spot on earth because its orbital speed is relative to that of earth.

A TELESCOPIC VIEW

The LEM unit of the spacecraft would be equipped with a telescope, star trackers, television, and radio astronomy antennas. Once in orbit, an astronaut would adjust the instruments, and peer through the telescope. His view from this speeding platform, far removed from the atmospheric distortions that have bedeviled earthbound astronomers for centuries, will surely be fantastic.

The astronaut could remain aboard the LEM or, more likely, leave the LEM and return to the command unit of the Apollo spacecraft, which would then disengage from the LEM, allowing it to fly on alone in orbit. Later, astronauts could fly back to the orbiting LEM, rendezvous, dock, and go aboard again to check the instruments and make any necessary adjustments or repairs.

In order to conduct long-duration experiments in earth orbit, say NASA engineers, manned spacecraft will spell one another. One satellite crew might fly, for example, a communications or navigation satellite for 45 days, then a fresh crew in a similarly equipped spacecraft would rocket up and take over the duty for the next 45 days. And so on.

During the applications program, astronauts will undoubtedly engage in considerable "extravehicular activity," leaving their spacecraft on tether lines to inspect and repair the spacecraft, and to perfect astronaut rescue techniques.

SERVICING SATELLITES?

Perhaps the astronauts will rendezvous with, inspect, and repair faulty unmanned satellites that are already whizzing around the earth. Thought has been given to fitting the LEM with a long grappling hook with which to recover unmanned satellites.

There are, of course, a multitude of Russian unmanned satellites zipping through space over our heads. Certainly many of these satellites are of great interest to us, especially from a military standpoint, just as some of our unmanned satellites are of interest to the U.S.S.R.

This brings up the question of the U.S. Air Force's secret Manned Orbital Laboratory or "MOL" program, which in many ways would appear to be a costly duplication of the proposed Apollo applications program—or vice versa, depending upon one's viewpoint.

The Air Force plans to use the Titan III rocket vehicle to launch the MOL, which will consist of a modified Gemini spacecraft attached to a large cylindrical laboratory.

FUNDS ARE SLASHED

Defense Secretary McNamara recently gave the Air Force the nod to proceed with the program, which he has never been enthusiastic about. But MOL contractors now say that the Air Force's budget request for MOL has been deeply slashed in the upper, civilian reaches of the Pentagon, partly because of the spiraling costs of the Vietnam war. The schedule calls for the first MOL flight in 1968, when the first Apollo applications flights are expected to begin.

Since its sputnik-inspired birth in 1958, the space agency has enjoyed a charmed life with its budgets once they have reached Capitol Hill. The same appears to be true this year, Vietnam notwithstanding. There are several reasons for this.

To begin with, Congressmen say that most of their constituents believe this country should have a vigorous space program. Secondly, the space program is, like the defense program, a political honey jar.

From the moment that Administrator James E. Webb assumed direction of NASA under the late President Kennedy he has distributed his agency facilities and contracts with finesse. In this manner, he has built a broad base of congressional support.

At the same time, Mr. Webb's Agency has distributed millions of dollars in research grants to universities, thus gaining another broad base of support. The intense criticism of NASA by non-NASA scientists has all but died out.

FEW WATCHDOGS

In the view of some objective observers of the space program, this situation has its unhealthy aspects. They say there are alarmingly few congressional watchdogs giving the space program a sharp going over.

A notable exception is Representative Joseph E. Karth, a Minnesota Democrat on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, who has led hardhitting investigations of NASA's Ranger, Centaur, and Surveyor programs. His recent investigation of the Surveyor lunar soft-landing program, for example, revealed that the program has fallen 2½ years behind schedule, while its original cost estimate of $50 million has rocketed to $350 million, and is certain to go higher. His conclusion: "Mismanagement was the prime culprit."

Mr. Karth prefers to let his investigations speak for themselves and refuses to criticize his fellow Congressmen. But another Congressman, a Republican, says:

"The manned space-flight program doesn't get the scrutiny that Mr. Karth gives the unmanned program. The Senate Space Committee, especially, acts like the Agency's protector rather than its overseer. But then I'm not a space booster. As I see it, NASA has created a gigantic monster, and now it's scurrying around like mad trying to justify its continued feeding."

This NASA-created "monster," as the rather extreme congressional critic prefers to call it, includes some 400,000 people in the 20,000 companies involved in the vast lunar-landing project.

CONTRACTORS' PROBLEMS

The major Apollo contractors such as North American Aviation, Chrysler, Boeing, Douglas, and Grumman, have invested untold millions of their own dollars in tailormade facilities to support the lunar program. For the past 2 years they have been growing understandably edgy, waiting for NASA and Congress to commit themselves to post-Apollo planning.

"The Apollo Applications program should soothe their nerves," says one NASA man.

For now, the Agency plans a busy year of space flights. There will be five more two-man Gemini flights between now and the first of next year when the Saturn 1B-Apollo program will begin with lunar-training flights in earth orbit. All the Gemini flights will involve rendezvous and docking with unmanned Agena rocket vehicles, plus extra-vehicular activity.

The unmanned program includes 29 flights, most notably the first Surveyor, Lunar Orbiter, and Orbiting Astronomical Observatory launches.

And it now appears that NASA is not going to wait much longer to get cracking on oceanographic research. Late last week NASA and the U.S. Naval Oceanographic office agreed to collaborate and define oceanographic experiments for Apollo Applications flights. "The photographs of the sea taken during the last few Gemini flights really opened peoples' eyes; they're fantastic," says one naval officer.

Boston College Sugar Bowl Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1966, the Boston College Varsity Club celebrated the 25th anniversary of their victory over Tennessee in the New Orleans Sugar Bowl of 1941. The guest speaker at the jubilee dinner was Msgr. George V. Kerr, who was a member of that championship squad. Monsignor Kerr has an outstanding record in the Archdiocese of Boston, and recently he was chosen by Sports Illustrated as one of the All-American selections who has succeeded in his chosen field.

The monsignor's talk that evening was most inspiring and I would like to quote him herewith:

> In the name of the Sugar Bowl team, and in the name of Boston College, I'm very privileged to accept this goalpost symbolizing a high honor.
>
> And yet any one of the members behind me are equal to the same. Of many accomplishments I have made none would be true without Boston College and its continual inspiration.
>
> So really in the name of my teammates, and in Boston College, I thank Mark Mulvoy and Sports Illustrated for this participation in football and in life.
>
> I don't know how Joe Zabilski feels tonight. But as for myself, if I had the chance to meet Ed Molinski and Augie Lio before the game, I'm almost positive that I'd never show up.
>
> These two young men—Ed Molinski and Augie Lio—are two of the greatest guards ever produced in America. And it's a great privilege for Joe Zabilski and myself for having the honor to play against them as well as the great teammate of Molinski, Bob Suffridge of Tennessee.
>
> As the spokesman for the Sugar Bowl team, I would like to quote a stoic philosopher of Rome, Epictetus, who once said something that bears true tonight, whether you talk of a team, statesman, or a life:
>
> "Nothing great in this life is produced suddenly, any more than a bunch of grapes or a fig. If you ask for a fig, my answer to you, 'There must be time. First, let it blossom; then bear fruit; then ripen.'"
>
> Under the ever-deft hand of a Ted Dailey, this Sugar Bowl team began to blossom in its freshman year.
>
> And under the patient insistence of a great and venerable coach on fundamentals, Gail Dobie, this team began to bear fruit in varsity competition.
>
> And then under the tree at Boston College that stood sentinel for so many years over old Alumni Field, the Sugar Bowl team began to ripen and it met for the first time a new and a young coach by the name of Frank Leahy.
>
> And it didn't take this team long to know that this young man was a great teacher.
>
> And it wasn't long before the lesson learned was to be hard but not heartless, to be tough but not toughs, and to be relentless but not ruthless.
>
> It was essential at all times to be a gentleman, and perhaps the most characteristic quality of this new mentor was to the fact that he was a disciplinarian.
>
> So were his assistant coaches—men of dedication, men who worked harder at times

than the players themselves: Ed McKeever and Joe McArdle and Johnny Druze and Ted Galligan and Tom Powers.

And they all knew to a man that you cannot train a team, and you cannot train an army, you cannot train yourself—without discipline, without deprivation.

But no championship team is ever born but was made with sweat and sacrifice, perseverance at the practice field.

And so tonight, Coach Leahy, we at the Sugar Bowl were better men because of you. And we are happy to express to you personally the thanks of the Sugar Bowl team for the opportunity to play under your direction, your genius, and your inspiration.

Nothing great is ever created suddenly.

Many helping hands are needed to seed, to water, to prune—and we had the helping hands.

We had a great press—men who were not just reporters but evangelists; men who were not sportswriters but friends, even to this day.

We had a great publicity director who brought the attention of this team to the Nation, Bill Sullivan.

And we had the skill and the dedication of men like Frank Jones as trainer and Larry Kenney, our equipment manager. And Dr. Ben Godvin is here tonight, our team physician.

We had the unmatched spirit of the very special organization known as the Chowder Club, members of the same team who never or rarely played. Their enthusiasm, their loyalty, was heroic.

And lastly, we had the helping hand of the Jesuit Fathers, of Fr. Frank Sullivan, Fr. Pat Collins, Fr. Maurice Dullea, Fr. O'Callaghan and all the wonderful teachers at Boston College and their unselfish devotion to the team—and to the players, personally.

They have enriched our lives even to this moment, because by their lips and by their deeds they carved an invisible niche above the portals of Boston College.

A man may glitter athletically on the gridiron, and he may twinkle intellectually in the classroom.

But unless his conscience sinks deep into the subsoil of religious faith and shoots its antennas up beyond the stars and space, that man will miss alike the music of divine inspiration and the thunder of divine command.

And so tonight the Sugar Bowl team expresses from all the helping hands of the past and the present their gratitude, and especially to the officers and members of the Boston College Varsity Club, to the publisher, the sports editor, and the sportswriters of the Boston Globe, for making this glittering jubilee dinner possible.

I assure you, all you gentlemen tonight, that it will remain a most delightful memento for the rest of our lives.

Thank you.

On-the-Job Training Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty is working. It is proving to be a success, in spite of the shrill cries of the opposition. It is giving hope to those with no hope. It is helping to make dreams come true.

One of Florida's great newspapers, the St. Petersburg Times, in its February 4 edition carried a fine story on the work the local St. Petersburg, Fla., Women's Job Corps Center is doing. I hope all of my colleagues will take the time to read it; and I include it herewith:

THE ON-THE-JOB TRAINING CORPS

(By Valerie Crosswell)

Job Corps vocational training for girls at the St. Petersburg Center meets Florida adult education standards, says Ralph G. Williams, vocational supervisor. Classes, excluding cosmetology, are taught by personnel from the Job Corps and Tomlinson Adult Education Center. Each job classification is outlined, explaining the necessary courses, expectations and estimated time to complete training in class and on the job.

Here's what the girls may choose from:

Cosmetology: A 1,200-hour course leading to State certification. A girl from a State requiring more hours will receive additional training. Classes are taught at Sun State Academy of Cosmetology.

Health occupations: Before choosing a specific field, enrollees complete a 210-hour health occupations orientation course taught by registered nurses. This leads to training in one of the following: day-care center assistant, nurse's aid, licensed practical nurse, physical therapy attendant, medical laboratory technical assistant, occupational therapy attendant, veterinarian's assistant, nurse assistant, dental assistant, X-ray technician assistant or electrocardiograph operator. Length of training depends on the course.

Vocational recreation: A 12-month course giving enrollees general knowledge of administration, aquatics, arts and crafts, physical education and leisure and cultural time education. The girls are assigned to the Job Corps Center's recreation program. They receive additional training at several city elementary schools.

Business education: Includes training for steno-secretary, clerk-typist I and II and key punch operator. Specialization and ability determine the length of the course.

Sales and marketing: Classes in store arithmetic, display, salesmanship, employer-employe relations and stockkeeping. Four months on-the-job training is required.

Job Corps trainees also may enroll at Tomlinson or Dixie Hollins High School for courses not offered by the center.

Catherine has started dreaming again. She can afford to because today she has a future—more than she could say a year ago.

As 1 of 271 girls at the St. Petersburg Job Corps Center for Women, 226 Fourth Avenue North, she is enrolled in a vocational program which begins in the classroom and is developed on the job.

Catherine's new future differs slightly from the one she would have chosen. Back in North Carolina she spent 16 years dreaming of becoming a nurse. Her father put an end to that when he left home. Though she loved school—was an "A" student, in fact—she felt obligated to help support the other children. She quit school to work in a laundry for 85 cents an hour.

Months later she heard of the Job Corps. She applied after learning the Government would send $50 a month home, $25 ordinarily placed in the trainee's savings account matched by another $25. That's when the new dream started. Catherine decided to seek training as a dental assistant. Come graduation this summer or fall, she will be qualified. She is praised highly at the center. Her dentist-employer has only the best to say. "Tell her something once and she takes it from there * * * an outstanding girl."

Not all the trainees have such bright prospects. Some may lack the potential or the willingness to learn. Each, however, has the opportunity. "We offer all levels of training," says Ralph G. Williams, vocational supervisor. "We train the girl according to her ability."

When a girl first comes to the Job Corps, she works with counselors in selecting a career. She may choose from five major areas: cosmetology, health occupations, business, vocation recreation, or sales and marketing. During her first months she studies her chosen field half a day, 5 days a week. The rest of her time is taken up with basic education, home and family life, and physical education. Once she completes these courses she devotes herself to the prospective career, either half day in class and half on the job, or full time on the job.

No girl is required to stick to a particular field if she is not suited to it. Early in her training she may be retested and counseled to help find the right career.

Williams, former diversified cooperative training coordinator at Northeast High School, and his staff, developed the program from scratch. It began May 11, 1965, a month after the center opened. All courses have outlines meeting standards of credit for adult education. On-the-job training began in June. Today 147 trainees work at no salary in the community.

The no-salary requirement presented the only problem Williams found in placing his girls. "Most people expect to pay whoever works for them," he says. "It's just plain, good American spirit." A few businesses turned him down because of this.

On the whole, on-the-job training has received community backing. "A total public-spirited endeavor," Williams calls it. "It's costly to train a person, especially when the training is terminal."

Williams insists the girls are not replacing regular personnel. Nor will many remain in St. Petersburg. "People have thought we will turn these girls loose on our economy," he says. "This isn't true." Three months before a girl will be graduated, the Job Corps mails a list of her qualifications and its recommendations to the city where she will live. This does not mean she will have a job waiting for her, "though we have had calls for some of the girls," Williams says.

The vocational supervisor has found great satisfaction in the program. "There are such differences in ability and aptitude," he says. "We have developed different schedules and special techniques emphasizing the special attention needed in reaching a vocational goal. That's too difficult a job to attempt in public school."

Oil and Natural Gas in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Brenda Faulkner, writing for the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Advertiser, has written an interesting article on the oil and gas developments in our section of West Virginia.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article from the February 6 issue of the Herald-Advertiser, entitled "Bubblin' Crude":

BUBBLIN' CRUDE

(By Brenda Faulkner)

There may not be gold in "them thar hills," but there certainly is wealth in many other forms. The coal industry, long considered West Virginia's wealthiest natural resource, is finding its glory light shared by two others—natural gas and oil.

Oil and gas both have been extracted from beneath West Virginia soil for many years, but within the past 4 to 5 years, the industry has grown by leaps and bounds—some estimate a growth of 500 percent. People in the know in the business attribute this rapid growth to improved methods and a good investment with little risk provided by the industry. Drilling equipment has been sufficiently improved to facilitate testing deeper rocks than before and methods, such as sand fracturing, have opened what once would have been considered dry holes to wells pumping 40 barrels a day.

"West Virginia is one of the States in which production of oil and gas was developed quite early, during the Civil War decade and, to some extent, even previously. The period of rapid development extended from 1890 to about 1920, during which our maximum rates of production of both oil and gas were attained," according to an article in the September 20, 1965 issue of Oil and Gas Journal by Paul H. Price, director of the West Virginia Geological Survey and State geologist, and O. L. Haught.

The western part of the State, was, for many years, the Nation's chief source of natural gas, petroleum, and natural gas liquids. It is now surpassed by the areas west of the Mississippi River, but is still leader among the Eastern States.

Five hundred ninety-eight thousand producing oil and natural gas wells in the United States produced 2.8 billion barrels of oil in 1963, contributing greatly to the 6.6 billion barrels produced the world over. The petroleum industry, our principal source of energy, is the third largest in the country. Approximately 42,000 companies of all sizes are now engaged in the search for oil and the production, refining, transportation and marketing of it. Thirty-two States have either oil or gas wells or both. Most wells produce both gas and oil, some only oil and some only gas. The U.S. crude oil output has soared from 64 million barrels in 1900 to the present booming industry.

Millions of dollars in oil and gas were lost before the value of the natural products became known. Prior to 1850 Indians and settlers skimmed crude petroleum off the surface of oil springs which seeped from the earth and used it as medicine and ointment. This product was known as fossil oil, rock oil, and Seneca oil.

The industrial revolution, with its tremendous need for machine lubrication, etc., and the need by the late 1700's for better and cheaper sources of lighting for homes and factories contributed to the birth and rapid development of the petroleum industry.

The first well in the country was drilled in 1815 near Charleston using the only primitive methods then known to the industrial pioneers.

In 1857 Edwin L. Drake of New Haven, Conn., with the Seneca Oil Co. (Pennsylvania Rock Oil Co.), drilled the first well to obtain oil, devised methods and machinery to do so rapidly and introduced the use of iron pipe to prevent the dreaded and fatal cave-ins. His well was near Titusville, Pa., northwest of West Virginia's own oil fields.

Then in 1860 the first nearly modern oil well was drilled in West Virginia at Burning Springs in Wirt County, which lies in what is now known as the Big Injun sand, which extends over Richie, Calhoun, Roane, Clay, Braxton, Lewis, Doddridge, Harrison, and Gilmer Counties as well. Drilling has been greatly intensified with excellent success in this central region of the State.

In Upshur, Barbour, and Lewis Counties, the Benson sands, and to a lesser extent the Riley sand, which have been of only marginal value prior to development of the new techniques of well completion, are now developing into extensive fields, according to the Price-Haught report.

There are now some 60,000 people engaged in the mining industries in West Virginia, where the most valuable natural resource is her minerals. Coal ranks first place, with natural gas and natural gas liquids taking second and third place. Stone, sand, and gravel are ranked next, only slightly ahead of petroleum.

West Virginia's natural gas is carried to Pittsburgh and other eastern cities by great pipeline systems from wells drilled 8 inches plus in diameter and from 250 to 9,000 feet deep.

Flaming wells of natural gas were once left unchecked at oil fields, resulting in the loss of billions of dollars of products. For a long time, natural gas was regarded as a curiosity and a nuisance. In Iran and India it issued from crevices in rocks and people kept it burning as a tribute to the fire-god.

The United States has the world's greatest wealth of natural gas. "Burning springs" were known as early as 1775. By 1821 natural gas was being put to use in Fredonia, N.Y., as the source of lighting. Titusville, Pa. was collecting and piping natural gas on a commercial scale by 1872.

The substance known as natural gas is a mixture of combustible gases and vapors, chiefly methane. In some places it is found alone, in others it must be extracted from oil and still in others it is found in the same place as but not mixed with oil. Porous rock, coarse-grained sandstone or limestone with a heavy shale cover, is the natural habitat of this gas. In most gas fields the beds are arched up and gas accumulates in arches, often above the oil.

The oil-gas industry is perpetuated not only by the great commercial operations but also, by independent operators. These operators are considered by the industry to be people with other major occupations who use this as a sideline or combined occupation-avocation. It is sort of extra-curricular activity for two Huntington men, Ernest Tweel, owner of Nick's News & Card Shop, and Dr. L. E. Farnsworth, retired optometrist.

Tweel first tried his hand at the business in Wolf County, Ky. with little success and much disappointment. But undaunted, with the "oil in his blood," he joined forces with Dr. Farnsworth who had been partially attached to the business for many years. They decided to procure leases for gas and oil fields in areas of West Virginia. Dr. Farnsworth located their first lease in Ritchie County where they formed the Richland Gas Co. which has produced three wells—two gas, one oil and gas, and two dry holes.

Their operations also include Kyger Creek Oil Co. near Cheshire, Ohio, Clayton Oil Co. in Clay County (11 wells), and Burnt Star Gas Co. in Ritchie County (1 well). Dr. Farnsworth is the operator for these individually owned companies. Stockholders sell their goods through him to the purchasing organizations.

The Kyger Creek Oil Co. is serviced by Ford Brothers of Ironton, Ohio, who haul the crude from the three leases there to Ashland Oil & Refining Co. which pays approximately $2.97 for a barrel of crude (a barrel equals 42 gallons). The Fulton lease at Kyger Creek was obtained by Dr. Farnsworth some 10 years ago and has one well which is still producing. The Tweel-Farnsworth latest joint efforts have centered at Kyger Creek resulting in other leases including the Merritt well I, Reese well I, and Reese well II.

The concern also has 7 storage tanks which hold 100 barrels each and fill up every 5 days. Each full tank brings in nearly $300. Wells are now set up with electrical timing devices which regulate the pumping automatically, relieving the problem of having an attendant constantly supervise. Most of the pumps work at off and on again shifts of 4 hours each. The lax of 4 hours gives the hole time to fill up.

Durl Fluharty is the fieldman in charge of the Ritchie County holdings. It is his job to look after the wells, checking the lines, pumps, and timers and to "blow the drips," that is to relieve the valves on the top of the gas lines of collected moisture. In cold weather ice forms at the drips.

Carnegie Steel is the market for the Richland Gas Co., as the Elk Refining Co. near Clendenin has the contract for the Clayton Co. Carl B. Young of Beaumont tends all the wells in Clay County. Products are hauled to Elk from Clayton by tank cars which hold 42 barrels each. The Hope Natural Gas & Columbia Gas System also hold contracts with the Tweel-Farnsworth operations.

Since 1958 these Huntington men have drilled 17 successful wells and had only 3 dry ones. Their ratio of success far surpasses the average of 75 percent paying wells out of every 100 drilled. These wells are drilled at an approximate cost of $22,000 to $25,000 each, including the drilling and completion. They are considered to be 2 year payouts, with the profits gained in the first 2 years of operations taking care of the initial debt.

After the drilling costs are written off, every drop of oil or gas which spouts forth is money in the pockets of the owners. The average life of an oil and gas well is 15 to 25 years with the average life of a plain gas well 30 to 40 years. The value of a barrel of oil today is approximately $3.85 compared to 60 cents during the depression of the 1930's.

Shallow wells, those from 1,600 to 2,000 feet are the type drilled by the Huntington operators in the West Virginia and Ohio sands. Plans are being made for future drilling of deeper and better-paying wells.

Developmental wells are those drilled in existing production areas, while exploratories are those drilled to find a new pool, extend an existing pool or to find an entirely new field. The latter are usually called wildcat wells. There are some 45,000 exploratory wells drilled each year in the United States. By now the U.S. petroleum pipeline network consists of over 200,000 miles of pipes to transport crude oil and refined products. Almost all the oil gain in 1964, for instance, has been attributed to wildcatting. Through October 10, 1964, there had been 687 successful wells drilled that year of which 593 were wildcat ventures and 94 developmental.

The rugged landscape of Kentucky, where Ernie Tweel started his first wildcatting with no avail, now boasts a bigger oil crop than the country corn. There has been a progression of strikes in the Sulphur Lick, Ky., area in the past few months in a geological formation that had not been tapped in the past. Farmers are being paid $25 to $50 an acre for leases near the land where the big strikes have occurred. The oil has been selling for $2.48 a barrel with an eighth of it going to the landowners.

Situations like these are living testimonies of the average man's chance of benefit from the bubbling crude. The wealth has been placed there and lies in wait—for the earth above it to be moved and the initiative of men to harness its power to benefit themselves and the whole world.

Even with all the financial advantages, Mr. Tweel can testify that there are days when an oilman is better off to stay out of the fields. One Saturday last summer, he and his partner planned to spend the day at their Kyger Creek concern, building ladders for the new storage tanks. Almost at their destination, he remembered that he had left the nails in Huntington.

"Never fear," the good doctor said, "I have just the size we need in my tool box in the back of the car."

They began working, with Tweel doing the groundwork. The sun came blazing down and perspiration hindered his nearly futile attempts to dig the nails out of the box. (He adds that one needs to be familiar with the state of affairs are in that particular toolbox to fully appreciate the magnitude of the job.) Laying his glasses aside, to help the situation, he finished out his work with a feeling of satisfaction.

As they began to gather their paraphernalia together to return home, Mr. Tweel bent over to pick up his glasses and found them crushed by a poorly placed shoe heel.

Fortunately, Dr. Farnsworth was driving. The tired, tried and hungry two (Tweel with also a no-glasses headache) stopped in Gallipolis for supper. As usual, when he went into the washroom to wash his hands, he took great care to prevent water from ruining his watch, so he laid it atop the towel dispenser.

When they finished their meal, Tweel started to check the time but found a bare wrist. By the time he got back to the washroom the watch was gone.

Weary and disgusted, but not undaunted, the two came on to Huntington where Dr. Farnsworth let his partner out at Nick's News to do a bit of office work. As was his custom, Tweel unlocked his desk drawer and left the key in the lock, as he only planned to be there a few minutes. Concentrating on the figures before him, he reached over to a side cabinet for something and broke the key off in the lock.

He calmly sat down, called his wife, and waited for her to come and take him home, at last.

Special Report on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last November I made a special report on Vietnam to my constituents. Much of the material in it still has application. I have asked that it be reproduced below:

SPECIAL REPORT ON VIETNAM

(By Congressman CRAIG HOSMER)

"Vietniks" demand we get out of Vietnam. Mothers wonder why their sons are sent there. The President wants to negotiate. Military leaders want a victory. Most Americans believe we should see it through. There are many questions about the war.

What is the country like? Half the size, but similar in shape, population, and coastline to California. It's rugged—mostly thick tropical forests, dense mangrove swamps, and concealing rice paddies. Vietnam is more a collection of small villages and hamlets than a strong nation to which the people give allegiance as we do to our country. The people are very poor. Until recently their only contacts with their government were visits from the tax collector with no benefits in return. Along with Laos, Cambodia, and North Vietnam, South Vietnam was created from French Indochina after France's 1953 defeat at Dienbienphu.

Who are the Vietcong? The Vietcong are strong Communist forces seeking to seize south as ripe for takeover by this means. tion strategy used successfully in Cuba. Following 1953, the North Vietnamese Communist dictatorship of Ho Chi Minh saw the south as ripe for takeover by this means. The war now is in its 12th year. Red China, just to the north, encourages the aggression by supplying great amounts of munitions.

How do the VC fight war of liberation? Strictly according to Communist doctrine. Cadres of VC political organizers and disciplined military units infiltrated South Vietnam. Glittering Red promises of a better life recruited thousands of South Vietnamese into VC ranks. Where promises failed, threats were used. Systematic terrorism began. Village chiefs, schoolteachers and officials were murdered wholesale. Kill-and-hide guerrilla tactics—so effective in Vietnam's concealing terrain—were used by VC military units to capture much of the country. Final victory was to be capped by consolidating guerrilla bands back into regular military regiments for the last battles.

Why haven't the VC won? For two reasons: First, millions of South Vietnamese would rather be dead than Red. They've fought back desperately and valiantly. Second, the United States has helped them fight. To begin with, by supplies and military "advisers" and now directly with over 160,000 men and more coming every day. Early this summer the tide of battle began to change. Now it's the VC who suffer setbacks.

Why is the United States fighting? For at least three strong reasons: (1) Born in freedom, our country cares for the freedom of others. (2) Should South Vietnam fall, so will Laos and Cambodia—then Thailand, Malaysia, Burma, and Indonesia. Ultimately all of Asia—the Philippines, Formosa, Korea, Japan, and New Guinea—could pass behind the Bamboo Curtain. We fought World War II to keep the Far East from domination by a single, determined aggressor who would force our first line of defense back to the Pacific Coast. We fight in Vietnam for the same reason. (3) Castro got away with his war of liberation. If we don't defeat this one, the Communists surely will start more of them all over Latin America, Africa and elsewhere in the world. U.S. troubles will be endless.

What we are doing in Vietnam is morally right, militarily sound and geopolitically correct.

How do U.S. forces fight? At sea Navy Task Force 77's carrier aircraft share with the U.S. Air Force an around-the-clock harassment of North Vietnam, bombing and strafing anything that moves on roads, rails, or trails. In South Vietnam they blitz suspected Vietcong concentrations. They are on immediate radio call to aid friendly units engaged on the ground. The Navy also hunts and sinks Vietcong shipping in South Vietnam's inland waterways and along the coastline. Its guns fire at enemy units ashore. A U.S. naval officer assists the captain of each Vietnamese Navy ship.

On land the Vietcong enemy wears no uniform and assumes many disguises. He may be anywhere—a laborer or farmer by day, a guerrilla at night. There are no frontlines. One is seldom out of range of the fighting anywhere in South Vietnam. The U.S. Army and Marines fight independently and in cooperation with Vietnamese forces to search out and destroy the enemy. Often the Vietcong cannot be identified until he fires at you.

How is U.S. morale in Vietnam? It's tops—ashore, afloat, and in the air. A fighting day may last 16 to 20 hours—our men are glad to take it. They know their job and its importance. They want to win and are determined to do so. I talked with many wounded in field hospitals. They want to recover quickly and get back to their fighting units. They feel the demonstrators at home stab them in the back as they face the enemy and are as hostile to them as to the Vietcong.

Do planners in Washington try too much to run the war? Most probably. The volume of instructions to generals and admirals on the spot is tremendous. They know as much about fighting this kind of war without letting it get out of hand as Washington does. They know the circumstances at hand much better. It would seem wiser to give them more authority while still reserving top policy decisions to the Pentagon.

What would happen if we pulled out of Vietnam? Our resolve and action is the keystone of free world resistance to Communist aggression all over the world. Pull out that keystone and everything collapses. Red China and the U.S.S.R. get a green light to take over most of the world.

Why not declare war, bomb Hanoi, blockade the north, etc.? Wisdom of these actions must be kept under constant review. For the present we do a good job destroying supplies from Red China and reinforcements from North Vietnam. Also, supplies from the U.S.S.R. and other bloc countries are coming in less quantity than might be expected. Should we escalate in North Vietnam, it would give Ho Chi Minh cause to call on his allies for more effective help. Thus, there are two sides to the coin when contemplating these possible actions. We want the best one up.

Should we use atomic weapons? In my judgment this amount of force is not needed against targets in North Vietnam and the location of friendly forces and people in South Vietnam is too close for their safe use.

How about using 'nonlethal' gases? These agents, such as tear gas and nausea gas, could be used very effectively. Example: clean out enemy caves and tunnels with nonlethal gas instead of lethal explosives. A lot of killing coud be avoided and the work of our forces made easier. The gas here suggested for use does not kill and does not leave lasting aftereffects. It is unlike World War I's deadly gases which created so much horror.

Do we fight cold war along with the hot? Indeed we do. Realizing this is the key to understanding why military victory over the VC is only part of the job in Vietnam. To win final victory and get out we must create a strong nation there—stable and able to take care of itself militarily and in other ways. This means convincing the people that Communist promises are hollow—that the better life comes from their own free government and alliance with the United States.

How do we fight cold war? In addition to fighting, every one of our servicemen does something to make the people's lives better. As they liberate a village they bring in food and medical supplies; they help rebuild schools, roads and other public services. This is done through and in cooperation with Vietnamese Government officials. It teaches the latter how government should serve the people. It demonstrates to the people that real benefits—not just hollow promises—follow allegiance to their own government. It also demonstrates to the VC they have chosen the wrong side—many are defecting from the Communist side.

We also have in Vietnam many hundreds of dedicated U.S. civilians in the U.S. Information Service and AID mission. They risk their lives daily to carry the war for men's minds to the rice roots—right inside enemy strongholds. They also help build up the country's economy to make it self-sustaining. They often fly through heavy barrages of antiaircraft fire to drop millions of leaflets urging surrender of the VC and rallying the people to their government. An important part of their ammunition is relief supplies for the people bought by contributions from Americans.

When will we win in Vietnam? No one can predict when or how the military war will end. Right now it looks like the VC effort will intensify for a while, then it could peter out after some months—but terror tactics will continue much longer. Final victory will take a long time. We must win the cold war too. That will be when Vietnam not only is peaceful, but when a strong nation is welded together—able to care for itself against the enemy and to provide a decent life for its people.

What can we at home do to help the cause? (1) Use this document and other data to convince doubters of the importance of America's stake in Vietnam. (2) If you know a serviceman there, write him you appreciation for his bravery and sacrifice—say the same thing to his family here at home. (3) In addition to your regular donation to United Crusade, consider a contribution earmarked for "Vietnamese relief" to an organization such as CARE or Catholic Relief.

Desperate Conditions in the Mississippi Delta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of February 7, 1966, carried an article by Gene Roberts entitled "Delta Area of Mississippi in Turmoil." It speaks of the growing militancy in this predominantly Negro cotton-producing section.

Unrest in the delta stems from mounting unemployment due to farm mechanization and crop reduction programs. Farm employment is expected to be reduced by another 25 to 50 percent.

The Negro farmworkers feel they have not been reached by civil rights legislation and that the Federal Government is, in part, responsible for their plight. The article says further that no one expects the new Office of Economic Opportunity programs to come anywhere near meeting the need of the people.

I commend Gene Roberts, the New York Times reporter, for bringing these deplorable conditions to the attention of America. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1966]

DELTA AREA OF MISSISSIPPI IN TURMOIL

(By Gene Roberts)

GREENVILLE, MISS., February 6.—Aunt Neff's Cafe was crowded one afternoon last week in nearby Sunflower, but the bright posters that advertised a cheap brand of beer and a still cheaper soft drink were failing to drum up any business.

"We can't buy no nothing," said 51-year-old Sam Watts, speaking for the 16 Negroes who were huddled around the coal burning stove in the dim cafe. "There ain't one of us that's hit a lick of work since before January. The white man got all the jobs."

Frustration like that of Mr. Watts is commonplace in the alluvial plain that is known locally as the Mississippi Delta—the predominantly Negro cotton-producing arc from the intersection of the Mississippi River and the Tennessee State line to Vicksburg 200 miles downriver.

There is growing social ferment in this land. There is also growing militancy, which sometimes turns to cold anger, in the young civil rights movement.

Last week, 110 impoverished Negroes and civil rights workers seized a deactivated Air Force barracks at Greenville, then kicked, bit, and cursed the military policemen who ejected them.

Next, airbase demonstrators and other jobless Negroes moved to Strike City, a collection of tents and one wooden assembly hall near Greenville. They were built by 60 Negroes who were evicted from delta plantations last summer after waging an unsuccessful farm strike.

Now, with Strike City's population swollen to 160 by the new influx, residents are denouncing the Air Force's action and talking vaguely of "forming our own government."

Their traditional winter problems of inadequate food and widespread unemployment have been compounded this year by subfreezing temperatures and by continuing farm automation and new Federal production controls that threaten to reduce springtime farm employment by 25 to 50 percent.

Civil rights legislation, meanwhile, has forced the White Citizens Council into disarray. Civil rights workers are moving across barren and muddy fields, from one clapboard plantation cabin to another, carrying out voter registration drives and forming community action groups.

James Phipps, a young Mississippi Negro who wears an Irish Republican Army-type tranch coat, flits through the delta denouncing the "white man's government" and praising Jomo Kenyatta, the African leader who once led the terrorist Mau-Mau.

"Boppers"—a name, hazy in origin, that has been given by established civil rights organizations to freelance, Northern activists—drive or hitchhike down the delta highways, looking for civil rights "action" and leaving in their wake religious tracts and such publications as the Communist Party's the Worker and the Socialist Workers Party's the Militant.

A WELCOME RECEPTION

Visitors—whether they be reporters, civil rights workers' or boppers—are usually welcome at cabins whose occupants see little hope of farm employment this spring.

Three nights ago at an unpainted cabin in rural Bolivar County, 40 miles from Greenville, Dave Rockemore, his wife, an 81-year-old aunt, a daughter-in-law, five children and two grandchildren sat around their wood-burning heater before retiring for the night in the cabin's three beds.

They had just finished their supper of pork neckbones, water, sirup and "flour bread," and were eager to talk of their lives and "tell it the way it is."

"The boss man told me in November we could stay on in this house free," said Mr. Rockemore, who is 55, "but he say there won't be anything for anyone in the family to do on the farm but me, and that'll be a mighty little bit."

NO HOPE FOR SPRING

"There won't be as much cotton planted this year," Mr. Rockemore continued, "and the boss says he's broke and needs to use chemicals on the weeds this year instead of cotton choppers. I ain't had a single day of work since the first day of November and now there ain't any hope for spring."

The only income "earner" in the family is Mr. Rockemore's Aunt Mary, who took a dollar of her $46-a-month welfare check to buy the neckbone for the family's supper.

The neckbone "didn't make it around the table twice," said Mrs. Rockemore, but it "tasted good" after the family's winter diet of Government-provided farm commodities—grits, rice, flour, canned beef, meal, and dried milk.

Three miles up a dirt road from Mr. Rockemore's cabin lives John Usher, 47, who had been counting on "picking up pecans" this winter to supplement his family's diet, but now even that hope is gone.

GOVERNMENT IS RESENTED

"Some winters, I used to make $7 or $8 and even $9 a day picking up pecans along the levees where they grow wild," Mr. Usher said, "but this year they got the land posted and they'll fine you if you get on it."

He thought the Federal Government had posted the land, but a spokesman for the levy board said that the Goverhment held only an easement on the land, and that it had been posted by the timber companies who owned it to "minimize the possibility of forest fires."

The Federal Government, as often the planter, is the target of Negro farmworkers' bitterness. They do not feel they have been reached by new civil rights legislation.

In Sunflower, which lies 35 miles east of Greenville, Anderson Maples studied the patent medicine calendar in his four-room cabin and observed that it would be a "long time 'til spring.

"Somebody killed us on the cross," he said. "I don't know who it was, but I believe it was the Government or something."

Mr. Maples had no complaint about "Mr. Jack," the plantation owner, who provides free housing and coal and pays medical and electricity bills. Still, he said, things were better 10 years ago when a man could farm on shares. Then the Government commenced to pay landowners for not growing cotton, and some of the landowners used the money to buy tractors and mechanical cotton pickers, and soon there wasn't much left to do but drive tractors at $5 a day.

Mr. Maples left his sitting room, which was crowded by 12 children and grandchildren, a bed and a potbellied stove, and walked outside. There, he said that he had had "nary a day of work" since the first of January.

Joe Smith, 72, walked over from a neighboring cabin and observed that what Mr. Maples said also applied to him. As Mr. Smith talked, he kicked up the muddy earth with his shoes. His left shoe was a black wing-tipped design, his right one plain and brown.

UNITED STATES AIDS THE POOR

Three days ago, in an attempt to ease the poverty in the delta and throughout Mississippi, the Office of Economic Opportunity announced that it had approved a $1.2 million grant for the Mississippi Department of Public Welfare to use in hiring 3,000 poor persons to distribute $24 million in surplus farm commodities over the next 6 months.

The grant will double the present commodity program and reach an estimated total of 600,000 persons in families whose income is under $3,000 a year. This represents almost a third of the State's total population.

Better yet, in the view of some delta Negroes, it will mean that the flow of commodities will continue into the spring and summer, when six delta counties have traditionally ended the program to insure that Negroes made themselves available for cotton chopping.

It will also bolster the State's welfare program in a period in which the average payment for a family with dependent children has declined $6 to $33.19 a month because of "insufficient legislative appropriations."

Meanwhile, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Labor are financing for the Roman Catholic Diocese of Mississippi a $7.2 million job retraining program and also underwriting preliminary planning for Government-financed job centers and community action programs in key delta counties.

PROBLEMS STILL REMAIN

In view of coming labor upheavals on the delta plantations, however, no one is predicting that the poverty programs will amount to more than a first step toward alleviating the region's economic problems.

The Mississippi State Employment Security Commission says that by spring the number of tractor and farm mechanic jobs in 18 delta counties will have declined by 25 percent to 19,500 and the "hired work force" of cotton choppers by about 50 percent to a total of 7,000.

Such reductions appear inevitable, according to the commission's labor analysts, because of continuing farm mechnization and a new Federal subsidy program that is attacking cotton surpluses by offering farmers 10.5 cents a pound on average cotton yield for production cutbacks of up to one-third.

Thus, the long-range outlook is for more out-of-State migration in an area where the migration toll has already been severe. A recent study by Mississippi State University showed that 114,460 Negroes left the State in the 1950's from 11 delta counties alone.

Leroy Percy, a Greenville planter who is a brother of the novelist Walker Percy and a member of one of the delta's oldest plantation families, called this winter's problems "part of a long trend."

Mr. Percy has kept this winter's upheaval to a minimum by abolishing only the five tractor driver jobs that were left open on his plantation by attrition. Thirty jobs are left.

He said he believed that other planters were taking the same approach and were, like him, also gradually replacing farm cabins that have no plumbing with new houses that have interior toilets and forced air heat.

But in Sunflower, where there are nine empty stores and a population of 700, Mayor W. L. Patterson, a planter, said many landowners felt compelled to reduce their work force to protect themselves from the possibility of a Federal minimum wage for farmworkers.

"There is not as much worry about tractor drivers, since many of them get $7 a day," he said, "but a $1.25-an-hour pay rate for cotton choppers would ruin you when you have been paying $3 for a 10-hour day. So a lot of people are switching to chemical weed controls as fast as they can."

Two blocks away, at Aunt Neff's Cafe, 2 of the 16 Negroes stroked the backs of 2 cats that lay near the stove while others rolled their cigarettes from cans of Prince Albert tobacco.

"Every year," said Willie Pendleton, 49, "it gets worse."

The American's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, thousands of schoolchildren throughout the United States have at some time memorized "The American's Creed," which was adopted by the House of Representatives in 1918. It was written by William Tyler Page, an employee of this body who served as Clerk of the House from 1919 to 1931.

How thrilling are the closing words of this inspiring gem:

> I believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

The smart aleck who scoffs at patriotism, sneers at loyalty to one's nation, and would welcome a victory by our enemies would not agree with William Tyler Page that "it is my duty to my country to love it."

The moocher who wants a handout from the Government but is unwilling to take a loyalty oath would not agree with the author of the creed that "it is my duty to my country to support its Constitution."

The power-drunk agitator who publicly shows his contempt for the law would not agree with Mr. Page that "it is my duty to my country to obey its laws."

The overeducated fool who carries the enemy's banner would not agree with the words of the creed that declare "it is my duty to my country to respect the flag."

The unwashed beatnik who tears up his draft card would not agree with William Tyler Page that "it is my duty to my country to defend it against all enemies."

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that those in our midst who hate our country, who refuse to take loyalty oaths, who believe they are above the law, who dishonor our flag, and who hamper our Nation in its war against the enemy comprise but an infinitesimal part of our people.

We should let the rest of the world know that the overwhelming majority of the American people love their country, uphold its Constitution, are law-abiding citizens, believe its flag to be the most beautiful in the world, and will, with God's help, defend our country against all enemies.

Dangerous Advertising by Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Judge Haven Parker, of the Third District Court of Eastern Middlesex County of Massachusetts. Judge Parker is deeply alarmed by the current newspaper advertisements of three leading airlines which are entitled "The American Youth Plan." As a member of the juvenile court, Judge Parker is an authority on the activities of our youths, and I am forwarding his letter to Chairman Charles Murphy, of the Civil Aeronautics Board. I am sure that my colleagues would want to join me in expressing grave concern to the CAB.

I would like to quote Judge Parker herewith:

> COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF EASTERN MIDDLESEX,
> *East Cambridge, February 2, 1966.*
>
> Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'NEILL: Pursuant to my telephone conversation with you yesterday, February 1, 1966, I send you herewith the enclosed copies of advertisement which appeared in Boston Newspapers on January 31, February 1, and 2, 1966.
>
> As a judge of a juvenile court I am shocked that such reputable business corporations as American Airlines, Eastern Air Lines, and United Air Lines can print such deliberate invitations to children of 12 years of age to run away from home and school. In this respect I call your attention to the wording of American Airlines advertisement. It is headed in large type "To Any Kid Who'd Like To Leave Home. We'll Pay Half Your Fare."
>
> Under the heading "The American Youth Plan" it is stated "American will pay half the jet coach fare for anybody 12 through 21" and after further invitations and explanation of how easy it is to leave home, this sentence concludes the advertisement. "We can't add anything else. Other than it's a marvelous opportunity to just take off."
>
> It is to be noted that the offer of American Airlines to children of 12–16, still required by the law of Massachusetts to be in school, says nothing about parental or school consent. According to the advertisement any child between these ages regardless of sex could be carried by American and left miles away from home without money or any place to stay. The child then, if fortunate enough to be found by the police or Travelers Aid, would have to be returned to its home at the cost of its parents or the community all to the advantage of the air lines who would, of course, sell the airplane tickets to accomplish this.
>
> I should like to point out that the airlines are soliciting a $3 payment from minors. What the minor may get beyond a card offering them a chance to run away I am unable at present to determine, but I intend to find out.
>
> In the advertisement published by Eastern I desire to point out the very subtle suggestion that the "ID Card" be mailed to the school address. Is this so that the parents of a 12-year-old girl may not learn that their daughter is planning on her own to see and enjoy by herself the pleasures of Florida at half price fare?
>
> The advertisement of United Airlines in the Record American of February 2, 1966, is not as blatantly objectionable as the other two, but is still an invitation to teenage children to go "To the sunny Southlands; To the Coast; Swing a little in the big city," and "Then start living it up (at a happy one-half fare) in the friendly skies of United."
>
> In my opinion these advertisements come close to contributing to delinquency of a minor.
>
> I am informed that the Federal bureau to which protest should be made is the Civil Aeronautics Board, Mr. Charles S. Murphy, Chairman, Washington, D.C. I intend to write him protesting against this publicity by the airlines. I am indeed grateful for your interest and help in doing something to put a stop to this, to say the least, attempt to subvert parental and school authority and control over juveniles.
>
> With best personal regards, I have the honor to be
>
> Most respectfully,
> HAVEN PARKER,
> *Justice.*

A Freedom War Soldier Is Gone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, everytime I have heard the liberal commentators and professors make their appeal on radio and television for us to soften our thoughts more toward communism and ridicule any individual or any group that might advocate conservatism and constitutional government, I am reminded of some great Americans that I have known who knew the true story of communism and all its vices.

It has become the recent fashion for the liberals of our Nation to ignore communism and call everyone that believes in the type of government established by our Founding Fathers a rightist. To me any politician or person that speaks in this tone has little confidence in himself.

I would solicit the support of every individual regardless of his ideology, since I have enough confidence in myself to know I will vote my conscientious convictions every time.

It has been one of the greatest worldly honors for this humble American citizen to have known a great young American of our times. His name was Paul Diakonoff. He lived much of his life in Communist Russia and I have had him to cry and tell me:

> We must prevent communism from taking over our wonderful America like it did my homeland of Russia.

In my estimation, there has never been an individual who loved America any more than did Paul Diakonoff. His death should be a real challenge to all Americans of our obligation to our God, our forefathers, and our country. An editorial appearing in the Daily Review, of Hayward, Calif., on January 14, 1966, most accurately expressed the unsurpassable patriotism of Mr. Diakonoff.

It follows:

A FREEDOM-WAR SOLDIER IS GONE

Many Americans quickly can give the name and much of the background of our famous professional athletes. But these same citizens could name few, if any, of our great scientists who have helped to revolutionize the world for the betterment of mankind.

Likewise, many men elected to a political office are well known although they have contributed little to the welfare of government during their tenure in office.

But there are many citizens whose names are virtually unknown but who have contributed more toward the preservation of our Government than the elected officials.

One of these was Paul Diakonoff, who died at 39, Monday, in his Hayward home. His background was such that he could talk with authority on totalitarian government, because he had lived under it.

Mr. Diakonoff was a native of Russia who had lived in this area 8 years.

Peter Diakonoff, his father, was a noted Russian geologist of the late 1920's who journeyed to England to accept an award for his work. When he returned to the Soviet Union he was summarily executed by the Communist regime.

Mrs. Diakonoff was imprisoned, tortured, and eventually released, under surveillance. She advised her son, not yet a teenager, to escape the country when he could. He made it when he was 14, taking with him such a hatred for the Communist system that he joined Hitler's army in time for the bitter Russian compaign.

Young Diakonoff was severely wounded and captured, and served time in two Soviet concentration camps, one of them in Siberia.

Eventually released, he assumed the status of a displaced person in the postwar period and worked many years in the Belgian coal mines. With his earnings, he paid the way of several other refugees to the United States, and finally his own. He arrived in the United States 12 years ago.

Some teachers, ministers, labor leaders, and elected officials are using their influence to sell our Nation into communistic slavery. These are theorists who have never lived under conditions imposed by dictatorship.

Mr. Diakonoff was effective in his exposure of communism, particularly with young people, because he could tell from firsthand knowledge the evils of the system.

He made his living as a pressman. At home he repaired television and radio sets and he used the extra money for anti-Communist projects. Using his technical knowledge of communications, he recorded shortwave radio propaganda prepared in Moscow for the Russian people and the similar basic news slanted for world consumption.

Mr. Diakonoff translated the broadcasts and exposed the craft of the Soviet propaganda mill.

Truly, he was a dedicated anti-Communist and joined "up to his neck" any activity that would expose the Red conspiracy, said a Hayward friend.

The same friend said:

"He was just a great man—a totally unselfish man."

This is borne out by Mr. Diakonoff's final arrangements before his death. He donated his eyes to a bay area eye bank. The sight that he had will be implanted in some blind person.

He donated his body to the University of California Medical School.

We regret the passing of Mr. Diakonoff. He will be greatly missed by those who knew the effectiveness of his work.

Congressional Handling of Public Law 89–10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I recently received from Mr. Earl Schramm, who is director of elementary education in Faribault, Minn.

Mr. Schramm has raised some excellent points in criticism of the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965. I believe his presentation is excellent and worthy of serious attention by the Members of the House. The matter of providing adequate educational opportunities for children in poverty is of continuing paramount concern to this body, and one which I know will be debated again this year. For this reason, I hope all Members will take notice of the following remarks of a school administrator who is devoting his life to the education of our children.

FARIBAULT PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Faribault, Minn., January 17, 1966.

Re Public Law 89–10
Congressman ALBERT QUIE,
House of Reepresentatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I must write to you in protest of the handling of said law. I am not at all pleased with the manner in which it was passed in both Houses. I do not think that 5 minutes is enough discussion. Were there present, in advisory capacity, superintendents or qualified school-oriented people who are to implement this law at the grassroots level? The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not so state.

This law should not be for all of the school districts of America.

I admit that I would like to see the poverty cycle halted, but as long as this monetary crash program is beamed at upgrading and updating existing school and educational situations in America, why not put priority upon the critical regions or areas and pour the money and resources into those areas, regardless of why or how they got to be the educationally and culturally deprived areas that they are.

1. The Black Belt of the South.
2. Appalachia.
3. The slums of our larger cities.
4. Our Indian reservations.

The children of these areas need our forces of concern now and in great measure.

The rest of us can and must provide for ourselves until general aid is needed by all.

I would like to remind you of the FBIA's 100 years' attempt to make a dole system work, it has not been successful, therefore don't try it again and especially not on a grander scale.

Please do what you can to influence amendments to this general aid bill that would make it a special aid bill specifically directed to the four areas I suggested earlier. May I hear from you?

This is the way I feel about the principal of this legislation, sir. I hope you understand, as I am really a relatively easy man to live with.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,
EARL SCHRAMM,
Director of Elementary Education,
Rice County.

Scott Air Force Base Newspaper Broadcaster Observes Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, February 11, marks the 25th anniversary of the Scott Air Force Base, Ill., weekly newspaper, the Broadcaster. During that time the Broadcaster has won various Air Force and Military Airlift Command journalism awards.

Thomas J. Lee, its publisher for the 25 years, has seen the Broadcaster grow to where it has an estimated reading public of 12,000 to 15,000. Having worked with approximately 50 different editors and 19 successive base commanders, Tom Lee has not missed a Broadcaster publication. The February 3 edition is the 1,301st consecutive issue, establishing the Broadcaster as one of the oldest, if not the oldest, newspapers of its kind serving an Air Force base.

I am proud to say that Scott Air Force Base recently honored Tom Lee for his efforts, awarding him a certificate of appreciation.

I congratulate Tom Lee, the Broadcaster, and its staff on their fine record.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include an article by Mr. Cecil Reynolds, base historian, appearing in the February 3 issue of the Broadcaster. Following that is a letter of appreciation to the Broadcaster from Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., commander of the Military Airlift Command.

BROADCASTER CELEBRATES 25TH YEAR—HISTORY OF SERVICE RECALLED DURING SILVER ANNIVERSARY

(By Mr. Cecil Reynolds, base historian)

A quarter of a century ago, February 11, 1941, the first issue of the base newspaper, the Broadcaster, appeared on Scott newsstands.

This initial issue, eagerly awaited by Scott readers, culminated a year of groundwork by base officials and the publisher, the D. L. Lee Publishing Co., Marissa, Ill.

The Broadcaster was the second base newspaper in Scott history. The first was the Aerofoil, serving Scott Field personnel in World War I, the last weekly issue of which, the 27th, was published March 22, 1919.

Twenty-five years ago the base was known as Scott Field. It was an Army Air Corps communications training center. The base commander was Col. Walcott P. Hayes.

The Broadcaster was initiated on a trial basis. When queried about publishing a base newspaper Colonel Hayes is reported to have said, "Do you think we really need one?"

The name "Broadcaster," selected as symbolic of Scott Field's mission, is still appropriate since broadcasting means, "spreading information over a wide area and informing many people."

The paper's organizers shared an interest in newspaper work, conviction of the need for a base paper and confidence in its future.

The Broadcaster made its debut as a regular weekly commercial enterprise base newspaper, a joint product of the Scott Information personnel and the publisher.

The fledging paper was received enthusiastically by the troops—an immediate success. It featured news of Scott Field people, local happenings, items of interest and information not available from other sources. Then, as now, it could be said, "Everybody reads the Broadcaster."

The Broadcaster became the pioneer Air Force commercial enterprise base newspaper, set the pattern for other similar papers and prompted the issuance of appropriate control directives.

For the next two and one-half decades, through changing times, differing commands, and 19 successive base commanders, the Broadcaster established a tradition of service to the Scott community.

In peace or war, whether serving the communications student of World War II or the MACmen of today, the paper was unfailing in its commitments to its readers. Today's issue, the 1,301st consecutive, carries on this tradition.

The paper is a veteran of the Scott scene. It can be called, "Old Reliable." There was always a Broadcaster. It never missed a weekly issue. It was always out on time. It told the Scott story through the years, featuring the big and the little headlines of the times. Its name, publisher, and format remained the same. A monthly insert, the AMTWX, was added November 1964.

The paper is published today in over 7,000 copies weekly and has an estimated reading public of 12,000 to 15,000.

Many people have worked on the Broadcaster staff. There have been about 50 different editors since the first issue. A sizable number of its staff have gone on to success in the newspaper world.

Today's silver anniversary draws attention to the important role of the Broadcaster in base life and marks a significant milestone in its longtime operations as a part of the Scott team.

The Broadcaster has received many honors over the years, most recent of which were: two times first place winner (1961 and 1964) in its class in the Air Force-wide newspaper contest and first place winner for fourth consecutive time (1961–64) in its class in the MATS-wide base newspaper contest.

The paper's goal for tomorrow, its future role and purpose are the same today as ever—service to Scott people.

The Broadcaster staff thanks its diligent publisher, its loyal readers, those who contributed to its columns, everyone who helped distribute the paper, and all that assisted with its success in any way.

Letter of Appreciation

(By Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., MAC Commander)

Few, if any, commercial enterprise newspapers at Air Force bases can match the record of the Scott Broadcaster of 25 consecutive years of publication. In that period the Broadcaster has won several Air Force and MAC awards for journalistic excellence.

More important, the Broadcaster has always met its objective of informing the men and women working at this base as to activities and accomplishments of base units, major air commands and the Air Force. It also has been invaluable in promoting a good relationship with businessmen from adjoining communities who advertise in its pages.

During this period, the broadcaster has been provided free of charge to Scott personnel by one publisher, D. L. Lee Publishing Co. of Marissa, Ill.

The extended and harmonious working agreement between Mr. Lee and Scott is in itself a testimonial to the close relationship this base has with adjoining civilian communities.

Congratulations to the present editor and staff of the Broadcaster, to Tom and Bob Lee and to all those who have contributed to the successful 25-year record of the Scott AFB Broadcaster.

Binghamton (N.Y.) Radio Station Shows Faith in Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, today marking the 56th anniversary of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America makes this an appropriate time to tell my colleagues about the faith that Radio Station WNBF, in Binghamton, N.Y., has in the Scouting movement, and how it put that faith to work.

On November 23, last year, WNBF invited local Explorer Post 12 to "take over" the station for an all-night operation. From 11:05 p.m. until 5 a.m. a dozen senior high-school-age Scouts broadcasted a special preholiday program of news, weather, music, and holiday safety tips. In addition, the Scouts recorded telephone conversations from relatives and friends of servicemen in Vietnam for replay over the Armed Forces Network in Saigon. The members of Explorer Post 12 handled every phase of the operation—from preparation music and cue sheets through editing the news. They manned the control boards and presented the commercials as well as the program content. The entire session was so successful that Robert E. Klose, general manager of WNBF-Radio, invited the Scouts to return on December 30 for another all-night stint of news, weather, music, and preholiday safe driving tips.

The Scouts gained invaluable experience in actual on-the-air operation of a big radio station, and Mr. Klose, in recognition of their outstanding service, also presented them with a check covering part of the commercial profits of the two broadcast periods for use by the Susquenango Council of the Boy Scouts of America. Explorer Post 12's senior adviser is Jerry McElroy, a producer on the staff of WNBF–TV.

In making the presentation, Mr. Klose said:

> This project is just further evidence of the faith that we at the WNBF stations share in the youth of our community.

Perhaps other radio stations in other communities would now like to follow WNBF's imaginative and practical example.

The Flag and Peter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the flag of the United States has a special meaning, not only to those of us who have shared its proud history, but to millions of people around the world who aspire to obtain for themselves and their countries a way of life where the individual has a say in determining his own destiny.

Too often, there is a tendency on the part of our people to take the flag, and all that it represents, for granted. All of us, at one time or another, have observed the casual or indifferent attitude of some of our fellow citizens toward the flag.

Perhaps now, more than at any other time in recent history, the message of our flag and the respect which it deserves should be foremost in our thoughts.

Recently there came to my attention an exceptionally fine and heartwarming editorial that had appeared in the August 27, 1960, edition of the Utica, N.Y., Daily Press. The piece, written by Mr. Joseph E. Ray, was in the form of an exchange of letters between the editorial writer and a young lad who, displaying maturity far beyond his years, had requested the newspaper to "please print the rules that people should respect for our American flag because I think our flag is our most valuable possession and should be respected."

This widely acclaimed editorial was awarded a medal by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge for its effectiveness in promoting patriotism to flag and country and I am pleased to share it with my colleagues:

[From the Utica (N.Y.) Daily Press, Aug. 27, 1960]

The Flag and Peter

(By Joseph E. Ray)

UTICA, N.Y.

DEAR EDITOR: I am 12 years old and in the eighth grade in school.

Would you please print the rules that people should respect for our American flag in your newspaper? I was taught early in my school career that our flag should be taken down at sunset but I have watched a flag out all summer night and day in front of a house in my neighborhood, yet they take in their lawn umbrella at night. This bothers me because I think our flag is our most valuable possession and should be respected.

I think maybe some people have forgotten or are just neglectful and if they see it in the paper they will be reminded again; if I'm right I hope to see it in your paper. Thank you.

PETER DOYLE.

DEAR PETER: You are right, of course, that our flag is more important than a lawn umbrella. An umbrella can only protect you from rain or sun; this flag can protect you from foreign dictators and domestic tyrants. It can guarantee you freedom, for whatever constructive purpose you want to use your freedom—to go to school, to cut the neighbor's lawn, to go swimming, to read a good book, to stay overnight at the home of a friend without fear of being dragged out at midnight and sent away to death or slavery.

It is the custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaffs in the open. However, the flag may be displayed upon special occasions when it is desired to produce a patriotic effect. The flag should be raised snappily and lowered solemnly.

When you handle this flag you handle the souls of millions of brave men, both foreign and American, who died to keep its red, white, and blue fields spotless. Only a patriot should touch this flag, never a scoffer or a cynic.

There is a piece of Lincoln and a piece of Robert E. Lee in our flag. There is a piece of Joyce Kilmer, George Custer, and Andrew Jackson. There is a piece of Ira Hayes, George W. Carver, and Helen Keller, and Jim Thorpe, and George M. Cohan and Irving Berlin and Enrico Fermi and Charles Mayo and James Whitcomb Riley and Davey Crockett, Herbert Hoover, and Ernie Pyle. It's a long and glorious list, Peter, and no need to recite them all.

A lot of nations have come and gone since the Roman Empire but all of them together are not worth one postage stamp corner of Old Glory.

Always view with suspicion, Peter, any man who sneers at this flag; and never be, on the other hand, afraid to snap to like a soldier when the flag comes down the street. Other more timid Americans will take heart by your action.

One of the priceless virtues of this particular flag, Peter, is that it does not penalize or intimidate those citizens who live under its folds and yet remain so indifferent to its greatness. Other flags exist which do not pemit this luxury. Under our flag you and a five-star general of the U.S. Army are equal; for he, too, must salute it, defend it, and be loyal to it.

There is but one Stars and Stripes, as there is but one America and one God.

Cardinal Shehan Honored by Har Sinai Brotherhood in Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about brotherhood, love for one's neighbor, good will, and tolerance. As a direct result of the great and truly wonderful efforts and work of the Vatican Council II, the spirit of ecumenicism and better understanding is growing. The world owes an everlasting debt of gratitude to the late Pope John XXIII, who convened the council, and to His Holiness Pope Paul VI, who successfully brought its endeavor to fruition.

Recently, it was my good fortune to have been present at an occasion that gave unquestioned proof of the reality of brotherhood and of the fact that the awareness of the kinship of men is growing, regardless of differences of faith. On January 25, 1966, at the brotherhood donor dinner of Har Sinai Temple, in Baltimore, Md., tribute was paid to His Eminence Lawrence Cardinal Shehan by the spiritual leaders and members of the congregation who also heard a most inspiring and eloquent address by Father James B. O'Hara of the Cathedral of Mary Our Queen. It is worthy of note that the Har Sinai congregation is the oldest continuously Reform Jewish Congregation in America, having been founded in 1842.

The proceedings of that eventful evening will long be remembered as productive of a far greater understanding and appreciation of those things that unite men.

The invocation was made by Cantor Henry Cooper whose voice is matched by his creative skill as a painter of portraits. It was as follows:

INVOCATION BY CANTOR HENRY COOPER AT THE HAR SINAI BROTHERHOOD DONOR DINNER HONORING HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL SHEHAN

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this opportunity for fellowship and humbly ask the grace of Thy presence among us. From ancient days we have been taught: "Hine mah tov u-mah naim shevet achim gam yachad." Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. We thank Thee this night for the vision of ancient days, that Thou didst teach Thy seers to dream of all Thy children standing humbly in reverence before Thee, joined in mutual friendship. Grant us, we pray Thee, a measure of Thy goodness and Thy tolerance, so that no hatred may blind us to each other's godliness. May all of us be ever conscious of standing together in Thy presence.

And as we invoke Thy presence among us, we especially pray that Thou be with His Eminence, the cardinal, with the speaker who brings his message to this gathering, as well as with all our guests. Strengthen the leaders of our congregation and our brotherhood that they may continue to guide us with wisdom and courage to do Thy will.

As we are about to partake of Thy bounty we join in the ancient prayer of our people: Praised be Thou, O Lord, Ruler of the world, who bringest forth food from the earth. Hamotzi lechem min ho-oretz. We give thanks to God for bread. Our voices rise in song together as our prayer is humbly said. Boruch atto Adonoi elohenu melech ho-olom hamotzi lechemmin ho-oretz. Amen.

His Eminence Lawrence Cardinal Shehan was introduced to the gathering by Dr. Abraham Shusterman, rabbi of Har Sinai, with these stirring words:

Your Eminence, Mr. Mayor, Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, distinguished friends, and fellow members of Har Sinai Brotherhood, it has been my privilege to attend and to take part in a number of affairs honoring His Eminence, Lawrence Cardinal Shehan. Within recent months I delivered the invocation at the annual banquet of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the benediction at the good will luncheon of the Advertising Club. At both gatherings the guest of honor was His Eminence. He was rightly designated as Baltimore's Man of the Year. For many months it has been my strong desire to participate in a meeting held within a synagogue and under Jewish religious auspices because there are good reasons for us to be thankful for the life and service of this leading citizen of our community and to be grateful that we live at the same time and in the same city with so noble a man. For me this hour is one of fulfillment and it is doubly so because you have honored me by asking me to make this statement and the presentation with which it will end.

There are so many reasons why, in Biblical language, we delight to honor Cardinal Shehan. He is a native Baltimorean who was called to the spiritual leadership of this, the primal see of the American church and who was elevated to the college of cardinals by His Holiness. When I visited him in his office last summer I told him that, in the eyes of all Baltimoreans, he had become "the cardinal" of all the community, a prince of the church and a prophet honored in his native land. From our conversations before and after the Vatican Council and from his recent speeches and writings I have what to me is a vivid picture of the part he played in Rome, both on the floor of the council and behind the scenes. But this picture is based on newspaper reports and hearsay. Certainly nothing authoritative has been disclosed to me. However, my impressions cannot be too fanciful for I know Lawrence Cardinal Shehan and daily my conviction grows stronger that he is a tower of strength to men of good will and a pillar of righteousness and justice. As a Jew and a believer in religious liberty I have no doubt what stand His Eminence took in all the debates at the councils in Rome. For all he did in his quiet, modest, and effective way I give him the assurance that our gratitude is beyond expression.

It may have escaped the cardinal's memory that our association began when he was auxiliary bishop of Baltimore and Washington and was stationed at the Church of St. Philip and St. James on Charles Street. When the first picture was shown on the very first televised program of WBAL-TV, His Eminence, Bishop Noble C. Powell of the Episcopal Church and I were the three clergymen to speak and bless this new medium in entertainment and education. This was about 20 years ago. Except for his service as ordinary of the diocese of Bridgeport we have enjoyed an unbroken association for this score of years. A high moment without precedent in interfaith relations came when he summoned me to his throne at the cathedral and awarded me the Cardinal Gibbons Medal, along with two other non-Catholics, Dr. Helfer and Wr. Middaugh. It is a source of pride for me to reflect that I am the only non-Christian to possess this medal and to have been honored in this way by a prince of the church. For these tokens of friendship toward a rabbi, a colleague, a friend, my gratitude and that of my congregation are too great to describe.

However, there is a reason that transcends the personal and the Jewish aspects of this function tonight. His Eminence has given leadership, bold and daring leadership, not only to the Catholic community but to the entire State of Maryland in the area of civil rights. We recognize in him an advocate of all democratic tendencies in group relations and especially in those areas where so much injustice has been done; namely, the interracial. Let me describe a moment of tremendous spiritual grandeur. I was one of a number of speakers, representing Catholicism, Protestantism, and Judaism, at the hearings before the city council, acting as a committee of the whole, held at the war memorial about 10 days ago. I was seated directly in front of the microphone from which, in turn, the Cardinal, Bishop Doll, Bishop Lord, Dean Peabody, and I—along with others—were to speak. The papers estimated the audience at

2,000. About half of them, we are told, came to oppose the fair housing ordinance, either by speaking or by noisemaking. As the paper described the scene, all of us who spoke in behalf of open housing and justice to the Negro were not only applauded but booed. But Cardinal Shehan was the first to be introduced and to speak. Tears filled my eyes, as I watched him—facing his audience with dignity and evidence of deep spirituality, a giant among pygmies, a man of conviction ready to stand his ground. But my tears were not only tears of sorrow that little men would dare so vociferously to pass judgment on so princely a man. They were tears of pride that I was to be accorded the privilege to follow him on the program and publicly to identify myself with the point of view he espoused and championed. I saw greatness in action. Your Eminence, I have no way of knowing what moments of grandeur came in the life of Cardinal Gibbons but none could have equaled this moment when, in our minds and hearts, the title "Cardinal" and the corresponding expression "prince of the church" meant only one man—Lawrence Cardinal Shehan. At that moment, though I long to visit far distant lands before I grow too old—Israel, Scandinavia, the Orient—I would rather have been there at the war memorial with you than anywhere else on the face of the earth. And I was so privileged to be there, cheering you and thanking God for you.

You have received many plaques and testimonials and I am sure these bring you joy. I want to be both sentimental and practical tonight, first to give you this picture of the two of us, taken in your office by our president, Morton Oppenheimer, and used in both the Catholic Review and the Jewish Times to announce this meeting. A copy of this picture will have an honored place at Har Sinai for all to see. Your associates tell me that you do not have an Anchor Bible and that you might find it useful. So far only seven volumes have appeared and we have them here, as the gift of Har Sinai Brotherhood to you on this happy occasion. But there are, I understand, 31 volumes to follow, the product of the research and thinking of mankind's greatest Biblical scholars. I hope we both live to add the final volume to your library but these wil come to you as they are completed, one by one. I commit our brotherhood (and will leave a directive to my successor) that Your Eminence is to receive all these books as gifts from us, to use an expression that has its place in Jewish parlance. If 120 years hence you and I are no longer in the active ministry the books are still to be added as Har Sinai's continuing token of love to the library of His Eminence Lawrence Cardinal Shehan. Here are the first of the offerings; the rest are yet to come. In making this presentation of a gift that we know will be useful and helpful I have the high honor to lead in acclaiming our leading citizen, His Eminence, the cardinal.

The Reverend James B. O'Hara, assistant pastor of the Cathedral of Mary Our Queen, is very active in ecumenical and interfaith affairs and he is also the Catholic member of the panel of clergymen on the popular TV program, "To Promote Good Will," on channel 11, WBAL–TV in Baltimore. Therefore, I feel that his inspirational address is of such importance I would like to have it printed at this point in the RECORD:

Mr. Frankel, Rabbi Shusterman, and our hosts from Har Sinai; Cardinal Shehan, and other distinguished members of the clergy; Mayor McKeldin, Attorney General Finan, distinguished guests, members and friends of the Har Sinai Brotherhood, it would be superfluous to comment on the importance of this event tonight. When the brotherhood of a Jewish Congregation shows its esteem and affection for a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, news is made. For my part, I am deeply honored by your invitation to be the speaker of the evening.

To be honest, though, tonight is a very real pleasure for me in another way. Since my return from Israel last summer, I have been haunting the tables and lecterns of Jewish groups. I have spoken to Hadassah; I have addressed the Council of Jewish Women; I have appeared before the sisterhoods of several congregations, not to mention a number of women's clubs.

Now, do not misunderstand me, I like Jewish women, and they treat me very kindly. But, I do like to speak to men, too. Besides—let me share this fear with you—you know how Jewish women are (better than I): the presence of a 31-year-old, unmarried male in their midst is taken as a personal challenge. And when he can't get married, it causes a certain amount of frustration. Tonight, gentlemen, safe from the marriage calculations of your wives, I breathe easily.

The circumstances of tonight's dinner suggest a quite obvious theme for my remarks. A brotherhood sponsors this affair, and soon Brotherhood Week will be with us. Tonight we will address ourselves to the theme of the natural brotherhood which ought to bind together Christian and Jew, and especially Catholic and Jew.

To begin, we must admit that this natural brotherhood, to me so obvious, has not been the story of the past. The history of relations between Christians and Jews is not pleasant to read. It is a sorry story, we must feel deep shame as we think about it.

And even the present is filled with signs that a recognition of the natural, affectionate brotherhood of Christian and Jew is more a hope than a reality, although events like this one suggests that we are on the way.

But sorrow for the past is not very positive, is it? And moaning about the present is not very positive either. If there have been, or if these are, times of crisis in Jewish-Christian relations, something can be done about it here and now.

President Kennedy once remarked that the Chinese word "crisis" is "composed of two characters, one signifying danger and the other signifying opportunity. * * * Our task is to overcome the dangers in order to see the opportunities."

A more positive approach will be to look at Christianity and Judaism, to discover in depth what it is that unites us. Pope John XXIII once said: "We must always prefer to insist on what unites men, and to go along with them as far as we can." Where do we start?

First, we can begin at the beginning. The old axiom speaks of the "brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God." It is trite to repeat it here, but the old axiom has much truth to it. We are truly bound together by our theology. We are united by our common belief in one and the same God. No Jewish service is complete without the affirmation of the Shema: Hear, O Isreal, the Lord our God, the Lord is one.

This common belief finds expression, too, in our common acceptance of the Old Testament. We Catholics must look upon Abraham as our father, too. Jacob and Joseph, Moses and David are our heroes, too. The psalms are also our songs, and the prophets are also our teachers. Your holy land is our holy land, too. We revere, too, your landmarks and your milestones.

I have the suspicion that Christians and Jews do not usually understand how deep and wide is this common theological heritage. And the misunderstanding exists not only because we do not know enough about each other; it exists also because we do not know enough about ourselves. There are too many Catholics and other Christians who are utterly ignorant about anything more than the most obvious simple truths of their faith. And to be very blunt: there are too many Jews who do not know enough about their own traditions and beliefs to be able to explain them intelligently.

A deep and reflective knowledge of religion is not a luxury in these noisy times. If your faith and my faith are to say anything to one another, we must know what we are talking about. The things that unite us are very deep, and the deep has to be dug for.

What is more, if we together are going to say anything worth saying to the world outside of sacristy and synagogue, we have got to put aside the stupid thought that theology is really for the clergy, and the layman need do no more than pay his dues, show a middling interest in what is going on, and pat the right people on the back in a spirit of friendship and fellowship. Superficiality invites disaster. And—let us be brutally honest—we have all been very superficial, both in dealing with one another and in understanding our own faith.

I say that any kind of interfaith movement worthy of the name begins when we show each other the best of our traditions instead of a mediocre substitute, lukewarm and halfhearted. I call on you to be better Jews, and you have the right to demand real Christianity from me.

A second place to start will be in our traditions. Both Judaism and Catholicism are faiths heartily rooted in traditions. This ought to make us both men of history acquainted with history, and shaped by history. Too often, this is not the case. A man who does not know his past has amnesia and we feel sorry for him. So must we feel sorry Christians and Jews who are not aware of the priceless heritage of their past. I am embarrassed when I have to tell a Jew where Messada is and what Messada means. And I am ashamed when Catholics do not recognize the great names and places of our history.

To plead for a return to history and traditions is not to tell men of this day that they must live in the past. But we can never be creative and dynamic in reshaping the traditions and making them grow if we do not even know what they are. Ignorance in this case condemns us to sterility.

Finally, may I suggest that Catholics and Jews should be brought together by a common concern for social service and social justice. This social concern is part of the heritage of Judaism, and has been so since Isaiah. It is a growing part of the Christian Church's understanding of itself. And especially since the days of Pope Leo XIII has Catholicism's awareness of its social mission grown and developed.

The tasks waiting to be done are enormous: interracial justice, poverty, crime, starvation, old age, sickness, men without futures, children without hope. All these things are tasks for us, not only for us as members of a city or a community, but tasks for us as members of a faith, groping to bring the insights and intuitions of religious men to their solution. We must pitch in as Christians and as Jews, unashamed, armed with hope and faith, and happy to be called.

My dear friends and brothers, the past of Jewish-Christian relations is squalid, tainted with hatred, and bloodstained. The future is what we make it, if we have the courage to throw out the superficiality that is always a temptation and dare to be deep.

To stand where I stand tonight is very encouraging. The recent past has been thrilling, and the future makes your head swim when one looks at it from the interfaith point of view. I compliment the members of this brotherhood on the contribution we can all make together, and on the steps we take together tonight. I particularly compliment my dear friend and your rabbi, Abe Shusterman, for the role he has played in the interfaith life of our city. May the God of us all bless this work of His, till it be done.

The cardinal, although speaking without a manuscript, was eloquent and his words are gems of wisdom. The following is a transcription of a tape recording of his remarks:

During the past few months all of us have become aware that there has been a certain gap in the work of the archdiocese and it was only this evening when I heard the beginning of Father O'Hara's speech that I realized that the work wasn't being done in our churches because he was visiting your synagogues.

I am very happy, however, that he came safely through all the temptations and dangers and that at last he has landed in the hands of you Jewish men who will see that he remains safe from now on.

We are very blessed, it seems to me, in this age in which we live because we are living in an age in which we can look forward to deeper understanding and stronger bonds of friendship between all of us. As I listened both to Father O'Hara and to Rabbi Shusterman this evening, I became aware of how strong those bonds are becoming. And I might say that these bonds are in perfect conformity with the noble traditions of this community of Baltimore.

Those traditions were exemplified by my great predecessor, Cardinal Gibbons, over 50 years ago on our part, and on your part they were exemplified during that period by the many rabbis and the many members of the Jewish faith who were over so long a period the intimate friends of the great cardinal.

And so it is that we have in this community of Baltimore, this tradition, this tradition of understanding, this tradition of friendship, this tradition of true love.

(Reference was then made to the recent schema pertaining to Jews by the ecumenical council—this portion is missing from the tape.)

There are portions of that statement that many of us would have wished to be much stronger. Fundamentally, however, it is a good document. All the necessary ideas are there—although I say we would have wished the words to have been strengthened, particularly in two places. However, I feel grateful that we have such a document. I feel grateful that we have this document which does underline all those things that we have in common. I am grateful that we have this document, which, I believe, paves the way for a far better and brighter future. Never again, it is our hope in the life of that document, will there be those misunderstandings, those tragedies which have defaced the history of Christian-Jewish relations in the past.

And so in the light of the Second Vatican Council, we Catholics look forward to a future, a future which will know deeper understanding and firmer ties and stronger ties of friendship, a future in which all of us can work together for the betterment of our community and for the welfare of our whole country and our whole race.

God bless you all.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

In Support of Veterans' Benefit Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. DON H. CLAUSEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 12410, the cold war veterans' benefit bill. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is to be enthusiastically commended for the outstanding job they did in bringing this legislation to the floor of the House this afternoon. With over 135 bills introduced on the subject, the committee molded the best parts of each into a single bill that is supported by virtually every veteran in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of education, this bill provides for a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. College level and below college level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided. Part-time training is permitted. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months. A minimum of 180 days' service is required to establish eligibility unless the individual is discharged for a service-connected disability. Persons serving on active duty for training do not accrue eligibility. The education and training allowance set by this bill for full-time training is $100 per month for a single veteran, $125 a month for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 a month for a veteran with more than one dependent.

Proportionate rates are paid for three-quarters and half-time training. Education must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge or 8 years from the effective date of this act. Training is provided for active duty members of the armed services who have served at least 2 years, a portion of which occurred after January 31, 1955. These active-duty members may receive payments for fees and tuition. The administrative provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, for Korean conflict veterans, and the war orphans' training program are applicable to this new program. Schools will be approved by the State approval agencies of the various States, and these agencies will be responsible for extending supervision to approved schools.

Other provisions of this act call for the Veterans' Administration home loan guarantee program to be extended to this new group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The guaranteed loan by a private lender of $7,500 is continued. Direct loans for housing in rural areas and small towns, established as direct-loan areas, will be available to this group. The maximum amount of the direct loan is increased from $15,000 to $17,500. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is given authority to regulate the interest rate, consistent with the ceiling established for the Federal Housing Administration. A fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses, by requiring the veteran to pay five one-hundredths of 1 percent of his loan at closing.

At the present time, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, are eligible for medical care in Veterans' Administration facilities only for service-connected disabilities. Under this act, this group is made eligible for non-service-connected medical care on the same basis as veterans of earlier wars. Eligibility for non-service-connected medical care is based on availability of a bed and the signing of an oath of inability to pay, as is required of veterans of earlier wars entering for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities.

Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to this group being discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans. Persons serving on duty for training purposes do not accrue veterans' preference rights.

War veterans are now covered by certain presumptions of service connection for a long list of chronic and tropical diseases. Peacetime veterans do not enjoy these presumptions of service connection. Under this bill, the wartime presumptions are extended to the group being discharged after January 31, 1955.

A flag is provided to drape the casket of war veterans. This provision is extended to peacetime veterans.

War veterans are provided job counseling and job placement assistance by the Department of Labor. The bill provides that peacetime veterans should be placed on the same basis.

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act is amended to increase protection for individuals who are renting homes when they are called to service. The amount of rental covered is increased from $80 monthly to $150 monthly.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is designed to recognize the dedicated service of our military personnel during the so-called cold war. The people of this country have spoken out in support of this bill. They have asked that we help the men who risked their lives to protect our freedom.

Some people who do not fully understand the provisions of this bill might label it as fringe benefits for our veterans. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, could be further from the truth. The provisions of this act are rightful benefits which should accompany the service of men and women to our country.

The legislation has my full support and I urge my colleagues to join me in giving the bill our unanimous support.

Farming in Idaho: A Look Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on December 16 I was pleased to be the guest of the Kiwanis Club of Twin Falls, Idaho, at its farm-city banquet, given each year in recognition of the community of interest which exists between farmers and city dwellers in the Magic Valley area. I ask unanimous consent that the speech I delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMING IN IDAHO: A LOOK AHEAD

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho)

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the completion of Arrowrock Dam, which, in its day, was the highest dam ever built, and which, through the years, has transformed the life of the Boise Valley.

When Arrowrock Dam was dedicated, on October 4, 1915, a remarkable address was delivered by J. H. Lowell, of Parma. Mr. Lowell was the chairman of the first water users association in the area, and the man whose name was subsequently given Lake Lowell, in memory of his lifelong service.

In his dedicatory address, Mr. Lowell said: "We are pioneers working with tremendous natural resources, out of which we are seeking to lay the foundations of a great commonwealth. We have made giant strides, but in truth, we are still only on the threshold of our development, and we are looking into the future, not the past."

Fifty years ago, the people of Idaho were willing to think big about their future. In the half century that has elapsed, I think we have come around full circle, and that the people of Idaho again stand ready to think big about their future once more.

"The tremendous natural resources," to which Lowell referred—the vast stretches of fertile, arid land, and the abundance of unused water—still await full utilization and development. In a very real sense, we still stand upon the threshold.

In all candor, we have not stretched ourselves to put these resources to work; we have, rather, come through a long period of comparative pause, during which our forward motion has been mostly confined to small, cautious steps.

On the whole, we have tended to avoid the kind of big risks once welcomed by the pioneers. The inheritance they left us, we have treated as our nest egg to protect; the exuberant vision they held of a future unlimited, we have tended to circumscribe with hesitancy and doubt.

Indeed, so negative, at times, has been our thinking, that, in this State where the economy is so largely dependent upon successful reclamation, we have actually come through a period when new reclamation projects for Idaho have been strenuously opposed. We have contented ourselves with piecemeal development, with a principal emphasis being given to the impoundment of supplementary water for existing tracts of irrigated land.

Now, of course, there have been reasons for this, plausible reasons, perhaps even good reasons, that account for this long period of lingering restraint. I think they can be assembled under one heading: the extraordinary revolution that has occurred on American farms in this generation, and the apprehension and uncertainty concerning the future of farming which this revolution has occasioned.

Fifty years ago, when Mr. Lowell was making his dedicatory address at Arrowrock Dam, half of the American people were still living on the farms. That is a ratio which still exists in Russia and the satellite countries of Eastern Europe. But in America today less than 10 percent of our people remain on the farms, and they are producing sufficient food, not only to feed themselves and the 90 percent of our people who now live in the cities, but to accumulate huge surpluses as well.

One of the consequences of this rural revolution has been the steady decline in the number of farms. Since 1945, for example, the number of farms in Idaho has decreased from 42,000 to 35,800. But during the same period, while the number of farms has dropped, the total agriculture yield in Idaho has climbed dramatically. Potatoes are up 65 percent, wheat up 55 percent, dry peas up 46 percent. We are producing twice as much milk and three times as many eggs.

In terms of productivity, this is our part of a success story unequaled by any other country in the world. But it has given widespread currency to the belief—here in Idaho and elsewhere—that we already have too much farmland, so that new reclamation projects can no longer be justified.

Moreover, the rising productivity on our farms has not been accompanied by rising prices for farm products. Indeed, these prices have failed to keep pace with increasing costs, so that many a farmer has found himself in the tightening grip of a serious cost-price squeeze. In face of this predicament, it is little wonder that many farmers have been disinclined to favor new reclamation, which would bring still more farms onto the production line to further glut the marketplace.

These considerations, coupled with the expensive Government farm programs that attempt to cut back on production, may account for the relatively slow pace of new federally sponsored reclamation in Idaho in recent years.

Surprisingly, however, though the same underlying conditions have existed elsewhere in the West, other western States have refused to wear the same straitjacket. Proceeding on the hypothesis that diversified planting on Federal reclamation projects does not contribute significantly to the surplus problem, other western States have been moving full speed ahead with ambitious water development programs. States in the Southwest, like California, Arizona, and New Mexico, States in the Upper Colorado Basin—which now boasts the largest developing irrigation program in the world—these, our sister States in the West, have refused to stand still.

And the growth in these States has been so great that they now foresee the day when they will be running short of water. Already, with a prudent determination to make provision for the future, these thirsty States are eyeing unappropriated and unused waters here in the Pacific Northwest.

Of course, we can hope for miracles, we can hope, for example, that the next few years will see big strides in the desalination of ocean water, which might prove of some relief to Los Angeles, next to the sea. But even the most accelerated progress in this field will be of little avail to the inland States, and, in any case, there is no basis to expect that this water can be produced cheaply enough for agricultural use. Therefore, as of now, we must assume that a major attempt will be made in the years ahead, to divert water from the Northwest into other river basins.

Indeed, there are presently study proposals pending in Congress, introduced by Representatives of the water-short districts of the West, which contemplate possible diversions of water from the Northwest in the future.

And where the Upper Colorado Basin is concerned, let's not fool ourselves: it would be foolhardy to divert water from the mouth of the Columbia River at sea level, and pump it all the way over the Continental Divide into the Upper Colorado Basin. That water, if it is to be diverted at all, will have to be diverted from the Snake River in Idaho. Already, there is one study under consideration by the Interior Committee of the House of Representatives directed toward ascertaining the feasibility of diverting 8½ million acre-feet of water from the Northwest into the Upper and Lower Colorado River Basins, and to supply irrigation canals along the route of the diversion. This, I would point out to you, is in excess of the total annual flow of the Snake River at the site of the proposed Guffey Dam in southwestern Idaho.

What would this water be used for in Colorado, Arizona, or southern California? To fill the empty water glasses of thirsty people? To provide the necessary sanitation and sewage disposal in Phoenix or Los Angeles? To meet vital industrial demands? Not at all.

The water which would be siphoned away from the Pacific Northwest is mainly to be put to the very same irrigation uses we have pioneered. At fantastic expense, it is to be diverted a thousand miles to reclaim new land in the Southwest, while desert lands, lying next to the very source of the diversion in the Northwest remain dry.

Incredible? Yes, but the proof can be found in the present use of the water in the very areas which now search for more. Southern California is now using 90 percent of its water, locally developed and imported, for irrigation. Throughout the arid Southwest, 75 percent of all the water is going into reclaiming new land or irrigating old.

So, I say to you tonight, whether you are an Idaho farmer or an Idaho businessman dependent upon the farmer—we are faced with a challenge of an entirely new order of urgency. If we are not to lose the excess water, presently unappropriated in the Snake River and its tributaries, we must delay no longer in putting that water to use. Partial, piecemeal projects will no longer suffice. The threat of eventual diversion is real. Faced with it, I hope it will never be said to us that our response was "too little and too late."

The answer does not lie in political assurances from any source. The Secretary of the Interior has given me, in the most unqualified language, assurances that the Johnson administration will oppose any diversion of water out of the Columbia-Snake River. But, as we all know, administrations come and go, and such assurances are, at best, transitory in nature. The only reliable course is to get on with the development of our water here in this State on a scale sufficient to protect our future.

The case for comprehensive use is exemplified in a proposal that Congressman Compton White and I recently put forward for a unified southwest Idaho water development project. Briefly stated, this is a $700-million plan to put the unused water in southwest Idaho to work. When it takes final form, the project may pull together as many as five previous proposals for piecemeal development of the region. Two major dams, two diversion tunnels, and associated generator facilities, fully integrated with existing works, would be entailed. The project would irrigate some 500,000 acres of vacant desertland, putting supplemental water on other land, now irrigated but without adequate water supplies. In addition, the project would generate more than half a million kilowatts of saleable Federal power to help repay its construction costs. Municipalities and industry would come in for their share of the water, while recreation, fish and wildlife would also be served.

Elsewhere in southern Idaho, right here, in the Magic Valley, on the Salmon tract, there has been a long-standing need for supplemental water. Southwest of Burley, in the Oakley Fan area, there is a prospect for new reclamation development connected with the study now underway to increase the height of the American Falls Dam. And in the Upper Snake there are still other possibilities. But if we're to face the challenge that confronts us, we're going to have to lift our sights above the confinement of our own State borders, and operate instead within the whole of the natural basin which is formed by the Columbia and Snake River drainage systems. In short, we're going to have to look for financing assistance which can come only through the establishment of a basin account.

A basin account for Idaho is not a partisan proposal. My colleague, Republican Senator Len Jordan, fully concurs with me in advocating such an account. Let me just take a moment to explain it.

Those of you who are irrigators know that, for many years now, it has not been possible for the water users to fully defray the mounting costs of new irrigation projects. For a long while now, in connection with new reclamation projects, we have made up the difference from revenues derived from the sale of public power. Without a basin account, we in Idaho are limited to power revenues from Federal dams located within the State. Indeed, until very recently we were even confined to those Federal dams situated in southern Idaho. No other Western State is so straitjacketed. The Southwestern Idaho water development project cannot be built unless Idaho is plugged into the great Federal power system that our tax money has helped to create downstream on the Snake and Columbia Rivers.

This system, as a whole, must be made to pay for a well-balanced and equitable development of all the lands these rivers drain. This can be achieved only through the establishment of an overall basin account, similar to those that have already been set up in the other great river basins of the West.

A basin account would enable us to lump together all of the revenues derived from the enormous public investment that has been made in the waterworks of the Northwest—including the power revenues from such giant Federal generating plants as Bonneville, McNary, and the Grand Coulee—so that we might draw upon the surplus, as these projects pay themselves off, to help finance new development, wherever it may be located, upstream or downstream, within the drainage system.

Without a basin account, we will continue to be excluded from the full benefit of this tremendous public investment; we will remain a kind of second-class citizen among the States of the Northwest. Idaho's entitlement to fully participate ought to be perfectly clear. The downstream dams belong fully as much to us as they do to the people of Oregon and Washington. And fully a fourth of the water turning their generators is furnished by Idaho.

So, if we're not going to shortchange ourselves, the time has come for us to seek a Columbia Basin account. Its easy enough to blame others for our failure to secure one long ago. But the truth is that we haven't gotten together to work for one, and the blame is ours. Still, I think the time is ripe and the opportunity exists in Congress. Accordingly, the legislation I shall introduce in the upcoming session of Congress to authorize the southwest Idaho water development project will contain the necessary "breakthrough language," and I hope that both Senator JORDAN and I will have the united support of Idaho in our attempt to achieve this breakthrough in the months ahead. It means a great deal. Without it, as I have said, the full development of our water resources in southern Idaho can never be achieved.

Well, I also want to talk about the farmer in a larger context this evening. I don't know whether you folks have heard the story about the Texas rancher who came to visit an Idaho potato farmer. One morning the rancher stepped out onto the porch of the farmer's house. He looked to the right and he saw the fenceline nearby. He looked off to the left and, down a little piece, he saw the other fenceline. So, he turned to his Idaho friend and said, "You ought to see that Texas ranch of mine. Why, I get up early in the morning, get into my car, and start to drive fronm one of my fencelines toward the other. I drive and I drive and I drive, and late in the afternoon, when the sun is beginning to set, I finally reach the other fenceline." "You know," replied the Idaho farmer, "I used to have a car like that myself."

I wish I had as ready an answer for the big question which continues to perplex all of us concerning the American farmer and his future. I don't possess a crystal ball. I can't give you a certain forecast of things to come. But I can tell you, on the basis of signs in Washington and obvious developing facts abroad, that I strongly sense that the role of the American farmer is going to change; that instead of expensive farm programs to cut back on the production, we're very likely to find the American farmer soon enlisted in a national effort to produce more instead of less.

Why do I say this? Not because our national food consumption is going to expand enough to change things for the farmer, but because of the world situation. The fact of the matter is that we are faced today with the specter of spreading starvation in the world. Half the world's people are suffering from a chronic insufficiency of food, with every likelihood that their plight will worsen. Only 3.5 percent of the earth's surface is arable, and most of that is already under cultivation. But world population, which took 100,000 years to reach 3 billion, will double in size in the next 35 years.

I just returned from Rio de Janeiro, where I went with Secretary of State Dean Rusk to attend the Hemispheric Conference of the American Republics. In Latin America, 35 years ago, they were exporting grain. Today, Latin America imports far more grain than it exports. There is insufficient food being produced to feed its present population of some 250 million people. Yet, between now and the end of the century, the population will increase to over 600 million.

In India, in the next 15 years, 200 million people will be added, a larger number than the present population of the United States. Inevitably, the world's demand for food is going to soar, in the years immediately ahead.

In the face of this prospect, there is a growing feeling in Washington that we cannot keep on paying farmers for not producing when spreading starvation stalks the world. So it is that food, in my judgment, will soon become our most precious weapon for peace. Better that we unleash our farmers; that we declare all all-out war against hunger for the balance of this century, than suffer the consequences that spreading starvation will bring.

This means that we should not only commence to share more fully in the commercial food markets of the world, but that we must expand upon our food-for-peace program, in Africa, Asia and in Latin America, where the best efforts to produce more food will fall short of meeting critical needs.

Now, it must be recognized that deliberately producing farm commodities for use overseas represents a departure from past policy. Present food-for-peace efforts are based largely on the distribution of surpluses that have accumulated in spite of farm programs to prevent them. It must also be recognized that in most cases it is preferable, if not essential, for developing countries to supply most of their own food needs. But the fact remains that for the foreseeable future, these countries cannot increase their production fast enough to meet their needs without food shipments from the United States.

The question is, Will we, at enormous public expense, continue to support farm programs designed to cut back on production, while mounting hunger spreads across the world? I don't think we will. Morally, I don't think we can. It is impossible to justify subsidies to cut back production when the money could be better spent to protect the producing farmer through export subsidies, especially when the food we send abroad is the best weapon we have for peace and stability.

I serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where I try to work for sensible foreign aid programs. I have become convinced that, of all the different kinds of aid we give, the food is the best. Much of the money we are spending on other projects is often wasted. It may well be that the American farmer is destined to become the most important single contributor to American foreign policy.

The second and more fundamental front in the war against hunger is the urgent need for a rapid acceleration of food production abroad. We and other advanced countries must assist the developing world to undertake the kind of agricultural revolution which we have experienced in the last hundred years.

There is an urgent need for the knowledge and skills of our agricultural technicians, research scientists, extension workers, and experienced farmers. An American Farmers Corps consisting of retired farmers or working farmers willing to take leave of their own farms for a time could perform an invaluable service abroad. There is great need, too, for more fertilizer, pesticides, irrigation development, hybrid seed and feed-mixing equipment. Enlightened land ownership and tax policies, improved distribution systems, and low-cost credit are essential to rural development. So is an improved system of rural education.

This type of aid is not inexpensive nor is it easy to implement. But food and agricultural assistance are less expensive than military hardware and they are much more constructive and helpful to the peoples we assist. As one watched our two impoverished friends, India and Pakistan, shooting at each other with American arms, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that both countries need our food and our farm know-how more than they need our guns.

Furthermore, the strengthening of the diets and the agricultural economy of the developing countries—far from removing them as potential American markets—would open the way for new long-range U.S. markets. Those nations with advancing agricultural and industrial productivity are also our best commercial customers. Canada with a tiny fraction of the population of India is a larger American customer than India. After assisting postwar Japan develop its agricultural and industrial economy, we discovered that she has become the largest purchaser of American farm produce.

Communist China has called for a "people's war" in Asia, Africa, and Latin America to win the world over to communism. But Red China has failed on the agricultural front and the situation has been worsened by drought and other natural hazards. She cannot win a "people's war" against the developed world if we will place the welfare of people above short-term goals of military maneuvering and cold war strategy. So let us take the lead in a "people's war" with corn instead of cannon, with farmers instead of marines, with agricultural technology instead of battle plans, with food instead of fear.

The future of the American farmer is big—not bleak. Then, let us begin to build big again for the future of Idaho's farmer. Let our plans match the dimensions of our rivers and our deserts. Let us move ahead, no longer the prisoners of pessimism, but as pioneers once more with promises to keep.

If we will do that, our grandchildren, long after we are dead and gone, will remember us in their prayers.

Hanoi's Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, "we will not grow tired." The President has repeatedly said this, but it is a fact which unfortunately has not penetrated into the thinking of Hanoi.

This is the reason for Hanoi's completely negative response to peace offers.

There some leaders expect that we may win their war for them. The war for them would be won if the United States should tire and give up the fight against aggression.

This point is made abundantly clear by the Houston Post which states that:

> Communist leaders are counting heavily on the American people and their political leaders to win the war in Vietnam for them.

Actually, says the Post:

> It was the men in Hanoi who made the decision for a resumption of the bombing of military targets in North Vietnam since, if the war must continue, the effort to reduce or prevent the flow of men and supplies into South Vietnam from North Vietnam must continue.

The tragedy over there can be stopped "anytime the Communists will abandon their aggression and lust for conquest." Because many concerned Americans will want to ponder the wisdom of this article, I think it should be printed in the RECORD, and with permission of my colleagues this will be done:

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 1, 1966]

BOMBING DECISION MADE IN HANOI

Communist leaders in Hanoi, and presumably in Peiping and Moscow as well, are counting heavily on the American people and their political leaders to win the war in Vietnam for them, and they have been given encouragement by a few noisy Americans, including some Members of Congress.

This is the only logical conclusion that can be drawn from their completely negative response to President Johnson's unprecedented peace initiatives and Hanoi's declaration of its intention to continue the conflict. It actually was the men in Hanoi who made the decision for a resumption of the bombing of military targets in North Vietnam since, if the war must continue, the effort to reduce or prevent the flow of men and supplies into South Vietnam from North Vietnam must continue.

President Johnson took obvious military risks when he suspended the bombings for more than a month. He felt that these were outweighed by other considerations, and he was correct in doing what he did. At the same time, the military situation imposed definite limitations upon how long the suspension could continue. In fact, the restraint shown by the President and American military commanders was in itself unprecedented.

It is clear the Communist leaders believe that, as was true of the French prior to 1954, the American people will become weary of this kind of war and its cost and that the war will become such a hot domestic issue in this country that President Johnson or a successor in the White House will be forced to surrender and retreat by withdrawing American forces from South Vietnam.

A report that the Communist leaders have decided to continue the war through the 1968 presidential election makes sense, in a situation where there is very little sense. They hope that, if they cannot force President Johnson to capitulate, they can bring about the election of another President who will.

Their appraisal of the internal American political situation, as well as that of American character, has been encouraged by the conduct of some Americans.

It is, of course, desirable that U.S. policy with respect to Vietnam be debated. This is true of all governmental policies. It is true likewise that debates of this kind actually strengthen democracy. But it also is true that people who do not understand democracy and the functioning of the American democratic system can easily be misled, and very few, if any, Communists have this understanding.

Time, we are convinced, will show the Communists that they were misled, that their appraisals and conclusions were erroneous. This is not the first time, nor is it likely to be the last, that the world has had to pay a very high price in blood, treasure, and suffering for the miscalculation of a few men who happen to have within their control the instruments of national power.

The tragedy is that all this waste, death and suffering could be avoided. It still can be avoided anytime the Communists will abandon their aggression and lust for conquest. President Johnson has made it clear that his pursuit of peace will go on, in the United Nations and elsewhere. It must, but there is not much hope for success so long as the Communists believe that the American people will win their victory for them.

The Recognition of God in Our Public and Private Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most controversial and important issues facing the American people today is the subject of the recognition of God in our public as well as our private lives. The Supreme Court has been instrumental in secularizing our public life through its series of decisions which began with outlawing voluntary, nonsectarian prayers in public schools. Mr. Gene Rickett has published a book of poems entitled "Poems of Inspiration," which are a significant contribution toward a better public awareness of the issue which faces the American public. This book of poems was published by the Marlboro Herald-Advocate, of Bennettsville, S.C., and Mr. Rickett has been kind and generous enough to present me with an autographed copy of his book.

One particular poem bears directly on the subject of prayers in schools. I ask unanimous consent that this poem entitled "God Out Of School," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOD OUT OF SCHOOL

(By Gene Rickett)

The Supreme Court made a decision today
To put God out of the schools in the U.S.A.
And now the problem that we have to face,
Is what will become of the human race.

Are we better today than we were long ago
Or have we just reached an all-time low?
And "We the People" could be a lot worse
When we face the Maker of this great
universe.

And these Justices, who claim they stand tall,
Who took an oath, under God, to serve us all,
And did they really have so little to rule,
Than to pick on God, to put Him out of
school?

Can we send our children to an atheist
school,
Where they can't even mention the Golden
Rule?
Where God isn't welcome, He was even expelled!
By this decision that was straight out of
hell.

Is it freedom of religion, or freedom of
speech,
When the Government tells us what we
cannot teach?
Is it justice, or just tribulation
And doesn't it warrant an investigation?

Dr. Frederick P. Whiddon, 1 of the 10 Outstanding Young Men in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce has, for the past 28 years, conducted an annual project in which it names 10 outstanding young men of the year.

The awards are determined by extensive study as a means of honoring some of the most capable, dedicated, and inspiring young men of the Nation. Men who have won this honor in the past include some of the most important names of our national leadership, in government, medicine, education, space exploration, and other important fields.

One of the 10 men selected for this extraordinary honor for the year 1965 is Dr. Frederick P. Whiddon, president of the University of South Alabama located at Mobile. He is worthy of the honor.

Dr. Whiddon is 35 years old, is married, and has four children. He is a native of Henry County in Alabama. He took his undergraduate study at Birmingham Southern College, and his Ph. D. at Emory University, in 1963.

In November of 1963, he was selected to be president of the University of South Alabama, an institution which was then created: the first public institution of higher learning to be established in Alabama in nearly 70 years.

At 33, Dr. Whiddon was judged to be the youngest college president in the Nation, according to a study of 2,046 colleges and universities. But the more significant accomplishments of this young administrator over the next 18 months brought added laurels from the general public and the field of higher education.

Within that period he engaged and organized an administrative staff and faculty of 100 members, recruited an initial student body which now surpasses estimated capacity by 100 percent, developed a basic curriculum, supervised purchase of 60,000 carefully selected books for the university library, and inaugurated first classes with 274 students in the summer of 1964.

Approximately 2,000 students are enrolled at the university now, and enrollment for the next several years appears limited only by the physical facilities.

Dr. Whiddon has a rare combination of the diligence and insight of a scholar and the business acumen of a man of action. He has needed these attributes in his successful efforts to translate the ideals of visionaries into the bricks and mortar of a university.

He is one of the first State university presidents in the South to handle racial integration without incident. He early established a policy of guarantees for academic freedom, and frequently has been called upon to defend it.

This policy has been a major factor in attracting highly qualified faculty members from throughout the Nation. Located as it is in a major port city, the University of South Alabama has faculty members from Europe, Central America, and the Far East, and, with foreign students, the institution already has an international atmosphere.

President Whiddon has moved strongly ahead to establish the second medical school in the State, and $3 million has been committed toward its development.

Dr. Whiddon financed his own education by contracting and building nine houses. When it came time to build the new university's presidential home he refused to use public funds for it, and instead, financed, designed, and built it himself.

He holds a clear concept of the significant role of education in our lives. He believes that Alabama's full potential will be realized only when thousands more of its citizens have available the opportunities for higher education.

In his own words, he states the objectives of his project this way:

> The University of South Alabama dedicates itself to the assault on ignorance and misery and to the leading of our citizens into a new dimension of realization, wherein every man may develop the full extent of his powers and grasp new insights at the upper reaches of his mind.

The U.S. Jaycees made their awards at St. Paul, Minn., in January of this year. I would like to include at this point in my remarks the brief acceptance speech which Dr. Whiddon made at that time:

> Distinguished ladies and gentlemen, to the U.S. Jaycees and especially to the Mobile Jaycees, my profound gratitude. In behalf of my colleagues who labor patiently and long in education, I accept this award. This honor, of course, surpasses personal merit and conscience demands acknowledgment of humility. Like my fellow honorees, I am indebted to multitudes, because any worthwhile endeavor is necessarily the work of many men and many women. Also my parents, my devoted wife and children must share this award.
>
> Since the task in which I am engaged is its own reward, I should not be honored. That the high privilege of serving the youth of today in an American college is both thrilling and challenging, is, I think, beyond question. Expanding the scope and the horizon of youth of all areas of society in all nations is worthy and demands the very best that is within us. Inescapably, more education is the solution to many of the world's problems.
>
> Most areas of the world have too much adversity and hardship. We have, perhaps, not enough. Strong character cannot develop without some adversity. Present, tonight, is an unsurpassed example of courage which inspires us all. Students in the halls, the classrooms, and the libraries of our institutions of higher learning today are going to go far and accomplish more than we now dream possible. If we, as a people, have problems added to problems staggering to consider, many of which are unrealized—we have multiplied capabilities not only in our technology but also in the talents of our youth. Solutions to all of our problems can be found if we, as a people united, can exert our will.
>
> This magnificent sculpture says something about the human spirit's need to struggle for something beyond its reach. If, in the past, the American scholar has been described as "Man Thinking" he must now be described as "Man Thinking and Struggling"—struggling for purpose, struggling to assign value. Perhaps we shall be successful in assigning value only to that for which we sacrifice or for which we patiently labor.
>
> Spinoza's stern words may convey some of that reasonable wisdom which we seek, "All things excellent are as difficult as they are rare."

I also would like to include here the text of an editorial regarding the honor given to Dr. Whiddon, as it appeared in the Mobile Press newspaper for January 11, 1966:

Tribute to Fred Whiddon Is Another Mobile Honor

For the 28th year, the U.S. Jaycees have selected the 10 outstanding young men, and Mobile was honored by having Dr. Frederick P. Whiddon, president of the University of South Alabama, among the 1965 selections.

Others, as announced today, include America's first spacewalker (Edward H. White), President Johnson's press secretary (Bill D. Moyers), the owner of the world's largest egg-producing plant (Fred Rodgers Adams, of Jackson, Miss.), and a young author who has been confined to his bed in an iron lung since he was a child (Richard Chaput).

Dr. Whiddon's selection was first announced publicly last Saturday at the Senior Bowl football classic in Mobile.

His appointment in November 1963, when he was 33, made him the country's youngest college president, but his accomplishments in the next 18 months as an administrator far outshone that simple statistic and brought added praise from those in the general public and in the field of higher education.

Within that period, sometimes working single-handed, he engaged and organized a staff and faculty of more than 100 members, recruited an initial student body which now surpasses estimated capacity by 100 percent, and developed a basic curriculum around the college of arts and sciences to include departments of engineering, commerce, nursing, education and graduate studies, all of which will be expanded into separate colleges at appropriate times. He has made the many decisions necessary to get under way the first $4 million in buildings of a complex expected to reach $20 million in the next 5 years.

Dr. Whiddon is a native of Newville, in Henry County, of southeast Alabama, where he obtained his basic education.

As one of the 1965 outstanding young men (the lists are open to those 35 or under) he joins other such notables of the past 28 years as Howard Hughes and Rudy Valee (1938), Nelson Rockefeller and Orson Welles (1941), John F. Kennedy and Joe Louis (1946), Dr. Frank A. Rose and Robert F. Kennedy (1954), Pat Boone (1958), and Virgil (Gus) Grissom (1961).

In a 1964 speech, Dr. Whiddon said:

"The University of South Alabama dedicates itself to the assault on ignorance and misery and to the leading of our citizens into a new dimension of realization, wherein every man may develop the full extent of his powers and grasp new insights at the upper reaches of his mind."

This could well serve as Fred Whiddon's credo for the future, and Mobile is proud to share it with him.

Thai Arms Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, an article written by Hanson Baldwin, in the February 4, 1966, issue of the New York Times, on the expanding arms strength of Thailand is another clear indication that the present struggle in Vietnam will not end U.S. commitment and involvement in southeast Asia is much broader than even Vietnam. Moreover, it once again points up the necessity of a full-scale congressional debate on the future U.S. role and objectives in Asia as a whole.

I call the attention of my colleagues to this editorial and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thais Expanding Armed Strength—U.S. Assists Them and They Help Train Laotians To Fight the Pathet Lao

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Thailand, threatened by Communist subversion within her borders and by the North Vietnamese and Laotian Communists across the Mekong River, is strengthening her armed forces and police and assisting anti-Communist factions in Laos.

Thailand has been acquiring military strength with United States help, and in turn has helped to train some Laotian fliers and ground troops.

The Bangkok Government has denied a recent newspaper report that Thai armed forces "invaded" Laos. But it did not deny a report published last October in Fortune magazine that Thai pilots and artillerymen in Laotian uniforms had been supporting Laotian forces against attacks by the pro-Communist Pathet Lao.

Thai experts, along with experts from the United States and other countries, are also said to have participated in organizing the Meos and other mountain tribesmen in Laos in a guerrilla effort against the Pathet Lao, some of it behind Communist lines.

Thailand's northeastern provinces, bordering on the Mekong River—the frontier between Laos and Thailand—jut deeply into Laos. At its narrowest part Laos is squeezed to a width of about 55 miles between Thailand and Vietnam.

The Pathet Lao in Laos, with the aid of North Vietnamese troops, hold much of northern Laos and a corridor in the east that extends along the Vietnamese border to Cambodia.

The so-called Ho Chi Minh Trail, a series of trails and roads, some of them usable by trucks, utilizes this corridor from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. The bulk of the Vietcong replacements and supplies comes into South Vietnam by land, traversing portions of the Laotian corridor.

NATIONS CLOSELY TIED

Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand have long been recognized by military officers as strategically indivisible, but it has taken time to translate this recognition into effective military action.

In the last year, as the United States commitment in South Vietnam and in Thailand has increased, the strange war in Laos has been progressing somewhat more favorably for the anti-Communist forces.

Premier Souvanna Phouma and his neutralist forces, supported by Laotian, Thai, and United States aircraft, and Prince Boun Oum, the rightist, in southern Laos, have been opposing the Pathet Lao in a war of episodic skirmishes and air attacks. The North Vietnamese are supporting the Pathet Lao.

Among the strongest and most important elements of the non-Communist forces are the Meo mountain tribesmen.

MEO TROOPS ACTIVE

The Meos have been instrumental in stopping several Pathet Lao attacks and have recaptured some portions of Samneua Province and the strategic Plaine des Jarres. Samneua Province, near the North Vietnamese border, dominates a number of important roads and trails from North Vietnam into Laos.

The Meo holdings include a number of small landing fields and mountain positions, some of them behind Communist lines. Helicopters and light aircraft land at these positions on supply missions and other duties. Forward air controllers on the ground or flying in light liaison-type planes direct the strikes of Laotian, Thai, and United States fighter-bombers against Pathet Lao positions and Communist supply routes.

Laos has an air force of about 35 T–28D armed reconnaissance planes and support aircraft. About half of these operate in the Plaine des Jarres area and in the north. The others, under Lt. Gen. Thao Ma, commanding the Royal Laotian Air Force, are based at Savannakhet, and conduct a separate and more or less independent air war against Communist positions and communication routes in the Laotian panhandle.

AIR FORCE HAS 20,000 MEN

Behind the Mekong River, which forms the border between Thailand and Laos, the Thais have been building their military strength. The Thai Army of about 85,000 men includes 3 infantry divisions and 1 horse cavalry division, a good airborne batallion and a group of antiguerrilla forces. It has few support troops and is badly balanced, but it inducts about 20,000 conscripts annually for 2 years' service and has a trained reserve of about 150,000.

The Thai Air Force of fewer than 20,000 men has 3 squadrons of F-86 jet fighters, which are to be partially replaced by modern Northrop F-5's.

Ten other squadrons include T-28's, light aircraft, transports and helicopters. The navy, which includes a well-trained Thai marine brigade, operates 71 patrol, escort, and coastal craft, including 1 destroyer escort. The Thai Navy will receive some Grumman antisubmarine warfare planes in the spring.

In addition to these military forces, a paramilitary force, made up of border patrol units, provincial policemen and metropolitan and marine police, is being increased to a strength of about 46,500 men.

Dangers of 4-Year House Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House Committee on the Judiciary began 1966 hearings on proposed legislation providing for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives. It is thus pertinent that we consider a column by Richard Wilson which appeared in the January 23, Washington Star. I believe it places in proper perspective the current drive for such a constitutional amendment:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 23, 1966]

DANGERS OF 4-YEAR HOUSE TERM

(By Richard Wilson)

One thing is basically and dangerously wrong with the proposal for 4-year terms for Congressmen. The rising acceptance of this proposal reveals the apparently irreversible trend of increasing the power of the Presidency.

A 4-year term is advocated by President Johnson for this reason and this reason alone. Four-fifths of the Members of the House of Representatives are now serving for 4 years or more. The President's argument that the complexities of Government today require Members to serve at least 4 years thus has only marginal application.

The reason why any President, and particularly Johnson, favors the 4-year term is to lengthen the span of time when his ability to control Congress is at its probable maximum. The period of greatest Presidential strength typically follows the President's first election when his party is likely to win the most seats in the House. In subsequent congressional elections his strength in Congress is likely to fall off.

It surely cannot be questioned that there is growing authoritarianism in the American system of government. How else can we account for the fact that by the President's decision alone, within only the vaguest and most general directives of Congress, we are engaged in a major military thrust in Asia?

How else can we account for the fact that, without any authority whatsoever conferred by law, the President controls prices of major industrial commodities?

Johnson's awareness of the need for 4-year terms for Congressmen came upon him last summer when he found that Congress was not going to do all he wished it to do in the first 2 years of his administration. An election would intervene before all that he wanted could be done.

It obviously made him uneasy to contemplate that this election might diminish his authority in Congress. He therefore set about doing everything he could to reinforce the shaky position of Congressmen who had ridden in on his coattails in the 1964 presidential landslide so that they might be reelected in 1966.

Johnson was fully aware that to propose 4-year terms for Congressmen during his own tenure of office could be interpreted as an expression of his desire to dominate Congress.

To escape this judgment, the President proposed that 4-year terms not become effective until the election of 1972, when, presumably, he would not be a candidate for reelection.

Such a deference merely reinforces the reasons why 4-year terms are not a good idea now or any time. Johnson's successor may be just as eager as he to retain maximum authority over Congress.

The surest way for a President to do this is to carry into office with him every 4 years the congressional majorities he wants. A staggered system of electing congressmen, similar to the Senate procedure of electing one-third of the body every 2 years, has been suggested. If half the Congressmen were elected in a presidential year and half 2 years later, presidential domination of Congress would be avoided, it is said.

What improvement this would be over the present 2-year term is hard to see. It would relieve Congressmen of campaigning so often. But it would threaten a President with a 2-year period of frustration in those instances when the voters demand a complete political turnover. Half of the House would be of the new order and half of the old order.

The Senate, with its staggered system, preserves enough of the old order while the new order comes on. An election of House Members every 2 years provides a much needed opportunity for a full electoral review of presidential policies in midterm. Election of half of them at midterm would provide a half-way review.

Another advantage of the 2-year term is that it tends to reduce, although it does not prevent, the entrenchment of Congressmen. This process is already so far advanced that once elected many Congressmen can count on their jobs until their voluntary retirement. Four-year terms would make the process that much easier.

If Congress should, by some now unlikely chance, happen to vote to propose the constitutional change, the States would have their opportunity to say that the power of the presidency has already grown enough and reject the amendment.

Henry Y. Kasai

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD some brief remarks and an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune, dated February 1, 1966, concerning the late Henry Y. Kasai.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HENRY Y. KASAI

Henry Y. Kasai, who died last week at the age of 75, had made a notable contribution to good relationships between the Japanese and other American communities and cultures in Utah.

Born in Japan, he came to the United States as a boy of 14 in 1904, attending school in California and Idaho, and finally moving to Salt Lake City where he conducted a successful life insurance business for many years. But his real work was in building bridges between the Japanese community and other Americans. Much progress in that direction was interrupted for a time by the war and some regrettable discriminatory actions aganist Japanese aliens and citizens, including Henry Kasai. But the impressive display of loyalty to their native or adopted land by these Japanese Americans, in particular the many young men who served so courageously in the Armed Forces, gave great impetus to the establishment of good relations.

For his work as a Utah leader in this regard Mr. Kasai was honored by a Salt Lake City Junior Chamber of Commerce award, a National Japanese American citizens League citation and presentation by the Japanese Government of the Order of the Sacred Treasure, given so far to only 11 Japanese Americans for their work in behalf of international good will.

Many of his fellow citizens of all races and nationalities will join his close friends and associates in paying tribute to Henry Kasai and in extending deepest sympathy to his widow and family.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, last week one of my good friends and a great American, Mr. Henry Y. Kasai, died.

His passing will leave a real void not only for his family but for his many friends in Utah and in fact throughout the world. His life was devoted to service to his fellow men and he was a real giant in building good will between the Japanese community and other Americans. Henry might easily have become embittered as a result of the discriminatory treatment given to Japanese-Americans during World War II, but he was too big a man to let bitterness rancor his life. He arose above bigotry and pettiness and achieved greatness not only for himself but respect and dignity for all Americans of Japanese descent.

It can truly be said of Henry Y. Kasai:

> Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord. (Math. Ch. 25, v. 21.)

The Dangers of Getting Used to Lies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Bob Shaw, manager of the Minnesota Newspaper Association, gave a most outstanding speech to members of the Wisconsin Press Association in Eau Claire, Wis., on

January 14. His subject "Government Management of the News" is of everlasting importance to the American people. Under unanimous consent I insert Mr. Shaw's speech in the Record.

Speech by Robert M. Shaw

Ladies and gentlemen of the Wisconsin Press Association:

First of all, greetings from the Minnesota Newspaper Association. We have, in my State, the same kind of press association you do here. We have a long and proud history. Like you, we also have a musical group of exceptionally high quality. I am disappointed that only a musician from our fine brass ensemble could come here today. With respect to your sympathy orchestra. I must tell you this: It was the first time in my whole life that music ever brought tears to my eyes.

We are planning our 100th convention—starting our centennial year—next month, February 24, 25, and 26, in Minneapolis. Our incoming president is Russ Mills, of Cambridge, Minn.; he is with us here today. Both he and I cordially invite you—especially those who live near the State border—to come on over to help us celebrate our 100th birthday.

About 2 months ago I told Cub Zielke I'd talk on newspaper management today—about the 15 steps to improve management practices on your newspaper. I have been interested in the problems of newspaper production for a long time—it's a large part of my daily work. But last week I read a book by a very great newspaperman: "The Despoilers of Democracy," by Clark Mollenhoff, of the Minneapolis Tribune's Washington staff. This book is a factual and specific description of unbelievable corruption in our Federal Government. It documents with names, dates, and data the truth about the way news is "managed" these days in our Nation's Capital. So I am switching signals on you a bit in talking; I will talk about management, but about news management.

Now, if any of you want to hear my original speech on newspaper management, I'll give it to you later, free, in the bar. I'll tell you (1) charge more for your product, particularly charge more to the big space users who steal ad space for less than cost; also to upcharge your classified and sub rates; (2) sell local advertising with prepared layouts, local pictures, and imagination, and (3) watch your costs carefully by means of a monthly financial statement. That takes care of my first talk. Now, allow me to get down to something which I believe needs your attention.

We press association managers are always alerting you to clear and present dangers. We are a bunch of professional worriers, always concerned with proximate pressing problems—getting a certain bill through the legislature or, more often, preventing other bills from getting through; explaining the effect of new rulings or interpretations by wages and hours or tax people; or—this is our particular cross to bear—trying to make sense out of Post Office Department statements. We managers also go out and talk about newspaper problems to various groups, and invariably catch hell for everything any newspaper has ever done wrong in the memory of every person in the room. I'm fed up to the gills on being a whipping boy.

But today I want to talk about a deeper and more dangerous problem, one in which the press is intimately involved. It's the habit of our Government leaders during recent years to tell us lies, and the damage I think which has been done to the confidence between us and our leaders, and between our leaders and the world, when these lies have been found out.

Now we all know that even with the best of intentions, it's a tough job to report the truth. Reporters always want the facts before officials think it's appropriate to give the facts. But the magnitude of the systematic, deliberate, brazen lying by officials of the U.S. Government—particularly in the Pentagon, the State Department, and the White House—during recent years is unparalleled in American history. Some of the best newspapers in the country—the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Wall Street Journal—have repeatedly cried out against this wholesale propaganda. Some of the Nation's top reporters, even those who support the administration's foreign policy, are very uneasy about the way news is being disseminated to us, from our leaders. The Alsops during the Eisenhower administration warned that the time had come when honest American reporters in Washington—the same as honest American reporters in Moscow—should warn readers in advance of censored, slanted stories. Larry Fanning, editor of the Chicago Daily News, said at an International Press Institute meeting that the Kennedy administration had " * * * restricted the flow of news to a degree that threatens journalism itself * * * the Pentagon in general decides what should be done, and there is no public discussion of alternatives before major political decisions are made." There have been books written by some of our dependable reporters, on the true facts behind certain news events. But these books, and the cries of these few newspapers, have been voices crying in the wilderness.

We were told, 'way back in 1960, that the U–2 plane shot down in Russia was an "upper altitude weather research plane" which had mistakenly flown over Pakistan. In a book on the U–2 incident, two reporters—Tom Ross and David White—tell how the CIA put together, in advance, "packaged" news releases which Air Force information officers were to release to the public if U–2 planes did not return. It was shocking to learn—from the Premier of Russia, if you please—that our Government was lying. Now, even if we make the assumption that it is a wise policy to fly over other countries on spy-plane missions—and I would question the assumption—then why was this clumsy falsehood necessary? Why didn't the U.S. Government officials simply say "no coment"? Certainly the American public is grown up enough to know that we are competing with dangerous adversaries, that we need espionage. But the Russians knew, the whole world knew, everyone but the American public knew that the U.S. Government was telling a whole series of baldfaced lies. It took Khrushchev to spill the beans.

It's been that way over and over again. The statements of our leaders have consistently proven to be unreliable. All we have to do is go back and read what our leaders have said.

We were told that a small force of American soldiers was being sent into Santo Domingo to protect American interests. Yet, at the very moment these handouts were being distributed, plans were being made to send a much larger force there, to prevent what was feared would be another Communist takeover. Now, even if we make the assumption that it is wise policy for us to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations. Why was the lie necessary? L.B.J., in announcing this event, was curiously like Napoleon, or Julius Caesar making his own foreign policy, going ahead with his military plans, then coming home to report—after the fact—what hé had done, to his legislature. When they took power, neither Napoleon nor Caesar abolished their legislatures. They honored, they flattered, the lawmakers. They just took away the power. But there was no public discussion in Caesar's Rome, or Napoleon's France, about what the big man was going to do next. Come to think of it, how long has it been around here since there has been a full, public discussion before the fact, on foreign policy? Or for that matter, a full congressional discussion?

President Johnson seemed to be telling us, the other might, that we might be stuck in Vietnam for a good long time. It's about time he said so. The administration persisted for a long time with the story first, that we had no fighting men there at all. Shortly before his death, President Kennedy, on TV, said "No Americans are fighting in Vietnam—there are only a few advisers—and no Americans ever will." But as early as 1962, James Reston wrote: "The United States is now involved in undeclared war in Vietnam. It is well known to the Russians, the Chinese Communists, and everyone else concerned, except the American people."

Now I can understand, we all can, that southeast Asia is important to the security of the United States. But why the myth, so long continued, about "advisers"? Why was the line, until recently, that everything was going just fine? Reporters in Vietnam find they are working under conditions as restrictive as any since World War II. President Kennedy himself unsuccessfully sought to remove, from Vietnam, two top reporters—Homer Bigart of the New York Herald-Tribune and David Halberstam of the New York Times, a man who later went on to win a Pulitzer Prize for his honest reporting.

Of the Cuban story, Herbert Matthews of the New York Times said "In my 30 years on the New York Times, never have I seen such a big story so badly handled as the Cuban story." Another Times reporter, Tad Szulc, wrote a well-dŏcumented book on how badly the story was told to the American people.

It was well known for 2 years, and printed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, that the CIA was training an army of exiled Cubans in Guatemala, for an invasion. But in spite of checks sent regularly to widows of CIA flyers—this, turned up by Senator Dirksen, of Illinois—the full story of the American participation in the awful, botched up, hastily conceived and haphazardly executed Bay of Pigs disaster, has never yet been told.

When I was in Washington State, several newsmen there were invited to a special State Department "briefing" in Washington, D.C., a few days before the Cuban missile confrontation. At this so-called briefing, one after another of this country's top officials took to the podium to minimize the dangers in Cuba, but point with great alarm to the situation in Berlin. It turned out later that this performance was a well rehearsed mockery. At the very time our editors and reporters were hearing about extreme dangers in Germany, our military leaders were studying photographs of Russian missiles in Cuba. In fact, the Government knew about the missiles, and the danger in Cuba, well ahead of the conference. Which raises the question:

What did the Government hope to gain by staging this elaborate fraud? And what did Secretary of Defense McNamara hope to gain when he had his flackman Arthur Sylvester say: "News is part of the weaponry of international diplomacy, and the results justify the methods we use." This statement has never been rescinded. But even if they believed it in their secret heart of hearts, what was to be gained by making such an arrogant statement? It is a wide-open announcement to us and the whole wide world that "Of course we tell lies. Those are the rules of the game we're playing. And we'll do it again." How can we trust any statement McNamara makes—or has his flackman make for him—ever again?

I believe the story of President Eisenhower's attack of ileitis, as it was presented to the American public, was politically motivated. I do not believe that surgeons just happened to stumble on a kidney stone by accident when they were performing a gallbladder operation on President Johnson.

We were told L.B.J. was in for a relatively simple gallbladder operation; but a kidney stone operation is much more serious. I think this was a clumsy deception. I am horrified at Clark Mollenhoff's report of how the present administration sought to cover up the Bobby Baker, and the Walter Jenkins, and the Billie Sol Estes scandals. I can understand how these things can happen. But don't our leaders think the American public would understand it, if, for instance, President Johnson had said, of the Jenkins matter: "I feel terrible about this, not so much for Jenkins himself, but for the danger which this put on the security of the United States. It is true that Jenkins obtained a top-security clearance, even after he had a previous conviction as a homosexual, and after constant warnings by Government security people that homosexuals were people who were always, automatically open to blackmail by Communist agents. Jenkins did sit in on top security council meetings. It is my fault. I will see that no mistake happens like this, ever again." But no: Lady Bird put out a release, indicating that Jenkins was ill, suffering from exhaustion, and she prayed for his wife and children. Well, one might ask, who's praying for the security of the United States?

And so it goes, on and on. We are deluged with more propaganda than anytime in our history. The Government, as you may know, is even playing with the idea of starting its own newspapers.

Several Minnesota Congressmen have told me that it is utterly impossible to get information from certain executive departments. I know this is true. I have been trying for 3 years to get a square answer from the Internal Revenue Service about the reported sharing of their computer system with other Government agencies. I have written many letters, talked to many people, about this. All I want to know is this: "Is it true that such conferences have taken place? Who was there? Where are the minutes of the meeting? Is it actually true—as a member of the IRS told me—that you are considering sharing the system with other agencies of the Government? Do you know something? Congressmen themselves can't find out.

Here is a quote from a letter I received the other day from one of our Minnesota Congressmen: "We have tried for some time to get information for you with respect to conferences which may have taken place between the IRS and other governmental bureaus. There is simply no way, under existing law, to obtain this information, when the agencies of the executive branch do not want Members of Congress to have it."

Let's think about this for a minute. Suppose that everything about you—your name, your work history, your service record, all your financial history, genetics, fingerprints, even your politics—were recorded—as this information could be—on half an inch of electronic tape. Are you sure that the Federad Government would treat this confidentially? I am not so sure. The IRS has been freely passing around so-called "confidential" tax-return information for some time. This fact was turned up by Senator WARREN MAGNUSON of Washington, at a Senate Commerce Committee hearing, of which he is chairman, in 1964. Would it be nice and sweet for a man like Bobby Baker, or some of his buddies in the Government, to have access to a plaything which would give them all the information about anyone they wished?

Mr. Mollenhoff documents, in his book, several cases when members of the executive departments sought to get damaging information on individuals they sought to discredit. One was a mysterious releasing of supposedly confidential service information regarding Don Reynolds, the man who testified against Bobby Baker. This was in an obvious attempt to discredit Reynolds and destroy his credibility. The second was the seizing of the files of Otto Otepka, the State Department employee who—often when he testified honestly to Senator MCCLELLAN's investigating committee—was demoted, humiliated, had his telephone tapped, in obvious retaliation for his cooperation with the Senate committee. Now let me ask you: What would a blackmailer do, if he wanted to "get" someone? Wouldn't it be a dandy instrument for unscrupulous officials, if they had every man's total data at their fingertips? And can't you see this coming? Wouldn't it be easy, on another extra quarter-inch of tape, to record a man's ideas? Hitler had only card files to work with, card files which went into exhaustive detail about each Nazi party member. A big-brother computer would have made his work much, much easier.

What is a scandal, anyway? Remember the sense of outrage when we learned that Sherman Adams had accepted the vicuna coat and the deep freeze? Doesn't this seem like small potatoes, now? Are we rapidly becoming conditioned to corruption, to lying? What did we think—and do—when we learned that Walter Jenkins—the man wide open to Communist blackmail—had somehow achieved a top-level clearance? What did we do, say, or write, about the Bobby Baker affair? The awarding of the TFX contract? Sylvester's brash boast about news management? The untruths about Vietnam, and Santo Domingo? I have the impression that we said very little. We are getting used to lies. And when we get used lies—accept them as normal behavior—then we have the very definition of a decadent society.

If you're really in the newspaper business—not the printing business, but the newspaper business—then you're involved in this, too. A handful of top journalists—men of unquestioned integrity working for some of the Nation's finest newspapers—have been telling you for some time, now, that you are being lied to. I don't want to sound like a political sorehead. Actually, this habit of deception goes back for about 14 years—through several administrations of both political parties.

But what can you do? I don't care what size newspaper you run, you can get good and sore at the way newspapers are taking the lash from the public, for repeating falsehoods. Yet, what can we do when top Government officials from the President on down, make statements which later prove to be untrue? We can't all be there in Washington. But we can at least read books written by some of our best journalists, thoroughly frustrated men, and pass the truth along in every way we know how, to our readers.

Some of us in the newspaper business may be lazy, or tired, or old, or have forgotten what news actually is. But we're not a nation of sheep. I honestly think that many of our Government leaders think we are. They "manage" the news—brag about it. I have lost confidence in these men. But I do have confidence in men like Reston and Mollenhoff, and in newspapers such as the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal.

I say "speak up"—stop taking the editorial fifth amendment. Defend your profession. We newspapermen have a certain stake in all this, for true facts, honestly communicated, are the only possible way that our democratic society can operate, progress, and grow.

Now, thank you for this chance to talk to you; please excuse me, Cub Zielke, for switching the signals on you, and I hope to be able to come down to earth—I am so mad about all this—and talk to any of you later privately about newspaper management.

New England's Big Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, those of us who are deeply committed to efforts to expand New England's economy were very pleased to see an article in the February 7 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

The article, entitled "New England's Big Comeback," shows that New Hampshire and the other five States in the region are "enjoying a boom unprecedented in history."

The great economic prosperity which is coming to my own State is a great source of satisfaction to me and gives me great hopes for the future of the whole New England region.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ENGLAND'S BIG COMEBACK—LATEST SUCCESS STORY

(NOTE.—A few years ago, New England was a land of adversity. Factories were closed. Jobs were scarce. More people were leaving the six-State area than were arriving. Now, all this is changed. New industries are coming in. Older plants are adapting to the space age. Result: Prosperity never was higher.)

BOSTON.—New England today is enjoying a boom unprecedented in history—and one which is steadily gaining momentum.

The upswing is broadly based. It extends to nearly every major industry and to almost every community of the six-State area.

Employment in New England in 1965 moved past the 4 million mark—the highest on record. Gains were reported not only in the region's factories, but also in a number of service industries of growing importance to its economy. Among these are insurance, financial and business services, medical service, education and recreation.

Construction, which trailed the rest of the country's industries last year, reached new levels. Spending for plant and equipment rose 18 percent in the region in 1965, and a similar increase is forecast for this year.

Throughout New England, unemployment is low and labor scarce. It is not just skilled labor and technical employees that are needed. Many employees would be overjoyed to find unskilled workers who could be trained. Help-wanted advertisements in the major newspapers are at an alltime high. Some areas are running short of housing for recently hired workers and their families.

Up from adversity

The current boom is something new and welcome in New Englad. Since the end of World War II, the region's economic growth had consistently lagged well behind that of the Nation as a whole. Regional comparisons usually had shown New England bringing up the rear in nearly every measure of economic progress.

Many of New England's woes were traceable to the loss of a big segment of an important industry—textiles. Scores of major firms picked up stakes and moved to the South to take advantage of lower wages, land costs and taxes, and to be closer to raw materials and major customers.

Left behind were factories of Civil War vintage, blighted cities, and pockets of massive unemployment.

Other long-established industries—shoes, shipbuilding, fishing, and paper—either declined or showed slow growth.

The States, particularly Maine and Vermont, suffered heavy losses of workers as residents moved out to find new jobs. Says one Vermont official of that period: "Our biggest export was our young folks."

New England came to be viewed by the rest of the country as worn out, ultraconservative, lacking vitality, and removed from the mainstream of postwar prosperity. As one Connecticut official remembers it, "People came to think of New England as having nothing to offer but stone fences, lobster pots, wooden bridges, and Yale University."

The spread of success

A unique feature of New England's newfound prosperity is that the northern tier of States—New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont—is sharing in the uptrend. Even in good times, these States usually had lagged behind southern New England. Conneticut for many years has been better off than the rest of the region and unhappy over being tarred with the same brush.

Now, the fastest growing State in New England is New Hampshire. Unemployment there is the lowest in the Nation. In 1965, unemployment averaged 2.9 percent of the State's labor force, compared with a national figure of 4.6 percent. Industrial construction in New Hampshire in 1965 was up 400 percent from the 1964 figure.

Behind the boom: brainpower

What has happened to change the picture in New England so suddenly?

Many of the region's top economic experts admit they are stumped for an answer. One explains it this way: "It is all very vague; you cannot measure it by statistics. But New England today has a competitive advantage over other areas. This advantage boils down to this—brainpower."

Long a leader in the field of education, New England lately has been getting a big payoff from this investment. The brainpower advantage is traceable, mainly, to the big three of its prestige universities—Harvard, Yale and, especially, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

MIT is a university completely built around science and technology. Because of its pioneering work in electronics, it was selected as the site of the Government's World War II research laboratory that perfected radar. This was a huge effort, comparable to the Manhattan project, which developed the atom bomb. Top scientific and engineering personalities were drawn to MIT from all over the United States.

Another wartime laboratory at MIT did early work on guidance systems and fire-control techniques. Today, the university is heavily engaged in guidance systems for missiles such as Polaris and for the Apollo moon vehicle.

When Soviet Russia exploded a nuclear bomb in 1949, the Federal Government called on MIT to develop an intercontinental-defense system. A new laboratory was built on Route 128, a highway that encircles all of Boston but the waterfront. In the process of developing the new system, major advances were made in computer technology. Among universities, MIT is the largest computer-research center in the world.

"Offspring" of MIT

To supply the new laboratory with needed parts and materials, a number of small firms began to spring up along Route 128. Many top scientists and engineers left the laboratory to form their own firms, to exploit their knowledge in a new and expanding technology.

With MIT spawning new ideas, with top-notch scientists and engineers, and new companies, the Boston area became a leader in the field of electronics and research-oriented industry based on new technology.

Once a country road, Route 128 today is bordered by new plants. A recent survey showed 574 firms along the highway, employing nearly 55,000 people. Included were: almost 100 manufacturing firms, 66 research companies, and 56 engaged in both research and manufacturing. Since 1962, there has been a 45-percent increase in the number of firms along the "Golden Semicircle" as it is now called.

Graduates of MIT, who once left New England to take jobs in more prosperous areas, now seem to prefer to settle in or near Boston and to work in one of the many laboratories or electronics firms, says an MIT official:

"As top scientists moved into this area, more and more younger men wanted to come and rub elbows wtih them. They were attracted, too, by the cultural advantages of the New England area. Culture is an 'in' thing with these highly educated people. We have more Ph. D.'s per acre around here than any other place in the country."

Recently, MIT set up four new research centers—space sciences, life sciences, earth sciences, and materials science and engineering. Coming is on in communications.

There is no evidence that the birth of new firms is slackening. It appears more likely to increase. University officials say that revolutionary changes may be ahead in the field of biology. Some new fields being studied by MIT's laboratories include oceanography and medical instrumentation.

Other major New England universities also are beginning to expand research activities.

Search for plant sites

The mushrooming growth of electronics and related research firms is by no means confined to Route 128 or the Greater Boston area. Successful firms seeking sites for new plants are pushing out into southern New Hampshire and, to a lesser extent, Maine and Vermont. Connecticut, and Rhode Island, as well, are gaining new industries.

The growing interest in siting plants in northern New England is due, in part, to a desire to get away from big-city congestion and problems. Vermont, for example, stresses its "moral climate" in newspaper ads. Says one: "Vermont has no really big cities with snarled transportation, strife, crime, bureaucratic waste, poor housing, air pollution and all the other seemingly hopeless problems of large metropolitan areas today."

Industry fits to area

The growth of research-oriented industry fits in perfectly with New England's needs. The region does pose handicaps for mass-production industries. It is poorly situated with respect to the center of U.S. population. It has high transportation and electric power costs, and is lacking in most raw materials.

Because of these deficiencies, New England is specializing more in low-bulk, high-value products. "Even in electronics," comments one observer, "when something is developed suitable for mass production, it is usually produced elsewhere. Then the research people come up with something new. We have to keep running all the time."

Throughout the region, there has been a steady shift to new products and procedures based on research. A study in 1955 showed about one-third of factory employment depended on products not in existence a decade earlier. A similar study today, experts say, would show this figure to be about one-half of total manufacturing employment.

New Englanders believe that their combination of brainpower and a skilled, adaptable labor force will enable the region to keep abreast of new developments. They also see the growth of research-based industry as giving New England a stability it never had before.

NEW ROLE FOR OLDER INDUSTRIES

Some long-established industries also have played a role in New England's upswing.

One of the most important of these is transportation equipment. United Aircraft, centered in Connecticut, is the region's biggest private employer. Its payroll is approaching 70,000 and has been increasing at a rate of 1,000 a month as the firm seeks to keep up with orders for jet engines, helicopters and other aircraft components. Another big employer, General Dynamics' Electric Boat Division at Groton, Conn., has built much of the U.S. nuclear submarine fleet. It has been stepping up production, hiring more workers. A large number commute from Rhode Island.

The machine tool industry, long important to the area's economy, is showing new strength. Employment in this industry tends to rise and fall in line with capital spending by firms across the country. With plant-and-equipment spending at high levels, and further gains projected, the industry is expected to continue to lend its weight to the boom .

Textiles: No longer a drag

Even the textile industry, which for many years acted as a drag on New England's economy, added slightly to its payrolls in 1965. During the postwar period, employment in the industry had fallen from 275,000 to about 100,000, but now it appears to have stabilized at that level. Most of the cotton textile industry already has been lost, and remaining firms produce mostly woolen yarns and fabrics—a more expensive product.

The leather and shoe industry has been adding workers. Much of it has shifted out of older Massachusetts towns with high wage rates to newer plants in Maine and New Hampshire. The area continues to produce one-third of the leather footwear made in the United States.

Shipbuilding, which had been in the doldrums for years, is showing new life—partly as the result of growing defense needs. There also has been heavy new investment in the paper industry, important to Maine.

New England's biggest growth, however, has not been in manufacturing, but in services. This includes a whole grab bag of activities.

Among the most important is medicine. The Boston area is one of the world's major medical centers. Doctors and patients come from Europe, Latin America, and other parts of the world for training or treatment.

Education is another big service, and New England is the leader in the field. Harvard, Yale, MIT, and Brown, plus a host of smaller schools such as Dartmouth, Amherst, Williams, and Middlebury, are among the Nation's top-rated educational institutions.

Many of the largest insurance firms have headquarters in New England, especially in the Boston and Hartford areas. Boston is one of the four largest financial centers in the United States. Its investment houses handle most of the major mutual funds.

Winter playground, too

New England always has been a popular area for summer vacations, and its share of the recreation industry is growing steadily. In 1965, excellent weather brought huge gains in the tourist business.

Now, the region is experiencing a winter-vacation boom. Ski resorts are rising all over, especially in the northern tier. Building of new lodges, motels, and roads has had a major impact on the construction industry. It is also driving up land prices. In one part of Vermont where land sold 5 years ago for about $5 an acre—less than it cost in 1760—the price rose to $200 an acre or more when a new ski center went up nearby.

The 1965–66 ski season got off to a roaring start. A 40-inch snowfall in Vermont in December is estimated to have been worth $250,000 an inch to the State. Holiday ski business in some areas ran 200 percent ahead of last season.

The "multiplier effect"

Skiing has what is called a "multiplier effect." State officials estimate that, for $1 spent for skiing, an additional $4 is spent for food, lodging, liquor, entertainment, gasoline and other needed goods and services.

Northern New England is one of the few undeveloped areas left in the Eastern United States. It is accessible to huge population centers in both the United States and Canada. Roads are being improved, making it easier to reach. With more people having 3 weeks or more of vacation a year, many employers are urging workers to take part of their vacation in winter—and New England is benefiting from this trend.

New England also is getting a boost from another development—the desire of many American families to own two homes. More and more high-income families that live along the eastern seaboard want to get away from the congestion. With increased interest in skiing and other winter sports, people can use a second home in winter as well as in summer. This two-house trend is adding to the rise in land values, especially in southern Vermont and New Hampshire.

CITIES: MIRRORS OF PROSPERITY

The effects of prosperity can be seen by driving through some of New England's cities.

Greater Boston, still the "hub" of New England with 3.2 million of the region's 11.2 million people, has been changed radically in appearance by a group of new buildings.

In 1965, the $160 million Prudential Center, which now dominates the Boston skyline, opened its doors. In process of construction is a $200 million government center in the heart of the city. The first building of the center to be completed, a $26 million State office building, was opened last year. Just finished is a new Federal office building. Still under construction; a large, crescent-shaped office building and a new city hall.

Another skyscraper nearing completion is the State Street Bank Building, adjacent to the financial district. It was financed by British investors.

Construction is about to start on a $60 million-electronics-research center for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It will rise close to MIT, across the Charles River from downtown Boston.

Boston also is having a boom in apartment construction. A large, high-rise building is going up across from the Boston Common. Others have been built overlooking the Charles River and in outlying sections of the city.

Progress is being made on new highways and expressways. In 1965, the last link of the Massachusetts Turnpike was completed, bringing it into the downtown part of Boston.

Urban renewal is evident in many other cities of New England. Hartford and New Haven in Connecticut have completed huge projects that have revitalized large areas.

A further example of a city which has come back is Providence, R.I. For many years, this city was listed as a "depressed area" by the Department of Labor, with "substantial and persistent unemployment." Last May, Providence and its environs were taken off the list. In October, joblessness was down to 3.9 percent—lowest figure in 15 years.

Providence has been helped by a new interstate highway which cuts through the center of the city and links it closely to Boston on the north and New York on the south. The highway has opened new industrial sites, and the city could become an important distribution center.

More spectacular than the progress of some of the larger cities is the change that has taken place in scores of smaller cities which were hardest hit when their textile mills closed their doors and moved south.

The Nashua story

Nashua, N.H., lost its major textile employer in 1948. In an effort to find jobs for thousands of people thrown out of work, a tax-free, nonprofit foundation was set up to buy the mill properties and either sell or lease them to any prospective employer.

Today, hardly a square foot of factory space is available of the 2.5 million square feet originally purchased. Instead of 1 firm employing 3,500 workers, the space is occupied by 24 separate firms employing more than 6,000 workers.

In addition, the city has 16 new plants—5 of them built by firms which outgrew their space in the old mill. Manufacturing employment, which stood at 8,400 before the textile plant left, has grown to 13,000.

Nashua, in fact, now has a labor shortage. Firms in the area are estimated to have 2,000 jobs they are unable to fill. As 1965 ended, unemployment was down below 2 percent of the labor force.

Much the same story is true of Manchester. After the loss of a huge textile mill, Manchester had staggering unemployment. Like Nashua, it is now booming, has a much more diversified industry and is looking for more workers.

Another city which has gone from bust to boom is Burlington, largest city in Vermont. It lost its major employer, a large woolen mill. Burlington took a different tack. Instead of trying to interest employers in the old mill property, business leaders formed an industrial corporation and raised money to build a plant on speculation. They snagged International Business Machines. Employment at the plant has risen from 500 to 2,500 over the past 18 months.

THE AREA'S SERIOUS PROBLEMS

New England is not without problems. Railroad service is poor—Maine is the first State to be inaccessible to passengers on regular schedules by rail—but expected mergers of New England railroads with major rail networks may help.

The threat of severe drought hangs over the region unless it gets heavy winter snows and spring rains.

Some of the older cities still have financial problems and urban blight. Others have exceptionally high property taxes that could discourage new industry.

Another worry is that much of the boom in industries such as electronics, shipbuilding, and transportation equipment is due to defense orders. Any major cutback in defense spending could have a heavy impact. But many business leaders aware of this danger are making efforts to diversity.

Right now, however, New England's greatest problem is its labor shortage. Both Government and business leaders are making concerted efforts to attract labor.

Some employers are considering trying to recruit Cuban refugees, or Puerto Ricans and Negroes from crowded eastern cities. At present, New England has few nonwhites. Vermont's population is .002 percent Negro. Many New Englanders say they would like to keep the racial balance the way it is now.

Is the comeback permanent?

Because of New England's large urban population and heavy industrialization, few experts believe the region can match newer areas such as the Southwest or Far West in growth rates. But they see the present boom as more than a cyclical revival.

"The east coast still has the Nation's biggest market, the biggest population," says an industrial-development official in Connecticut.

And, it appears, the view that New England is decrepit, out of tune with modern times, will have to be reviewed and updated as the boom continues.

New Rochelle VISTA: Local Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, aspects of the war on poverty have been undergoing scrutiny and criticism from various quarters. Certainly, the need to know if these programs are being administered soundly, economically, with a minimum of politics and in the clear interest of those who most need help and training for meaningful jobs is plain. Operation Paycheck in New Rochelle, N.Y., is an antipoverty effort that meets these criteria and whose success has come from communitywide cooperation.

Paycheck, Inc., was organized in July 1964 and it provides jobs and job training for more than 40 disadvantaged youngsters. It is sponsored by three local businessmen and supervised with the assistance of a VISTA volunteer, Joseph Allard.

Paycheck is the only privately financed and profitmaking antipoverty project in the country. Its primary enterprise is the operation of a 450-car parking lot in New Rochelle. In addition to running the lot, the boys learn how to keep their own books and tax records and general business practices.

The boys also operate a snackbar at a municipal marina, sell American flags door to door, perform office maintenance work, and run concessions for concerts. The youngsters pay themselves $1.25 per hour for their work and in April of 1965 were able to pay off loans they had received only the previous July as well as make charitable contributions to local agencies.

Participation in the project has enabled all the boys to remain in school and has given most of them a new appreciation of the value of education as well as experience in business. Several are now planning to go on to college.

Mr. Boris Feinman, one of the businessmen sponsoring the project, has stated that—

> The cooperation of city officials has been 2,000 percent.

At the same time as giving these youngsters a start in life, Paycheck provides needed and practical services to the community.

The New Rochelle Standard-Star recently published a story on the work of VISTA Volunteer Joseph Allard with Operation Paycheck. Mr. Allard has also written an article on the purposes and goals of this VISTA project. Under unanimous consent, the story from the

Standard-Star and Mr. Allard's article will be printed in the RECORD following my remarks:

[From the New Rochelle (N.Y.) Standard-Star, Jan. 25, 1966]

WESTCHESTER TODAY—NEW ROCHELLE VISTA: LOCAL PEACE CORPS

VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—a domestic version of the Peace Corps, is represented in New Rochelle in the person of Joseph Allard, of Lowell, Mass., supervisor for the antipoverty project known as Paycheck, Inc., which provides jobs and job training for disadvantaged youngsters.

Mr. Allard, 22, says of Paycheck, "It's sort of a private version of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, only better." He has been working hand-in-hand for 6 months with Paycheck director, Boris Feinman, a New Rochelle businessman who set up the organization in July 1964.

The corporation runs a series of small private enterprises and employs only teenagers who come from low-income families on welfare. "Our biggest enterprise," Mr. Allard stated, "is a 450-car parking lot. The lot is located on a vacant urban renewal parcel downtown, which has been undeveloped for 10 years."

In running the lot, Mr. Allard continued, the boys learn how to keep books, manage their own time records, file the necessary taxes and learn all about economic self-reliance. Mr. Allard's job consists of supervising youngsters, giving them supplementary tutoring in English, mathematics and providing counsel for them and their families.

Mr. Allard is enthusiastic about Paycheck, and thinks it is well worth copying in towns and cities all over the country.

SELLING OLD GLORY

"Another enterprise we created," he said "was selling American flags door-to-door. The flags cost $3 wholesale and the boys sell them to residents for $6. In the process they learn the value of a smile when they deal with the public.

"This project is one of the hottest things going in the whole country in the war on poverty," Mr. Allard added. "Not only are the kids involved, but the whole community has taken an interest and cooperated with us 100 percent.

"The reason this project is so great," he stated, "is that it teaches these youngsters the risk of loss, and how to run a business efficiently. The corporation is not a plaything. If we don't earn enough money to stay in business, we fold and they lose their jobs."

Among the other enterprises run by the youngsters are office cleaning, house painting and a restaurant.

"It takes 12 youngsters," he continued, "to run the parking lot, at one time we had as many as 40 youths involved in the various enterprises." They are constantanly looking for new services they can perform which will make money.

The son of Eveline G., and the late Arthur J. Allard, he is a Lowell High School graduate. He also attended Northern Essex College in Haverhill, Mass., and the University of Maryland School of Social Work.

FOR THE LESS FORTUNATE

Why did he volunteer for VISTA? He was sitting home watching television when it suddenly struck him how lucky he was. He resolved to go out and do something to help those persons less fortunate than he.

"I felt there was so much to do in this world, and at first I thought I would join the Peace Corps," he said. "But then I realized that we have some very big problems right here in our own country, that there was a tremendous opportunity here and that I had to take it."

Mr. Feinman speaks very highly of the young man, describing him as "dedicated, pleasant, knowledgeable, likeable, hard-working, capable and personable."

PAYCHECK

(By Joseph R. Allard, VISTA volunteer assigned to Paycheck)

Operation Paycheck is a youth-oriented business training program which strives to reach the disadvantaged youth of the city by providing job opportunities for them. It's helping to answer President Johnson's request to employ youth and to train them for the future.

Paycheck creates businesses for the sole purpose of providing jobs for youth in need of such assistance. The entire staff, consists of youngsters 14 to 16 years of age. Examples of such jobs created are: a 450-acre parking lot, a snack bar at a municipal marina, a sales division selling American flags door to door, office maintenance work, sign painting, impresarios who sponsored a concert, concessionaires for concerts. During the recent water shortage in New York, the youngsters pumped water from city lakes and sold it to residents so that they might save their prized shrubbery.

MORE THAN JUST A JOB

While the youngsters earn $1.25 an hour, they receive individual counseling as well as family counseling. Also constant contact with New Rochelle's senior high school and its two junior high schools is maintained. Both school guidance counsellor and Paycheck help iron out the youngsters problems.

Paycheck stimulates youngsters to observe better working habits such as promptness, responsibility, courtesy, and good health habits.

Education and community involvement is stressed. Tours of various civic agencies are part of their job training. Tours of the New York Stock Exchange, courthouse to witness a trial, city council meetings and the like, are included. These are intended to make the youth aware of their responsibility to the community and to prepare them to play their role as future leaders.

Paycheck provides a real and practical service to the community. All its created businesses have provided the people of New Rochelle with needed services.

When an employee leaves Paycheck, he has a darn good idea of employer-employee relationship, he knows what to expect and what is expected of him. This is a service well appreciated by all employers.

One of the most unique qualities of Paycheck is that it is the only "privately financed," profitmaking antipoverty program in the United States, which donates to other charities. Certainly this is an ideal example of the poor helping themselves.

As President Johnson said, "We must open the doors of opportunity. But we must also equip our people to walk through these doors." Paycheck has opened the doors and it has trained its people and equipped them to walk thru these doors to a brighter future and a more fruitful life.

Welcome Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, there was a new and welcome note of realism in President Johnson's message on foreign aid.

We must concentrate on countries that are not hostile to us—

He said—

and that give solid evidence that they are determined to help themselves.

The New York Journal-American recently hailed this as a welcome change, commenting that this should be "pleasing news to American taxpayers who, far too often in the past, have seen their money go to countries tacitly or openly hostile to us, or 'neutral' against us."

Because the editorial praising this message makes good sense, I suggest that others may want to see it, and I herewith offer it for the RECORD.

WELCOME CHANGE

There was one refreshing emphasis in President Johnson's foreign aid message to Congress, calling for $3.4 billion in fiscal 1967. The President is committed to giving more help to countries that help themselves.

"We must concentrate," he said, "on countries not hostile to us that give solid evidence that they are determined to help themselves."

That should be pleasing news to American taxpayers who, far too often in the past, have seen their money go to countries tacitly or openly hostile to us, or "neutral" against us.

Congress has debatable topics in the proposals for a long-term, 5-year authority for foreign aid, and for the global program itself to be split into separate economic and arms aid bills.

But taxpayers owe the President a vote of thanks for steering foreign aid onto a more realistic course.

Analysis Given

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, before the announcement that bombing in North Vietnam would begin again, there was widespread discussion in this country as to whether it should or should not be renewed. Now, however, once the decision was made and clearly stated, the Nation has united behind the administration.

The columnist, William S. White, predicted that this would happen, and one of the newspapers, the Houston Chronicle, which prints his column commented that White's analysis "is interesting and, we think, significant."

According to his analysis, there has not been and will not be any great debate on the issue.

White estimates that only a fraction of the Senate would want to "cut and run," and that 90 percent would "back the President and his advisers on measures they consider necessary." The newspaper adds:

The Chronicle agrees with the majority viewpoint.

I found the editorial to be of great interest and in the belief that others will also find it helpful, I offer it for the RECORD.

ANALYSIS OF SENATE VIETNAM STAND

The William S. White article on this page today dealing with Senators' positions on Vietnam policy is interesting and, we think, significant.

The columnist asserts that strong opposition to resumed bombing of North Vietnam is limited to 10 or less Senators. There is an additional group of perhaps 25 who have expressed themselves as being opposed in varying degree to bombing "right now." Concerning these Senators, who kept hoping in the face of all the evidence that something would turn up to make bombing unnecessary, White writes:

"Once the hard decision has been taken at the White House to resume what must be resumed to protect our troops, this bloc of 25 will vanish like the mists after sunrise."

Concerning the 10 or fewer who would "be left manning the barricades," the columnist declares that their position is in fact no position at all. They simply want to withdraw, which means surrender.

And that, according to this analysis, is why there hasn't been and won't be any "great debate" on the issue. For, White declares, at some point these Senators "would be required at long last to say plainly what it is they really want."

So, White estimates, no more than 10 percent of the Senate, and perhaps slightly less, would like to "cut and run." Ninety percent would back the President and his advisers on measures they consider necessary.

The Chronicle agrees with the majority viewpoint.

Minnesota Precinct Caucuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota politics is among the most exciting in the Nation. In each election year the two major political parties are required by law to conduct precinct caucuses in each precinct in the State. Both the Minnesota Republican Party and the Minnesota Democratic Farmer-Labor Party are conducting these caucuses this winter. The Minneapolis Tribune has done an outstanding job of building interest in precinct caucuses through a series of three articles on its editorial pages. Because I believe so deeply in the precinct caucus as the proper instrument for citizen participation in politics and because I hope that other States will follow the Minnesota lead, I am inserting in the RECORD today this fine series of articles written by Miss Miriam Alburn of the Tribune editorial-opinion-page staff:

[From the Minneapolis, Minn. Tribune, Jan. 1, 1966]

PRECINCT CAUCUSES GIVE VOTERS CHANCE TO SPEAK THEIR MINDS

(By Miriam Alburn)

Both major political parties are gearing up for biennial precinct caucuses—to be held February 7 to 16 by the Minnesota Republican Party, and March 1 all over the State by the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party.

Why should the average voter bother to go to a precinct caucus?

To the uninitiated, the very word "caucus" may suggest factional political wrangling, or a kind of grubby, low-level organizational meeting that only the "pros" find fascinating.

What matters to most voters—according to this casual reasoning—is voting for the candidates for important offices. And that comes much later.

These impressions, however, don't fit the realities of the precinct caucus. And those who stay away don't know what they're missing.

The caucuses form the broadest base of the Nation's political pyramid and serve as the source of much of the political structure and activity that follow. Many candidates for both low and high offices get their initial push at the precinct level.

Moreover, little groups of citizens gathered together on caucus night have been known to launch ideas that could change the character of a village government or command the attention of the National Congress.

Essentially, the precinct is the neighborhood unit of political organization. And so the precinct caucuses are held in ordinary neighborhood locations—in home living rooms, school gyms, church basements, corner coffeeshops and the like. The group is usually small and the mood informal, and everybody gets a chance to talk, or not talk, as he chooses.

One of the few things leaders of both parties agree upon is the importance of broad particiaption in precinct caucuses. They urge attendance by professionals and average voters, those familiar with such meetings and newcomers, older and younger adults.

"No matter what you hope to achieve politically, the precinct caucus is a good place to start," says George Thiss, State Republican chairman.

"By not attending, you hand over the political process to someone else," George Farr, State DFL chairman, points out.

For those inclined to be suspicious of party systems, the professionals point out that the best guarantee the public has against machine political control is high attendance at the local caucuses. They serve as a great leveller: The high-ranking politician in his home precinct has a single vote, and so does the man or woman who never went to a political meeting before.

The questions asked by newcomers often provide an informative, useful balance in discussion of candidates, issues, resolutions, and party philosophy.

Even those in attendance who choose to listen and remain silent lend some stability to the situation. Their votes and their mere presence as witnesses assure that a little handful of leaders can't take over in ways not approved by the other voters.

The League of Woman Voters of Minneapolis, as part of its continuing program of throwing a bipartisan spotlight on politics and government, will sponsor a precinct caucus kickoff luncheon at 1 p.m. Wednesday at the Pick-Nicollet Hotel. It is planned as a briefing session for the public, with talks by both State party chairmen.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Feb. 1, 1966]

"UNORGANIZED" PRECINCT CAUCUS IS A GRASSROOTS FREE-FOR-ALL

(By Miriam Alburn)

A contingent of Russians had arrived in Minneapolis to introduce an art exhibit, and it occurred to one of their official hostesses that they might be interested in attending an old-fashioned American precinct caucus.

The scene was a church basement in the second ward, with precinct groups meeting separately before merging for a ward meeting. It was crowded. It was noisy. For the strangers, it was difficult to figure out who was doing what or why.

But the Russians were fascinated and impressed.

"It seemed so informal, so unorganized to them—but they really did see democracy at work," one of their escorts recalled the other day.

"They saw nominations come from the floor. They heard resolutions debated. They witnessed competition for delegate positions, and they were surprised at the number of articulate people there. They had heard about this sort of politics, but had to see it to believe it.

"They did comment, however, that the process seemed wasteful of time and energy," we were told.

By American values, the precinct caucus, however chaotic or inefficient or frustrating at moments, is never a waste of time.

The very freedom and diversity of discussion which made it seem cumbersome and unsystematic to the Russians are what make it a cherished grassroots free-for-all to American voters.

If you've never been near one before, you, too, may wonder whether you're really helping the democratic system—as political leaders say so nobly in speeches—or just contributing to the confusion.

"Who, Me—Go to My Precinct Caucus?" is the title of a folder prepared by the St. Paul League of Women Voters and widely used as a primer. "Yes, you. Take part in the party of your choice," is the primer's obvious answer.

State law protects the system—by requiring parties to set dates, times, and locations and by defining a few ground rules. Other details of procedure have grown up by custom within the two parties and are not exactly alike.

Who is eligible to participate? "You may attend if you are a qualified voter or will be by the next general election. * * * You should be in agreement with the principles of the particular party and have either voted or affiliated with the party at the last general election, or intend to do so at the next general election," explains the primer.

By law, a precinct caucus must remain in session for 1 hour. By practice, it may last much longer. Democrats move directly into ward meetings (the next step up), the same evening at the same places. Republicans hold ward conventions at later dates. Both are laying groundwork for the significant county conventions, legislative district meetings, and State conventions.

Voters at a precinct caucus start by signing a roster, and a temporary chairman launches the session. A permanent caucus chairman and secretary are elected. Then the business moves on to election of permanent officers (for a 2-year period) and convention delegates. Any nominee may be questioned about his stand on public issues and candidates for higher offices.

The resolution field is wide open. Some participants come with prepared statements. Some may tentatively voice concern about problems as far apart as dog leashing and Vietnam—and if others agree, the ideas will be put into resolution form for voting.

In 1964, Republican precinct caucuses were electrified by the controversy over Senator Barry Goldwater. The philosophical split between "moderates" and "conservatives" may again erupt at the precinct level.

In both parties, the caucuses will offer opportunities for the first voter-level tests of support for candidates, announced or unannounced, for Governor. And leaders of both parties expect lively discussion of tax problems.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, February 2, 1966]

PARTIES NOT ALWAYS SWAYED BY IDEOLOGY

(By Miriam Alburn)

Precinct caucus night is the beginning of a new period in politics—the time when each party begins to renew itself from the bottom up and establish its character for the next 2 years.

It also is a time of clear party identification, which presents special problems of politics and conscience for Minnesota's numerous independent voters.

Do the independents really belong at partisan caucuses—legally or philosophically? Are they welcome? Are they being honest with themselves and the sponsoring party if ultimately they do not vote for all of that party's candidates?

G. Theodore Mitau, professor of political science at Macalester College, St. Paul, and an authority on Minnesota political history, has firm answers for the doubters.

In 1960 he wrote, "In the dynamics of Minnesota politics, party lines have never seemed sacred. Significant numbers of voters show no hesitancy in crossing over, splitting their ticket, supporting the man rather than the party. * * * At the same time there has been no absence of intense partisanship."

Today he warns against too literal an interpretation of political designations. The two major parties are "not primarily ideological parties," he says, because both include wide differences of viewpoint.

Most independents are not completely independent—they have definite leanings toward one party, Mitau points out, and so can appropriately attend the caucus of that party.

In fact, the voter who does not attend a caucus "robs himself at the moment of decisionmaking," relinquishing his chance to influence the choice of candidates, according to Mitau.

"You don't lose your independence of mind and judgment by attending a party caucus," he says. "And you can still vote the other way" in any given race. He believes strongly that participation in a caucus is "a test of caring enough to work through established channels for the good of the country" and a way to express protests in a calm and orderly fashion.

Both parties encourage the participation of independents, hoping to win them over to greater partisanship, of course. They do expect honesty about political leanings, however, and general agreement with their principles. They have a right to challenge anyone they believe may represent the enemy camp, and no voter has a right to participate in caucuses of both parties.

Party officials try to make the caucus system easy and convenient for voters. Lists of times and places are published in advance and notices posted at precinct voting places.

County political headquarters are useful sources of information. They'll give caucus locations by phone, answer questions about procedure, and mail printed material. (In Hennepin County, the DFL number is 335–9241; the GOP phone is TA. 5–6837.) The Republican Workshop already has held a caucus rally, and party officials are holding training sesions for caucus convenors. The DFL plans a "school for politics" for voters soon after the caucuses.

Hennepin County party chairmen directing much of this activity—Lyle Schwarzkopf, Republican, and Gerald Dillon, DFL—are urging voters to hang out flags on both caucus days, to emphasize their importance.

The League of Women Voters (FE. 3–6319) offers pamphlets and general voter information at its office and at an information booth in Donaldson's store, which will be opened after the league's caucus luncheon today at the Pick-Nicollet Hotel.

All DFL precinct caucuses in Minnesota will be held at 8 p.m., March 1. Republican precinct caucuses in the Twin Cities metropolitan area will be held at 8 p.m. as follows: Carver County, February 7; Hennepin and Dakota, February 8; Anoka, February 10; Scott, February 12; Ramsey and Washington, February 15.

Risks in 4-Year Terms Not Worth the Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I have found that the weekly press often presents intelligent discussions of major issues. One issue which is before the Congress this year is the proposal for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives. One of the well-written and influential newspapers in my district is the Hinsdale Doings, whose editor is Mr. Wayne Woltman. He has written an editorial on this subject which, I believe, expresses a widespread point of view.

Risks in 4-Year Terms Not Worth the Change

We are not convinced that what is good for Congressmen is necessarily also good for the country.

We refer to President Johnson's state of the Union recommendation that terms of Congressmen be extended from the present 2 years to 4 years and that they be elected in the same general election in which the President is elected.

The plight of the Congressman and his 2-year term long has been a topic of appraisal in political circles and by political scientists. There is no question of the burden it imposes both in time and campaign expenses. For all purposes, Members of Congress are always running for reelection, with little time for detailed work on their legislative responsibilities. Members of the Senate, in comparison serve comfortable 6-year terms.

We recognize this condition and don't envy the Congressman's job stability. It is a good job, and the pay and benefits today are substantial. Yet, it is an expensive process to win a nomination and an election.

On the other hand, we should be cautious in tampering with established political machinery. The 2-year term was set to provide one of the many checks and balances of our system. It provides for a "review" by the voters every 2 years to insure responsiveness to the changing moods of the Nation. The off-year election is an important barometer reflecting public acceptance of the administration and serves a practical role in adjusting the balance of party power in the lower House.

If we elect every Member of the House at the same time we elect the President, we run the real risk of emasculating the check of the legislative over the executive. In most instances, the party which carries the White House will sweep the House, and, except for the influence of the Senate, we will have a one-voice Government.

Some observers say this is what we need, that too frequently the positive programs of the President dies because of legislative obstructionism. This is true, but we are convinced it is necessarily bad. We today have a tempering effect which while slowing the process of change also insures our stability against turn-of-the-moment thinking.

We have an increasing drift of power to the Federal Government, particulary to the executive. Extending the congressional term to 4 years and making it coincide with that of the President can accelerate this concentration of authority. The risk in our thinking, isn't worth the advantages.

DuPage County's Congressman John Erlenborn was one of the early critics of the plan to extend House terms to 4 years. His position was voiced the day after the state of the Union message.

E. Clinton Towl, Distinguished Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, E. Clinton Towl, president of Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage, Long Island, was honored on February 3, being presented with the Distinguished Citizen Award by Adelphi Suffolk College.

The money raised at his award dinner will be used by the college to augment its scholarship fund as part of its program of encouraging excellence by aiding students of outstanding intellectual ability.

In introducing Mr. Towl to the more than 600 Long Islanders in attendance, New York State Assemblyman Perry B. Duryea, Jr., pointed out that E. Clinton Towl, richly deserving of the award, was a man of contrasting and seemingly conflicting attributes.

For example, as head of Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Long Island's largest industrial organization, and one which is enjoying phenomenal growth since his assumption of the presidency 5 years ago, he undoubtedly can be classed as one of the Nation's busiest executives. Yet in the past year he has taken time to direct the Long Island United Fund Drive, two Boy Scout fundraising efforts, serve on the Nassau-Suffolk Economic Development Council, on Governor Rockefeller's committee to study the Long Island Railroad, on Adelphi University's board of trustees and be active in the Suffolk College's scholarship program.

A veteran of the wood and fabric airplane era, his was the managerial foresight which brought Grumman into top rank among companies engaged in space projects. The lunar excursion module which will transport men to the surface of the moon and an orbiting astronomical laboratory soon to be launched are witness to this.

His background is obviously that of an administrative—he was administrative vice president before election to his present post—but he directs the most sophisticated and diversified team of scientists and engineers on the east coast.

By temperament an intellectual, he is an outdoorsman who hunts and fishes from a lodge in the Berkshires and was rated a tough skipper to beat when racing small sailboats at the family summer home on Shelter Island when he had enough leisure to compete.

Stern enough to weld a 30,000-man organization into a unified team and drive it to prominence in an extremely competitive technological industry, he has remained "Clint" to the thousands with whom he worked during his rise to the top.

He asserts he is conservative in fiscal matters, but shows the venturesome spirit so essential for progress in a time of rapid change.

Clint Towl is a complex individual, pleasant to know, nice to be with, successful in his endeavors, gruff, warm, friendly—he truly is a distinguished citizen, Mr. Duryea concluded.

I would also like to include in the report the brief but pertinent remarks made by Mr. Towl after accepting the award.

SPEECH BY CLINTON TOWL

My feelings about being honored tonight are very difficult to express.

I want to thank all of you for your attendance, and for making this a wonderful evening for me and my family. I want to thank Dr. Brown, Dean Robinson, and the members of the board of overseers of Adelphi Suffolk College for selecting me as recipient of this award. Their interpretation of my contributions to Suffolk County were very generous.

To all those who have made this occasion possible I am deeply grateful.

And keeping in mind the real significance of this occasion, on behalf of the many college students whose education will continue because of the generosity of each one of you here tonight, I wish to thank you again for your participation.

The nature of our times places great demands upon us to insure that the future leaders of this Nation are adequately prepared for that leadership.

We live in an age when the total effort of our technological capabilities is being summoned for the national good. Not only to protect our hard-earned freedoms, but to meet the challenges of outer space and the ocean's depths. History reveals, however, that technological accomplishment, by itself, will not fill all of our needs and make us complete, as a people or as a nation.

For the problem of the world really hasn't changed. It's still a matter of wisdom: the ability to use our capabilities for the betterment of mankind.

So, it's plain we must continue to encourage excellence in engineering, science, and technology. And it's even plainer that we must foster the values, the understanding, the total comprehension of what man is today and what he has been—that will enable the generations who follow us to apply their capabilities wisely.

We shall require the guidance of historians, the understanding of philosophers, and the fresh views and interpretations of artists and musicians. We shall need, as the world has always needed, specialists in the communication arts.

Liberal arts will continue to serve as the foundation upon which human progress and development rest; will remain the custodian of lessons drawn from the past; and will be a pioneer in promoting sound values—the real determinate of man's future.

Thank you very much for the privilege of being asked to join you.

The Realities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, because of his long years as an observer and writer in the Orient, Keyes Beech has earned the title of being a Far Eastern expert. Recently in a column sent from Saigon and published in the Chicago Daily News, Beech had a forthright appraisal of the Vietnam war.

With facts at hand and in his clear, concise way with words, Beech masterfully shot down some myths which have been floating around a long while.

His "Realities Versus the Myths About Vietnam" will, I believe, be an informative addition to what we know about the situation, and with the permission of my colleagues I offer this article for the RECORD:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Feb. 3, 1966]

THE REALITIES VERSUS THE MYTHS ABOUT VIETNAM

(By Keyes Beech)

SAIGON.—It seems to be fashionable these days to examine American foreign policy in terms of "myths and realities." Perhaps that is as good a method as any to apply to the United States and Vietnam and its relation to the rest of Asia.

Myth: We are facing a nameless debacle in Asia.

Reality: The United States is in fact stronger in Asia today, simply because of its presence in Vietnam, than at any time since the Korean war.

There is always the risk that China will intervene but the odds are overwhelmingly against it. The Chinese have gone out of their way to make clear to Hanoi—and the United States—that they want no part of the fighting in Vietnam.

Red China's most grievous loss was Indonesia. Thanks to an abortive Communist power grab, Indonesia's once-flourishing Communist Party has sunk from sight, and with it Peiping's grand design to outflank the U.S. position in South Vietnam.

Meanwhile, as Peiping struggles with endless economic problems, its non-Communist neighbors are enjoying unprecedented prosperity.

Myth: There is no support for the Vietnamese war in Asia.

Reality: Every non-Communist nation in Asia knows that its future rests on the outcome of the war in Vietnam.

The Republic of Korea has sent nearly 20,000 troops to Vietnam, Australia 1,500 and New Zealand 300. Nationalist China would send troops if they were wanted, which they are not.

Thailand has stuck its neck out and provided the United States with bases. Many U.S. Air Force strikes on North Vietnam are staged from Thailand. Thailand also has pilots flying with the South Vietnamese Air Force and has "advisers" in Laos.

Myth: Good works rather than guns will win the war.

Reality: Good works are certainly necessary and the United States has done more in Vietnam than it's given credit for. But, as Mao Tse-tung has so aptly observed, power comes from the mouth of a gun.

Myth: The late Ngo Dinh Diem "robbed" Ho Chi Minh of South Vietnam by refusing to hold countrywide elections in 1956 as called for by the 1954 Geneva agreements ending the war with the French.

Reality: He certainly did. South Vietnam never signed the Geneva agreements and, for that matter, neither did the United States. Diem considered the division of Vietnam a personal betrayal.

Besides, free elections were impossible. North Vietnam, with more than 50 percent of the population, could be counted on to vote 100 percent for a Communist Vietnam.

Myth: The National Liberation Front, political arm of the Vietcong, is a legitimate home-grown political movement native to South Vietnam.

Reality: It is not and it never was. The front has been Hanoi's creature from the very start. It is a carbon copy of the Viet Minh, which Ho created to wrest North Vietnam from the French. And the Viet Minh was borrowed from the Chinese Communists.

Myth: "The South Vietnamese won't fight."

Reality: This myth has been so carefully nurtured that it dies hard. It's true that, because of superior organization and indoctrination, the Communists get more mileage out of their soldiers.

But to say the South Vietnamese won't fight is not only untrue but an insult to the thousands who have died. Last year South Vietnam lost 11,100 dead and 22,600 wounded. That's quite a few casualties for a people who "won't fight."

Myth: The United States should adopt a holding strategy in South Vietnam and withdraw its coastal enclaves instead of tracking down and destroying the enemy in his jungle bases.

Reality: This strategy would abandon the entire countryside to the Communists. It would allow them to bring up heavy weapons at their leisure to shell the enclaves to pieces.

The enclaves would in time degenerate into isolated pockets of resistance inhabited only by American garrison forces supported by bars, night clubs, get-rich-quick artists, and an army of prostitutes.

Creative Federalism and the Great Society—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I extend my remarks to include the concluding portion of an article from the January issue of Fortune magazine: "Creative Federalism and the Great Society," by Max Ways.

Many Great Society programs are marked by an emphasis, similar to that of the Defense Department, on "cost effectiveness."

Take, for a sample, Appalachia. The casual reader of the news may assume that the program for stimulating this backward region is just another dribble of welfarist pap from the Washington udder. The casual reader will be wrong. And he will be missing one of the most interesting of recent political innovations.

The act of Congress creating the program contains a remarkable clause: within Appalachia Federal funds are to be "concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth, and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest." This method of allocation runs counter both to the old congressional pork-barrel system and to the welfarist system that allocated funds on the basis of "need." Appalachia's "need" is such that the $1.1 billion authorized by Congress would be frittered away if it were concentrated on the neediest hollows, the deadest hamlets, and the most eroded hillsides.

By making the greatest investment potential its basic criterion, the Appalachian Act directs the program to concentrate in another way. Within Appalachia there are, right now, a number of economically vigorous towns that may be stimulated to greater growth. There are other areas where local initiative and private enterprise can make a case for a high potential return on investment. The new criterion of public spending leads the men in the Appalachian program to talk in businesslike terms about market analysis and plant location strategy rather than in terms of social work. John L. Sweeney, Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, does not try to wring the reporter's heart with statistics of beriberi and illiteracy in Appalachia. Instead, he makes his pitch like a chamber of commerce secretary, about how Appalachia, lying between the two great markets of the United States—the eastern seaboard and the Great Lakes complex—may have a glittering economic future.

But how will concentration on the growth counties of Appalachia help the people of the back hollows? How can it relieve them of the grim choice between continued poverty and psychologically disruptive migration to Chicago, Detroit, and other great industrial centers? In answer, Sweeney turns to a map. A large proportion of Federal funds for Appalachia will be spent to aid the construction of a road network that would allow the hill dwellers to live in the land they love and commute by bus or car to jobs in the growing centers of the region. Motorized transit offers the possibility of large labor pools without a megalopolis.

One danger of all this is that the Federal Government, in moving away from welfarist standards, will find it has let in the seven worse devils of rigid central planning. But the Appalachian program is set up in a way that minimizes this danger. The key power center is not Sweeney's office but a commission made up of the Governors of the 12 Appalachian States. States, counties, towns, colleges, and private businesses have already been stimulated to compete in presenting to the commission proposals based upon the test of "greatest potential." If this local initiative continues to wax, Federal coordinating functions will be a small part of the total activity. If the local initiative subsides there wouldn't be anything worth coordinating and the Appalachian program will be a clear-cut failure. In neither case will Washington have increased its control of Appalachia.

TENSION AT A HIGH LEVEL

The same organizational principles can be seen at work in the Government's relations with one of the most advanced sectors of U.S. life, higher education. John W. Gardner, the recently appointed Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, did much shrewd and unconventional thinking about this subject when he was head of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Over a year ago in a speech to university people he took aim at the familiar charge that the flow of Federal money to universities represents a dangerous increase in Federal power and a threat to academic independence. He pointed out that there was another side to the story. "To the old-line Federal official, used to a world in which Government funds were spent for purposes defined by Government and administered by hierarchically organized departments under complete Government control, the new trend looks like a grievous loss of Government power," he said. "Wherever he looks, he sees lay advisory bodies recommending how Government money shall be spent, and he sees nongovernmental organizations spending it."

A Government agency, because it is accountable to Congress and the taxpayer, wants to define quite precisely what is to be done with public money that it hands over to a university research project. The university, accustomed to the notion that science works best when it is free of externally imposed conditions, resists the definitions, restrictions, and reviews insisted upon by the agency.

Gardner has urged university people to give more sympathetic understanding to the Government view, and he has urged Government officials to see the university view. But he does not believe—and this is the important point—that the tension between them will or should disappear. "Actually, there is some advantage to the public interest in keeping a certain adversary quality in the relationship."

This thought gets close to the heart of "creative federalism." In the context of modern knowledge and work, whether we are talking about business or Government, the overall degree of centralization or decentralization is seldom an interesting or useful question. What matters is the quality of an ever evolving process of deciding which functions to centralize and which to decentralize.

TOWARD A LIVELIER SCHOOL SYSTEM

"Creative federalism" is also conspicuous in the hugely expanded Federal program of aid to primary and secondary education. Some redistribution from the prosperous to the poor is involved in this program since Federal tax money, collected mainly from a graduated income tax, will be spent at a higher rate per pupil in poorer school districts. But this was not the central motive for enacting the new education program and is not the dominant idea of the administrators in Washington.

Two main motives have converged to increase Federal aid to schools. The first is the widespread belief that the next 30 years will see a rapidly increasing national need for better educated men and women. Economists believe this. Business executives, now running into skill shortages, believe it. PTA groups believe it. And it is almost certainly true. The second idea, held by many educators, is that techniques of teaching now stand on the verge of a major breakthrough into greater efficiency and improved quality. Clinical psychologists have demonstrated the lifelong importance of stimulating the learning processes of children under six. For all age groups, radically new teaching materials—movies, closed-circuit television, programed learning, recording devices—suggest that important advances may lie around the corner. How long it will take to turn the corner will depend partly on how much research and development is done in educational methods.

The Federal Government has no solutions to educational problems—and no particular competence in finding solutions. It has no set educational philosophy or policy to sell, and does not expect to develop such a policy. Those who hope and those who fear that the Federal Government is about to take over the schools are both off the track. The official expectation is that a heavy infusion of Federal funds entering the educational scene will further stimulate innovation and improvement at those points—nearly all outside the Federal Government—where educational innovation can actually be made.

A very large measure of control over the spending of Federal funds will be in the hands of State departments of education and local school boards. Congress even appropriated a small but significant sum for the purpose of strengthening State departments of education, some of which are now too professionally feeble to carry out the independent functions that the spirit of the program requires of them. Many local school boards, superintendents, principals, and teachers will find, if the Federal aid program works as it is supposed to, that they will have new budgetary elbowroom to develop their own initiative. Following the 1965 act, the Office of Education has invited local school boards to submit experimental projects, the most promising of which can be supported by Federal funds.

Until a few years ago there was scandalously little professional interest among university scientists and scholars in the quality of elementary and high school teaching. Lately there has been a great ferment, of which the new math and the new high-school physics course designed by Prof. Jerrold R. Zacharias, of MIT, and his associates are the best-known products. The Federal research program is designed to spread and stimulate this ferment.

The U.S. Office of Education won't do any of this research and it won't be able, even if it so wished, to exercise a tight control over research. Scholars and scientists will insist that they be given a rather free hand. Moreover, when any piece of research is finished, its conclusions are not going to be put into practice unless local administrators and school boards are impressed. Some proposals will be tried out in one State, some in another. Federal aid can help create a livelier network of professional information and evaluation—a market, that is—in which the relative merits of educational innovations can compete more actively. Markets, of course, are far from infallible; but they are fundamentally different from decisionmaking by centralized control. The marvel is that this marketlike competition for forming educational policy is the one that now appeals to the people we are accustomed to call educational bureaucrats.

WHO WILL CART THE GARBAGE?

Research and its more costly brother, development, turn up at point after point in the wide spectrum of enlarged Federal activities enacted by the 1965 Congress. A small but interesting example is the Solid Waste Disposal Act. Hah, cry the alarmists, now the Federal Government is going into garbage collection; the last rampart of local autonomy has been stormed. But maybe not.

The technology of a nation that can put men in space may discover a more efficient manner of garbage and trash disposal than burning it, or dumping it, or hauling it by scow to the open sea—which will wash it up on the beach of some other municipality. Cities struggle along with one method or another, and few of them can afford a thoroughgoing R. & D. project to find better ways of coping with the garbage and trash explosion. New ideas for solid-waste disposal will have to be tried out in practice, and in the trying it may be desirable for Washington to make a grant to some city willing to be, if one may put it so, the guinea pig.

Similarly, we have Federal programs for research into the causes of crime and delinquency and into better methods of transmitting information on suspected criminals. These do not necessarily imply that Washington is about to take over all the police work of the Nation. We will not necessarily be forced to choose between the Keystone cops and the police state.

Health, including medicare, is the largest single category of increased Federal spending projected by the 1965 legislative program. The fact that there is now a huge and increasing population over 65 years old represents medical triumphs in saving lives at all age levels. The public has shown its appreciation of the improved quality of medical care by increasing its payments for such services from a level of 4 percent of disposable income to 6 percent. Part of this increase represents the fact that "unit costs" of medical care have been rising somewhat faster than other costs. But in the main, the increase to the present level of nearly $30 billion a year indicates that the public has decided that medical care is worth more than it used to be.

For the aged, especially, there are now many opportunities for treatment (e.g., the removal of eye pupils in cataract cases) that did not exist a generation ago. Once such treatment becomes medically feasible, this society raises its standards of what it considers essential. Lack of money, it says, must not be allowed to stand between an aged person and a chance to preserve his eyesight. Even though private health insurance, pension plans, and individual savings have expanded rapidly, they lagged behind the new standards of minimum medical service to the aged. In a problem-solving society medicare was seen as a way of closing a gap that medical progress had opened up.

Unquestionably, medicare will throw a new burden of demand on medical services that are already overloaded. Recent Federal legislation provides funds to encourage the expansion of medical and nursing schools.

THE AMA SHIFTS ITS GROUND

Meanwhile, there may be opportunities to increase further the productivity and quality of medical services. To explore some of these opportunities a presidential commission headed by Dr. Michael E. De Bakey, of Baylor University, proposed Federal aid for an elaborate system of regional centers for the treatment of heart, stroke, and cancer cases. The American Medical Association did not like De Bakey's plan, but in this case the AMA avoided the all-out ideological attack that had characterized its unsuccessful opposition to medicare. Congressmen, sitting down with AMA leaders and Federal officials, greatly modified the De Bakey plan into a setup that many doctors believe will work. Federal funds will be used to strengthen the professional networks that now run between practicing doctors and the great centers of medical research. In order to take advantage of the best medical knowledge, a patient in a small town will not have to be transported to a great teaching hospital; relevant information can be brought to his bedside by closer, quicker connections between existing research centers and local hospitals.

This is not a bricks-and-mortar program; Congress authorized no funds for new buildings. The goal, improved channels of communication among the doctors of a region, obviously can be sought only with local doctors in control of the program. The Federal fund dispensers can suggest procedures and can relay information from one region to another. They can deny funds to regional projects that do not meet the very flexible requirements set up by Congress. But the weight of authority will have to lie in professional organizations. Fifteen years from now medical practice will undoubtedly be organized quite differently, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that 99 percent of the decisions shaping the change will continue to be made at points outside the Federal Government—even if, as is also probable, Federal activity in the health field expands.

THE CITY IS A PROCESS

In 1965 the Federal Government acquired a new Cabinet-level department—Housing and Urban Development. Over the last 20 years, as the problems of the cities have become more formidable, there has been a change in how we think about these problems. This new way of seeing the urban challenge works against the danger that the Federal Government will take over the cities.

A generation ago, slum had a simple, physical meaning. It signified a group of buildings that were overage, overpopulated, and underequipped. That simple meaning implied a remedy, which is now understood to be inadequate; slum clearance and public housing would replace bad buildings with better buildings. All that required was money and the Federal Government had it. In a program so conceived there would be some—but not much—inherent need for local decisionmaking and local initiative. Federal housing on this model made some—but not much—improvement.

Slum today signifies a complex in which such elements as the quality of education and the morale of inhabitants are more important than the buildings themselves. Moreover, a slum is not thought of as an isolated blighted area that can be quarantined and dealt with independently of the rest of the city. We are now aware of gray areas, which may be degenerating into slums faster than bulldozers can level old slums. From this and similar observations we have come to look upon the city as a process to be improved rather than as a product to be altered.

As any manager knows, improvement of a process requires analysis of how its parts affect one another and how they can be better coordinated to obtain the chosen objectives. It is simply unimaginable that in any given city the Federal Government can play a major role in such coordination. The problems are, city by city, so unique that local coordination and local initiative must be the determining elements. Experience bears this out. Philadelphia, New Haven, Boston, are cities where urban renewal is making huge strides because bubbling local initiative and increasing professional competence make effective the spending of Federal and other urban renewal money. By contrast, New York lags, not because it has been out of favor with Washington fund dispensers, but because it has lacked the local political and business leadership, which is more important than money from Washington. Members of Congress—relics of the old politics—who promise to do more in the way of increasing the flow of Federal money to such laggard cities as New York will continue to be helpless until local initiative develops.

Urban renewal, far from being an extension of the monolithic Federal power, has created or revived a host of local organizations, which have become centers of influence on reconstructing the process of living in cities. A Philadelphian involved in the revival of that city said: "Citizen organization is the principal phenomenon of this town." In other words, Federal housing money in Philadelphia helped to create and strengthen decisionmaking centers that lie outside of Federal control.

The new limits are practical ones.

It is as true today as it ever was that a free society must be vigilant against concentration of power in a few hands. It is also true that in the 20th century many national governments, using humanitarian slogans, have tended to squash the sphere of local government and constrict the scope of private organizations and individuals. The United States has not been immune to this trend. Twenty-five years ago State and local government in the United States was anemic, and predictions—some approving, some despairing—were widely made that the Federal political system must be transformed into a unitary national system on the British or French model. Twenty-five years ago the dispersed and competing power centers of private enterprise were being cramped by the encroaching power of Washington.

As resistance to this trend developed, the United States seemed to be in a struggle between what was politically practical and what was, by traditional interpretation, constitutional. The traditionalists lost ground steadily until it became much harder to see the tidy pigeonholes into which Americans used to separate what was private, what was governmental, what was State, what was Federal. Today the scope of Federal action cannot be specifically defined by categories (e.g., defense and foreign affairs). The Federal Government may have a proper function in almost any field of action. This change raises a question: can a central government that has massive roles in business agriculture, schools, health, and even, perhaps, garbage collection truly be described as a "limited" Federal Government?

The answer, oddly, is yes. The new limits on Federal power have been imposed by political practicality. Ironically, the popular hunger for progress that seemed to generate a threat to limited government has come to the rescue of limited government. An electorate that began to expect real results—and would not be fobbed off by such psychological titillations as "soaking the rich"—pressed political leaders toward more effective modes of action. These modes turned out to put a heavy practical emphasis on State and local government, on business freedom, on the market as a way of making economic decisions.

If in January, 1956, anybody had forecast a Federal Government budget of $175 billion by 1976, his prediction would have been taken to mean that more and more power would be concentrating in Washington. Today we can view the same prediction against a projected background of a 1976 gross national product of over a trillion dollars and understand that Federal spending at $175 billion would take a smaller share of total national activity than the present budget does. Today we are less interested in the size of the total Federal budget than in the relative "cost effectiveness" of the programs that make up the budget. The old public sector versus private sector argument is giving ground before a rising interest in good management, both government and private.

CONSTRUCTIVE WORK AND OUTDATED ORATORY

Lyndon Johnson as Senate majority leader in the Eisenhower years showed that he sensed the new political framework. He muted the strident ideological slogans that had dominated his party in the years 1933–52 because these class struggle slogans in a rapidly progressing country were losing their appeal. As President, his much-derided insistence on "consensus politics" is in part a shrewd recognition that "issues" are no longer central. Knowing that his new programs will be judged more by what they accomplish than by the good intentions of their authors, he has warned administrators to build these programs soundly rather than quickly. Even so, several of the new programs—notably the "war on poverty"—have run into serious organizational difficulties. Johnson's fundamental difficulty is that many leaders of this party are still stuck in the old framework where ideology counted more than good management.

Many Republican leaders are also stuck there, still firing irrelevant ideological guns at a target area from which the enemy is decamping. The great Republican political asset for the future is its hold on a high proportion of the managers and professional men whose skills are especially needed in the conception, execution, and criticism of the new type of governmental program. Use of this asset requires close engagement with the new programs at local, State and national levels. Beneath the surface of the last congressional session some exceedingly important work was done in improving Great Society measures proposed by the executive branch—and Republicans made a contribution to this improvement that has been somewhat masked by the party's own outdated oratory.

All through the postwar period, partisan political debate has lagged behind the radical change, generated outside politics, that has been sweeping through U.S. society. This accelerating rate of change, which appears to be a permanent condition, posed a challenge to the fundamental American political institutions. We are now emerging—successfully—from this period of challenge. In a way that was hardly conceivable 25 years ago, U.S. democratic institutions have proved flexible and adaptable and are becoming, once again, the objects of envy and admiration by discerning men in other countries. The American political genius is moving through creative federalism toward new ways of expanding individual choice while maintaining social cohesion.

Young Cincinnatians Learn Skills in Classes at Job Corps Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a reporter, Margaret Josten, of the Cincinnati Enquirer, has written a seven-part series on the antipoverty program in Cincinnati. Today, I include the sixth part of her series to illustrate the kind of reporting that helps inform the public about the various antipoverty programs at work in our communities under the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

YOUNG CINCINNATIANS LEARN SKILLS IN CLASSES AT JOB CORPS CAMPS

(By Margaret Josten)

Camp Kilmer, N.J., may have seen more exciting days—if not in World War II when it was the U.S. staging area for the European theater, perhaps in 1956, when it was a temporary dwelling for refugees from the Hungarian revolution.

Now the sprawling complex of weatherworn barracks on the Jersey coast is the showcase of the Job Corps, major youth program of the war against poverty. It has never been the subject of a headline screaming "trouble."

Because of the headlines about a few of the 75 camps strung throughout the Nation, however, the visitor to Kilmer is pleasantly surprised when he sees no evidence of the young ruffian who has become the Job Corps man's prototype for many who read the newspapers.

The International Telephone and Telegraph Corp., a leader in electronics and communications, operates this camp for the Government. And it appears to be giving about 1,200 young men between the ages of 16 and 21 the kind of skills which may one day produce a reduction in welfare rolls.

Depending upon their talents the young men can take courses in elementary and advanced electricity, welding, logistics, automobile body repair and finishing, refrigeration, appliance repair, the building trades, office machine operation, even cooking.

"We have been successful so far," says John W. Guilfoyle, IT&T vice president.

"Kilmer graduates have been hired by large and small firms and have been accepted by the Armed Forces," Mr. Guilfoyle adds. "We have every indication that American business is opening the doors to the graduates of this and every other training center."

Businesses like IT&T, itself planning to hire at least 100 Job Corps graduates, were chosen to run the camps for approximately 40,000 young men and women throughout the Nation.

The businesses know the problems and they know how to get results, explains R. Sargent Shriver, Director, U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

"Kilmer management knows what a body repair shop is," Mr. Shriver says. "It has had experience; there is no play-acting."

Although there are no Job Corps camps near Cincinnati, well over 100 young men and women from this area are in installations which have been set up in both urban and rural centers.

A number of Cincinnatians are at Kilmer, which was named for the "Trees" composer.

Cecil Hamilton, 18, formerly a resident of Elsinore Street in Mt. Adams, has gained 32 pounds since he arrived at the center in May 1965. He is learning to be an automobile mechanic and hopes he may one day put his skills to use in Cincinnati.

Young Hamilton, who recently took first place in Kilmer's pool shooting tournament, says, "There's a good chance for every boy here."

Then there is George C. Vanderpool, 17, 1703 Carll Street, who completed the 8th grade at Heinold Junior High School. He, as well as all other corpsmen, is enrolled in an academic program. But he, too, is learning the basics of automobile mechanics.

Richard W. Clift, 8406 St. Clair St., says he likes everything about the Job Corps but the food. (It is basically the same as that served in Army camps.)

At any rate young Clift is also learning to be an automobile mechanic, apparently a popular vocation here and in other camps. He wants to return to Cincinnati.

Among Job Corpsmen who visited the Youth Opportunity Center, 108 E. Seventh St., while home on holiday education:

Willie Curry, 19, 1400 Linn Street, stationed at Camp Gary, San Marcos, Tex. He had gone as far as the 11th grade and had done no more than weekend restaurant work before leaving Cincinnati. Now he is learning welding.

Ralph Bartholomew, 20, 148 W. 73d Street, Carthage, stationed at Mexican Springs, N.M. He had attended school until the 10th grade, but now is becoming acquainted with the basic elements of electricity.

Harry Needom, 21, 326 W. McMicken Avenue, now at Camp Gary, San Marcos, Tex.

Young Needom says he could neither read nor write acceptably before entering the Job Corps. "At first I couldn't even read letters from home," he declared, adding, "But I'm improving a lot."

Now he is learning laundry management, explaining, "Some hospitals are begging for people who know this work."

OEO officials ask how anybody can condemn a system which is zeroing in on such problems.

Clear Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, in ending the 37-day pause in the bombing of targets in North Vietnam, President Johnson said he did so because "only denunciation and rejection" came from Hanoi and Peiping in reply to his peace offers, and because a continuation of the pause would cost American and Allied lives.

In this peace-searching period the only fact brought to light, according to an editorial in the Columbus Dispatch, "was the stubborn intention of Peiping and Hanoi to press their luck to the bitter end."

The Dispatch states that:

> Behind the President's decision was a reckoning of the cost in lives and money of a continued diminished military effort against the lesser overall cost of definitive action.

The newspaper believes that—

> The world that pays attention to the truth is well aware, after the 37-day lull, of the U.S. good intentions and of the sincerity of our peace offer.

Because this editorial gives such a clear analysis of a subject of great concern to all Americans and to all the world, I insert it in the RECORD:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, Feb. 1, 1966]

SECOND LESSON BEGINS NOW

After a fruitless 5-week suspension of bombing of North Vietnam during which our pursuit of a negotiated peace was insolently rejected by Hanoi, President Johnson has made the reluctant but inevitable decision again to bring to bear the might of the U.S. Air Force against the centers of support and supply which abet the Vietcong attack on South Vietnam.

The only fact brought to light in the search for a way to the negotiating table was the stubborn intention of Peiping and Hanoi to press their luck to the bitter end.

Behind the President's decision was a reckoning of the cost in lives and money of a continued diminished military effort against the lesser overall cost of definitive action.

In ordering renewed bombardment of North Vietnam, the President made it clear he still holds the door open for Hanoi and Peiping should they find negotiation to be more profitable than further fighting.

The world that pays attention to truth is well aware, after the 37-day lull, of the U.S. good intentions and of the sincerity of our peace offer.

What remains now is to convince the Peiping-Hanoi axis that we are dedicated to the defense of democracy whether by conversations around a table or bombing around the clock.

L.B.J.'s State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, developments in the past 4 weeks demonstrate the insight expressed in an editorial from the St. Paul Dispatch of January 13, 1966, published the day after President Johnson's state of the Union message to Congress and the American people. This editorial accurately places in print the thoughts that many of us had after listening to the President.

The editorial follows:

L.B.J.'S STATE OF THE UNION

It will be possible to analyze fairly President Johnson's plans to provide both guns and butter only as specific proposals are sent to Congress, but on the face of it his state of the Union address Wednesday night comes across as an election year document full of a good deal of windy nonsense. We are to enlarge and broaden the Great Society, to provide for every human want. We are to continue to support much of the world, even, as we heard, help educate it, and we are to pursue the war in Vietnam with vigor. All of this, so help us, at no additional cost to the taxpayer save in resumed excise taxes on automobiles and telephones.

This was an address filled with glad tidings for big labor, despite his admonition to both business and labor to keep an eye on inflation and despite his plea for some sort of weapon to settle such strikes as that which tied up public transportation in New York City for 2½ weeks.

It must have been pleasing to the great liberal bloc of Congress, which views the Federal Treasury as a vast and unending source of loot and solutions for all of mankind's ills.

It must, however, trouble anyone who has watched TV's late-show pitchmen perform great feats of financial legerdemain by which boobs are convinced they can get something for practically nothing.

Quite frankly, we don't see how he can have it all: to rebuild cities, to provide addition largess and benefits to all, to expand medical care (he even mentioned physical examinations) and to fight a costly war and close the budget to near balance (if you happen to think a billion dollars or so is an insignificant sum) and not tax us until we are bloody.

His expanded Great Society will, of course, expand the Federal dominion in the States and the cities. This would be further heightened by his contemplated revision of workman's compensation, Federal intrusions into jury selection and what seems to be the beginnings of a true Federal police force to enforce special Federal laws to be created for the protection of civil rights workers.

Laws are needed, he said, "to strengthen the authority of Federal courts to try those who murder, attack, or intimidate either civil rights workers or others exercising their constitutional rights."

The conduct of southern juries and courts does, of course, add persuasiveness to this approach. But it would be to enter a realm of constitutional upheaval, a swift approach to the "Big Brother" state and, we think, to kill a swarm of gnats with atomic weapons.

The foreign policy portion of the address contained no surprises and seems to have encountered only that opposition which could have been expected. It was a simple reassertion. It went into no additional detail as to present aims in Vietnam. It revealed again that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are having none of our overtures for peace.

Somewhat significantly, the President received great applause when he called for a constitutional amendment to increase congressional terms to 4 years. Doubly significant, and giving a quick study of the rubber stamp 89th Congress, was the enthusiastic applause which greeted the President's praise of its efforts last year, which were truly remarkable as to quantity if not quality.

It does not seem as if we are to have a year of close study of that which has been wrought with so many imperfections and gross miscalculations. If the Great Society leaks a bit the solution apparently is to load it rather than patch it, which, in the case of gas balloons and tires can be disastrous.

U.N. Assignment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam issue has been referred to the proper authority with the U.S. request for the U.N. Security Council to use its "immense prestige in finding a prompt solution."

The task will not be easy. But we can take hope, remembering that it was in the U.N. corridors that the Berlin blockade problem was finally resolved. Moscow and Washington were not able to find a way by themselves but conversations in the United Nations led to a settlement.

Taking the Vietnam problem to the United Nations was hailed by the New York Journal-American, which stated:

> It is a victory for the United States and the administration because it dramatizes before all the world the sincerity and persistence of the President's drive for an honorable peace—a truly impressive effort that has explored every possible diplomatic approach.

It adds:

> It is a victory for the United Nations because it affirms that body's basic reason for existence, which is to restore and maintain peace wherever it is violated.

Because it deals with a matter of such vital urgency, I suggest that the editorial to which I have referred be published in the RECORD—and it is herewith submitted.

A BIG WIN IN U.N.

The United States, President Johnson's administration, and the United Nations itself, have won an important victory in the vote of the Security Council permitting a full-scale debate on the Vietnam war.

It is a victory for the United States and the administration because it dramatizes before all the world the sincerity and persistence of the President's drive for an honorable peace—a truly impressive effort that has explored every possible diplomatic approach.

It is a victory for the United Nations because it affirms that body's basic reason for existence, which is to restore and maintain peace wherever it is violated.

The 9 to 2 vote (with four abstentions) of the Security Council is, on the other hand, a shameful indictment of the Soviet Union and its curious companion, France, which led the opposition to the debate. Russia voted "No" along with Bulgaria. France took transparent refuge in abstaining, along with Mali, Uganda, and Nigeria, which was a "chicken" way of saying "No." They all, in effect, were acting against the primary purpose of the U.N.

Our Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg handled the administration's case magnificently in turning back the vitriolic attack on the United States by Soviet Delegate Nikolai T. Fedorenko.

The little nation of Jordan, which cast the decisive vote, deserves applause for seeing the issue clearly and acting accordingly.

It is not a conclusive victory, of course, because the vote on the U.S. resolution itself is yet to come and opens the way for a veto.

But it was a big victory just the same.

Intent of Congress Was Not To Destroy the Billboard Industry, But Rather To Develop a Program of Beautification With Reasonable Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Department of Commerce published a draft of standards which they are proposing to regulate the use of billboards on Federal highways in cities and industrial areas. I feel very strongly that the draft standards represent a serious misinterpretation of the intent of Congress in passing the Highway Beautification Act, and will seriously jeopardize, perhaps almost destroy, the outdoor advertising industry.

I supported the President's highway beautification program when it came to us on the floor of the House, and I still support it. I feel that we can vastly improve the beauty of our countryside by fair and judicious control of billboard advertising. The general appearance of our cities, too, can be improved by limited control of billboards. However, no interpretation of the Highway Beautification Act can accurately describe the intent of Congress as being desirous of the destruction of the outdoor advertising. On the contrary, the bill was designed to assist the outdoor advertising in its development consistent with the mutual desire to improve the appearance of our cities and countryside.

Therefore, the draft standards came as quite a shock to many, for they go far beyond the stated intent of Congress and indeed in some places violate the language of the law itself. The standards are also in violation of the expressed intent of Commerce Secretary John Connor, in his explanation of the proposal as originally put forth by the administration.

When the House of Representatives debated the highway beautification bill, as it was passed by the Senate, it passed the Tuten amendment which called for the adoption of standards "consistent with customary use." The standards proposed by the Department of Commerce are, I feel, in violation of this language.

The draft standards would impose a size limitation of 300 square feet for any billboard within 150 feet of the roadway, require a minimum setback of 25 feet for all signs, limit the height of billboards to 30 feet, and require that signs be placed at least 500 feet apart with the maximum limit of 6 per mile. A prominent businessman in my district rightly referred to the size limitation as a "postage stamp" approach and said that advertising effectiveness would be seriously hampered by the imposition of such limitations. The requirement of a 150-foot setback for larger signs is extremely unrealistic and unfair in that such setbacks are virtually impossible to find in industrial or heavily populated areas. The imposition of a minimum 25-foot setback for all signs would, at least in the industrial areas of my district, cause the destruction or removal of a large percentage of billboards and result in an unreasonable financial loss to outdoor advertising companies. The height limitation would, of course, eliminate almost all advertising on top of buildings. And most important of all, the proposed regulation limiting the number of billboards to 6 per mile would in itself virtually eliminate the industry.

None of these regulations can by any stretch of the imagination be considered as following "customary usage" as required by the law. I certainly feel that some regulation of the billboard industry in industrial and urban areas may be necessary, but the draft regulations of the Department of Commerce are most punitive in their effect. I feel that their adoption would at best be an unfair and unwarranted step toward the complete destruction of a valuable advertising industry and at worst is a direct violation of both the spirit and the letter of the Highway Beautification Act.

H.R. 12410 Provides Education and Other Benefits for Veterans of Service After January 31, 1955

SPEECH
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I vigorously support H.R. 12410, the bill to provide education and other benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955.

This bill was unanimously approved by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. It is a good bill, and a major step forward in providing cold war veterans realistic compensation for service in Vietnam and elsewhere.

The bill is more far reaching than the bill passed by the Senate last year, and it contains most of the provisions of my own GI cold war bill, H.R. 12215, which I introduced on January 20, 1966, and which extended the provisions of the Korean conflict GI bill.

The new GI bill provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving after January 31, 1955, on the basis of a month of training for each month of service up to 3 years. It also provides the same educational benefits as those provided by the Korean conflict GI bill.

The loan-guarantee provisions are the same as for veterans of the Korean service. The Veterans' Administration guarantees as much as $7,500, and direct loans also are authorized where private financing is not available, up to $17,500.

H.R. 12410 also contains all of the important provisions for medical care and job training for veterans as were provided in the Korean conflict GI bill.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am glad that so many of the provisions of my bill have been included in H.R. 12410. I am satisfied that this bill is complete in all essential details and will adequately provide for veterans of the Vietnam conflict as well as areas of potential conflict.

I am confident that the President will sign this legislation promptly.

During the congressional recess it was my privilege, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to travel to Vietnam, and to observe firsthand the hazards faced by American fighting men, and to see their dedication to duty in the swamps and jungles under the most difficult conditions.

It was also my privilege to visit our troops in Korea which are holding the cease-fire line in that sensitive and important area which was won at such great cost.

Every Member of Congress who has visited these areas has been impressed with the quality of character and dedication of American fighting men who are serving on the frontiers of freedom. Today our servicemen are serving under combat or near-combat conditions in many areas of the world. During the period of time which is covered by this bill, our Nation has gone through a series of crises associated with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, Laos, and now Vietnam. As the committee report says, "The perpetual cold war condition, with its crises, compulsory military service, and expanded overseas commitments, makes this bill necessary if our servicemen, during this tense period of history, are to receive equitable treatment."

In Vietnam, in Korea, in the Dominican Republic, in Berlin, and in other posts which are now, or may at any moment become hot spots in this cold war period, American fighting men must be ready at any moment to make great sacrifices to preserve our precious heritage of freedom. The cost of stopping aggression is a high one.

It is, therefore, entirely proper and fitting that we at home express our gratitude to and support of our fighting men of the Armed Forces now, as we have in the past, to veterans of World War II, and the Korean conflict, and of World War I. In my opinion, there is no better way to do this than to establish the permanent program provided in H.R. 12410, which will assist these men in obtaining educational benefits and other assistance upon their return to civilian life.

Those who serve in the Armed Forces in this cold war period shoulder a disproportionate burden of citizenship. While they are exposed to great hazards in the service of their country, other young men of their age at home are preparing for occupational or professional careers.

Here at home we must make certain sacrifices to insure that our Armed Forces personnel can, when they return, pick up their lives and progress at a normal rate in our rapidly changing society and economy. We must assist our veterans to adjust to our economy at home when they return, as we pray they will.

Clergymen Back President's Vietnamese Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, an article of great significance appeared on Monday, February 7, in the Atlantic City Press, the leading daily newspaper in Atlantic County, New Jersey's Second District, which I have the honor to represent. This article containing the views of Atlantic County clergymen on our participation in the Vietnamese warfare makes worthwhile reading for the ideas which my district's men of the cloth express, and I would like to reproduce it here and commend it to my colleagues for their illumination.

The Atlantic City Press article follows:

CLERGYMEN FROM AREA SUPPORT L.B.J.'S VIET POLICY

(By Joseph Di Leo)

A shadow has been cast across the face of southeast Asia. It is all encompassing, lethal in character and woven with deception.

Today nearly 200,000 American GI's are engaged in the deadly business of battling the elusive Vietcong troops who lurk in the sweltering jungles of war-torn South Vietnam.

For these men, the reality of war has become a way of life.

Whether the limited war in Vietnam will mushroom into a worldwide conflict undoubtedly is uppermost in their minds. Whether these men will see their families again is a matter of grave concern to them.

"What is the Mekong Delta, and why must I die there?" American soldiers in Vietnam often wonder. "Who will remember me—and who will dig my grave?"

The loneliness and doubt felt by many GI's in Vietnam undoubtedly has been heightened by the variety of opinions among Americans as to the feasibility and morality of the war.

However, a poll of Atlantic City area clergymen indicates they support the President's policy regarding the war in Vietnam.

On Sunday night, the press called three local clergymen for their comments on the war. "Americans to decide who will lead the Nation. Our decision is demonstrated at the polls on election day. After that we can only have confidence in our leaders," Rabbi Jerome S. Lipsitz of Temple Beth El, Margate, said.

Rabbi Lipsitz, who served as an Army chaplain during the Korean war, said the United States has a "vital commitment" to the defense of South Vietnam but added we should attempt to peacefully settle the war.

Citing the similarities between the Korean and Vietnam wars, the rabbi said "we shouldn't draw lines, such as the line that divides North and South Korea, in seeking a settlement to the war.

"If we have to negotiate along such lines, we should only accept a divided Vietnam on a temporary basis," he said, predicting that North and South Korea will be reunited within 20 years.

Rabbi Lipsitz noted that during the Korean war American GI's were beset by frustration because they had to fight their way to the tops of mountains like Old Baldy and Pork Chop Hill—in a nation so distant from the United States that it hardly seemed worth the trouble.

"The situation is similar in Vietnam, and the cause is just as worthwhile," he added.

The Reverend Charles F. Rinck of Grace Lutheran Church, Somers Point, said, "the United States must stop the spread of communism."

He added that he supported the policy of the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur to extend the Korean war into Red China.

When asked if he thinks the United States should bomb Hanoi, the minister said: "If we can fire one bullet in this war, we can bomb Hanoi. The scope of the war is not so important as we make it out to be."

However, he noted that bombing Hanoi may have dangerous consequences in that it brings Red China into the war.

"We are not at war with China, and we never will be unless they initiate it. However, Russia wouldn't be unhappy if we went to war with China," he said, adding chances are greater of war developing between Russia and China.

He said democracy would better suit the peoples of southeast Asia than communism because of the economic prosperity it would bring.

"With the exception of Russia, communism has stunted the economic growth of every nation in which it has developed," he said, contrasting this with the prosperity that earmarks the democratic nations of Japan and West Germany.

He said the United States should attempt to agriculturally develop the Mekong Delta, now the scene of some of the fiercest battles with the Vietcong, once the war is settled.

"It would be easy to pull out and go home—leaving this part of the world to be eaten up by the 'peaceful revolution' of communism, but this would not be the best thing to do.

"The war in Vietnam is giving Americans an opportunity to discover whether they really believe in democracy," he said.

"I believe we should support the President in his Vietnam policy—even if we think he's wrong," the Reverend Kenneth Shirk of Epiphany Church, Pleasantville, said, adding he personally supports Lyndon B. Johnson's war policy.

He said Americans have the right to conscientiously object to U.S. participation in the war so long as they don't break the law by so doing—as in the cases of burning draft cards.

The Reverend Shirk said the reason many America young men seem to be unenthusiastic about the war is because it is undeclared. He noted that if the war grew to the enormity of World War II, these men would rally to their Nation's side.

"We gain nothing by not having diplomatic relations with Red China," he said, citing the danger of that nation entering the Vietnam war.

He said he would favor admission of Red China to the United Nations "if she alters her terms for joining." Those terms call for immediate expulsion of Nationalist China from the U.N.

"It is no longer possible for a limited war to take place. If a world war begins, we are in for a major holocaust. And if a nuclear war develops, China's sheer numbers will be to her favor.

"If there is a nuclear war, the only thing we can do is run to the nearest bomb shelter—and pray to God," he said.

An Overriding Concern: The Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the executive vice president of the Minnesota Retail Federation, Inc., Mr. Thomas H. Hodgson, has provided me with samplings of a most unusual survey he has taken among small businesses in Minnesota. Mr. Hodgson stated in an accompanying letter that "A handful—of surveyed stores—may have annual sales of $1 to $2 million. A vast majority has sales substantially under $300,000 or $200,000, and some sell as little as $50,000 to $100,000."

The survey, according to Mr. Hodgson, revealed:

> Thousands of small and large retailers in our State are having their troubles, strangely enough in a period of unprecedented expansion, high economic growth, and general national prosperity.

What are these troubles? Mr. Hodgson observed:

> The overriding concern of the merchants centered on laws and growing governmental regulation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be helpful to Members of Congress to read for themselves representative observations of storekeepers in Minnesota about such matters as governmental relations, wage-hour legislation, and unemployment compensation. Under unanimous consent I insert these appropriate survey comments in the RECORD today.

SURVEY COMMENTS

GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Government's regulations and reports require full-time secretary which raises our costs higher proportionally. (Small store in town of 3,000 population.)

We have all but lost our voice in Government. The boys in Washington couldn't care less about what is going on in Windom, Minn., even when we tell them. Unfortunately, our State government is acting the same way.

The Federal Government and also the State have lost sight of the small businessman. They think the small businessman does one-half million in volume and up and that they can afford some of the garbage the Government is trying to pass off on us. What about the guy who does $100,000 or less, or under $200,000. We can't afford high-priced bookkeepers for Government recordkeeping and for keeping within the varied and sundry laws that we are under. We do it ourselves. Tom, we have all we can do with trying to keep our heads above water.

Federal interference through wage-hour law, medicare, raising unemployment benefits for undeserving people.

Biggest problem—growing encroachment of Government on business. Large firms can add people to handle these things at a direct cost to the company. "The small merchant doesn't have the wherewithal to employ additional personnel and * * * is forced to assume the duty himself or split it among other present employees to the detriment of their present duties.

Any governmental regulations that don't take into account the size of the business and the locally oriented problems cannot be equitable and can only serve to crowd out the small guy.

The head of a large State retail association lists as the first problem governmental regulations and taxes.

Our greatest problem is government regulations. Because we are small and I have no one to advise us on our individual problems, we never know if we are properly complying or not. (Town population about 500.)

Continued takeover by Federal Government by more and more regulations.

Initiative-killing bills—repeal of 14(b) (taking away a man's rights), reducing to $250,000 the qualification to come under the new minimum wage and hour law and federalization of unemployment compensation amendments to eliminate experience rating and dispensing our money from Washington instead of locally.

"The greatest problem the small retailer has today is to be under Federal control of wages and hours. The Government says that Federal control * * * does not effect the small retailer but it definitely does. Many of us are next door to J. C. Penney's, Woolworth's, Montgomery Ward, etc. How can we hire girls for $1 to $1.25 an hour and have the girls next door receiving $1.75? It will force us to pay $1.75 but at the same time we will have to operate our business with one or two less girls, which will create more unemployment.

Another problem has to do with the clerical work we do for the government. It's getting more voluminous daily. The government owns a lot of computers * * * why doesn't it go into a timesharing deal with smaller retailers so that we could feed the information for our firm into their computer. It could be programed the way the government wanted it so that the government reports would all be on time and correctly processed by their own computer. Or is that too naive? In the absence of that, how about rebates for our doing government work, or the government sending someone to do the work for us?

Recordkeeping. "We are expected to keep records on so many things: wages and hours worked, social security, withholding taxes, unemployment compensation, and many more. It's time consuming and expensive.

"Business today is not working for itself but for the government due to the many unnecessary rules, laws, regulations, etc. Regulations are running rampant and not until we can get a conservative government that is not labor controlled can we start digging out of this mess. Government today channels everything to interest the voter and it is the vote that keeps them in power and builds for further power.

"We have many employees in our store and community who own their own homes, and cars, are debt free, and have sent or are sending children to colleges, who earn less than $3,000 per year. We do not appreciate 'Big Brother' in Washington telling them they are poverty stricken and neither do they. The government wage scale and ideas of poverty are not applicable to every geographical and economic area of the country.

"Living in northern Minnesota we have seen what happens to the American Indians when they are put on reservations and become wards of the government. We are forced to be pessimistic about the future of our country when we are faced with the rising trend toward making everyone in the country a ward of the government. The people should be running the government, not the government running the people."

Too many duplicate Government forms (for reporting) that take up too much of a retailer's time.

"It is especially difficult for the small merchant to assume additional duties foisted on his business by the Government because his primary means to stay competitive are his abilities to use his imagination and implement his programs. When tied down with routine duties his efficiency is curtailed and his creativity dulled. Without the small merchant working in his most efficient manner, the sociological and economic problems may make some of the present problems in these areas small by comparison."

WAGE-HOUR

"We need some definite guidelines on wage-hour regulations having to do with commissioned big-ticket salesmen. We don't know how liable we are on minimum wages for these people."

Because he's doing a little more than $250,000 volume a year, a merchant located in a very small rural town fears being saddled with unrealistic wage-hour controls.

Federal wage and hour regulations have "kept our expenses top heavy for the past 3 years and made it almost impossible for our store to show a profit. A 10-cent-an-hour raise to our employees costs us $8,000 to $9,000 per year. We can't recover from one jolt before we get another."

"The restrictions, regulations (wage-hour) and compensation required to meet the Federal law place a tremendous handicap on a small merchant. We have, for instance, some managers of minor departments that we just can't afford to pay $150 per week (executive scale). They are part of our management team but we have to make them punch the clock. It takes away their prestige and harms their pride and initiative. It is a sorry situation."

A small merchant lists as his No. 1 problem "Our Federal Government setting minimum pay scales. Very difficult for a small store in a comparatively small town to maintain a $1.25 minimum pay scale and not reduce the amount of service our customers are used to."

A medium-sized retailer in a city of about 40,000 lists as his third most serious problem the Federal wage-hour regulations (after (1) State and Federal income taxes and (2) State personal property taxes).

"We are greatly concerned over the Federal wage act before Congress as it will be difficult for all small businesses to compete on this hourly basis. It will tend to compel many of the smaller stores to discontinue business and certainly curtail the services now enjoyed by the public.

"I think the big thing that is bothering me Tom, is the proposed minimum wage laws which seem to be gaining momentum. We in the smaller towns are faced with an entirely different picture on minimum wage. Quite frankly we can put up with some inferior help at the rate we are paying, but if they make the move to $1.25 I have two employees who must go. Nice girls, but they will never command this rate, and when they leave here under a $1.25 minimum no one else will use them either. Our labor market being as restricted as it is makes it difficult to get the kind of help you need to be able to pay the price the Government thinks they can earn. Let's face it, some people will never be able to be worth certain values such as the minimum wages proposed. In my opinion they will create unemployment.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

"The federalization of unemployment (compensation) is about as needed as another hole in the head. It is a free handout to the loafer and nothing more, again who wants to work for pay when the Government will give a man up to two-thirds of the State average wage."

The leading merchant in a city of about 10,000 says right now his big worries are wage-hour laws and the Federal unemployment compensation bill. "It is really going to hurt our merit rating. We've earned this through many years of careful planning with our employee relations program. Now with one swoop the Federal Government will wipe out this rating (we have earned and deserve because we haven't contributed to any noticeable degree to the unemployment problem.) In fact, we helped the overall employment picture by giving steady employment to around 35 employees year in and year out."

Bringing the Ohio River Valley to Its Finest Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have just had an opportunity to read the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who was principal speaker at the christening of the first seagoing vessel built on the Ohio River since World War II. His salient observations point up the importance of this great river to the general economy of the entire valley and, indeed, its value to our Nation. Like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], I foresee the Ohio River's vital role in our future progress and economic prosperity.

I commend his remarks to the attention of all the Members and under unanimous consent I insert them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. LEE H. HAMILTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM INDIANA, AT CHRISTENING OF M/V "PHAEDYA," JEFFBOAT, INC., BOATYARDS, JEFFERSONVILLE, IND., DECEMBER 18, 1965

You may not be aware of it but today you are witnessing a historic occasion in the life of the Ohio River Valley. You may not be aware of it from my speech because I'm not that good at conveying thoughts, but in spite of my speech, and not because of it, this is a historic occasion.

In Shakespeare's "Henry V," the king is about to lead his men into battle; he gives them a stirring oration urging them to arms. In part he says "And gentlemen in England now abed shall think themselves acursed they were not here." Well, I don't know if your friends and neighbors who are not here today will think themselves accursed 5 or 10 or 20 years hence, but I do think they might regret it because this is a significant day in the history of the Ohio River Valley.

It is significant because Jeffboat has reached a milestone by producing a seagoing vessel, the first since World War II. And it is because a milestone has been reached that our thoughts naturally turn today to our inland waterways, their importance to the Nation, to the Ohio River Valley, and to Louisville, Jeffersonville, and Jeffboat.

This is a day to remember because we see today the evidence that the Ohio River Valley is on the move in meeting one of its and the Nation's greatest needs—good transportation. The evidence is all about you.

IMPORTANCE TO THE NATION

The milestone reached today reminds us of the importance of the inland waterways to this Nation.

Water carriers today move 431 million tons of freight annually—14½ percent of all of the Nation's domestic freight. And they do it at an average cost to the shipper of 3 mills per ton-mile. This compares with an average cost to the shipper by rail that is five times that of the water freight cost or 15 mills per ton-mile. Truck freight service costs the shipper an average of 6½ cents per ton-mile—and average aircargo rates are in the range of 22 cents per ton-mile.

The savings realized on our waterway transportation are diffused widely throughout the Nation's economy. Coal is an excellent example of that and very important to us because almost 47 million tons moved on the Ohio River in 1964. The savings in transportation costs of coal is reflected, for example, in the price of electricity in home and factory.

The inland waterways are the workhorse of our transportation system. They have set the floor under transportation pricing in this country for many years and will continue to do so as long as water transportation is an effective competitor for business.

Our inland waterways have had a substantial effect on water resource development. Navigation requires that a stable supply of water be maintained in a channel in order to provide a standard operating depth for commercial vessels. In most water resource development projects, this is done by building a series of dams which create relatively deep stillwater pools. But in order to feed that system, dams are built on headwaters and tributary streams to conserve water supplies which feed into the main channel. The water supplies created in these navigation projects are among the most precious and most valuable assets which this Nation has.

Our inland waterways are big business in America. The United States has 25,260 miles of usable, navigable inland channels exclusive of the Great Lakes; the Ohio River alone is 981 miles. In all, there are some 1,700 companies operating on the waterways, some 2,600 tank barges, more than 14,000 dry cargo barges and scows and approximately 4,000 towboats and tugs, representing a total investment of over $1.6 billion.

The inland waterway business is booming. It stands in stark contrast to our oceangoing merchant marine which required a total Government subsidy during the calendar year 1964 of $319 million for construction and operational differentials.

The inland waterway system is a recognized instrument of national defense.

IMPORTANCE TO OHIO RIVER VALLEY

This milestone reached today of producing the first seagoing vessel since World War II reminds us of the importance of inland waterways to Jeffersonville, Louisville, and southern Indiana.

In my congressional district, we talk a great deal about industrial development. And the history of recent years shows that off-river plants constitute the industrial base of much of southern Indiana: the powerplant in Madison, the distilleries in Lawrenceburg, Jeffboat, and the detergent and soap business in Jeffersonville. In the last decade a high proportion of industries' capital investment dollars have been spent in adding new facilities or expanding existing facilities along the navigable inland channels—or very close to these channels.

These waterways become vital to the communities. Traffic on the Ohio River doubles on an average of once every 11 years. It is now pushing 90 million tons annually. In 1963 there was an average of 64 tons for every household in Louisville. It is easy to see what an impact on income and prosperity the waterways have in the Louisville metropolitan area. And for each 100 water-based jobs, it is estimated there are 100 to 135 additional jobs created by the waterways.

In my congressional district, I have said repeatedly that we have no greater concern than the development of our water resources. I usually say this in the context of reservoirs, watersheds, flood control, and water supply which are very important to my district. But the same concern applies to the development of waterways which abut the Ninth Congressional District in Dearborn, Ohio, Switzerland, Jefferson, and Clark Counties. A sound use of our waterways creates a firm industrial base, helps create jobs, produces income and brings economic vitality and prosperity to the region.

So I share your concern that the Nation's future is vitally dependent on full development of water resources, vigorous prosecution of a dynamic policy of water resource development. American national policy, from the writing at least of the Federalist papers and the famous Northwest Ordinance of 1787, has been for the free use of the Nation's rivers, harbors, lakes, and water courses.

The Northwest Ordinance said "Navigable waterways shall be common highways, and forever free—without any tax, impost or duty."

This policy is based on the sound recognition that the waterways have served and will continue to serve a variety of basic public purposes. Among them are unification of the country, furtherance of western expansion, defeat of sectionalism, low-cost transportation and lower prices to the consumer, water resource development, water supply, power, recreation and conservation.

So I join you in opposing special charges and user taxes on America's historically free waterways. Such taxes would retard essential development, upset competitive balance, bring economic hardship to businesses which depend on water commerce (and many do), raise prices of transporting goods and materials, and it would be an economic hardship to inland cities like Louisville and Jeffersonville.

JEFFBOAT

And the milestone reached today of producing the first seagoing vessel by Jeffboat since World War II symbolizes the contribution of Jeffboat and its parent company, American Commercial Lines, Inc.

Jeffboat is a producer. In 1965 it completes its greatest peacetime operation in its history—with 233 barges, 2 towboats, 1 deepwater vessel. In 1966 things look even better—250 barges, 7 towboats, and another deepwater vessel. A barge a day.

Jeffboat is a wealth creator. In 1965 its revenue will exceed $20 million and in 1966 this figure is expected to exceed $25 million. It is now the Nation's biggest manufacturer, tonnagewise, of barges, towboats, and related marine equipment. And it meets a staggering production schedule.

Jeffboat is an employer, too—920 people approximately were employed in 1965 and this figure will probably exceed 1,000 next year. Its present annual payroll is approximately $6.3 million.

And, of course, it's a consumer, too, using, for instance, about 9,000 tons of steel a month.

Jeffboat and the American Commercial Lines have had a distinguished history reaching back into World War II when it produced 125 LST's. It was honored five times by the U.S. Navy. The best is ahead.

So I am exceedingly pleased to be here because this is a happy occasion. All of us want to build and grow and create. And you have done this in a remarkable way. You are helping the Ohio River Valley and southern Indiana and the Louisville metropolitan area take a giant stride forward in meeting the needs of its citizens. You are conserving, improving, and making use of our natural environment—the waterways—to the benefit of all of us. And many of us here today draw strength and encouragement from what you do—do for yourselves and for the Ohio River Valley and for the Nation.

I look forward to a great future for the Ohio River Valley—a future in which we will match our performance with our potential, our wealth with our resources, our power with our purpose.

I look forward to an Ohio River Valley—
Developing its natural environment.
Harvesting its rich crops.
Achieving in the arts and sciences.
Using its waterways to make the economy vital and vibrant.

And I salute you in the major part you are playing to bring the Ohio River Valley to its finest hour.

Necessary Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have taken the floor to support President Johnson on his decisions in Vietnam. The record continues to mount on how right the President is.

We Americans love peace and want peace, but by now it should be clear to all of us and, indeed to all the world, that the long pause in bombing raids did not persuade Ho Chi Minh to make even the slightest gesture toward peace.

On the contrary, Hanoi only reiterated its demand that the United States surrender its commitment and withdraw from Vietnam. This, the administration will not do.

Meanwhile, the search for peace will be continued—and the bombing has been resumed.

In an editorial entitled "United States Still Seeks Peace," the Detroit News stated that—

> This Nation put a stopper on its bombing power for 37 days in its pursuit of a Vietnam peace, but because the Communists did not take even one short step to meet our appeal, North Vietnam is no longer an immune sanctuary.

It adds:

> This Nation could no longer leave as a hostage to ill fortune the security of 200,000 American fighting men or the security of allied Vietnamese forces or even the security of the villagers whose freedom we help defend.

As Mr. Johnson stated:

> It is our clear duty to do what we can to limit the cost in lives.

The newspaper says:

> We will keep knocking on all doors which might lead to peace.

Adding that—

> What we could not afford was to prolong the pause and thus risk having the Communist aggressors think our heart wasn't in the job of defending the south's freedom and also risk lives on our side by pinioning one hand behind our back.

Because I was so impressed with the good common sense I found in this editorial I would like to recommend it for the perusal of my colleagues, and with their permission it will be inserted in the RECORD:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Feb. 1, 1966]

SECURITY REQUIRED NEW BOMBING, BUT UNITED STATES STILL SEEKS PEACE

This Nation put a stopper on its bombing power for 37 days in its pursuit of a Vietnam peace, but because the Communists did not take even one short step to meet our appeal, North Vietnam is no longer an immune sanctuary.

This Nation could no longer leave as a hostage to ill fortune the security of 200,000 American fighting men or the security of allied Vietnamese forces or even the security of the villagers whose freedom we help defend.

As President Johnson told the Nation and the world, those are the reasons the bomb pause is over. It won not a response but denunciation and rejection. To persist in a diplomatic effort while continuing to expose our military flanks was impossible. "It is our clear duty to do what we can to limit the cost in lives," is the sober way Mr. Johnson put it.

However agonizing the ultimate decision, the alternative to persisting in the lull was as simple as that. The carrot was ignored. The stick is brought back into play. But the carrot is not withdrawn. That is why this Nation has brought the issue of more war or of peace to the U.N. Security Council, so often a meaningful compromiser, but because of the veto and a lack of military power, rarely a decisionmaker.

The resolution we present there is responsive to "the spirit of the renewed appeal for peace of Pope Paul," Mr. Johnson says. The key word here is "spirit." What the Pope suggested was that neutral nations at the United Nations should arbitrate. The genuine impartiality of some neutral nations is not in doubt. But the motives of others which profess to nonalinement are suspect.

One-third of the U.N. membership is African and professedly nonaligned in the cold war. But as a bloc these nations have pledged themselves over Rhodesia, for example, to a war of "national liberation of the enslaved," much as North Vietnam and Red China are pledged to rid the "enslaved" of South Vietnam from imperialist warmongers.

Nevertheless the decision to bring peace in Vietnam to the attention of the Security Council is welcome, commendable, and even shrewd. It demonstrates that despite the resumed bombing the pursuit of peace is not abandoned.

The world, which witnessed—and in large measure commended—the many-pronged American peace offensive, now sees us on record as calling on the ultimate world peace authority to use its good offices.

Moreover this calls on the Soviet Union (with its veto) to stand up and be counted. It either wants peace in Vietnam or more war. As cochairman of the 1954 Geneva conference, it can no longer fence straddle. Moreover, the recourse to the council demands that De Gaulle (with his veto) act and not preach.

All the doors to peace on which this nation has knocked in the last month are still open—except, it would appear, some Red doors. Now we've flung open a new door. We could do no more. We could do no less. What we could not afford was to prolong the pause and thus risk having the Communist aggressors think our heart wasn't in the job of defending the South's freedom and also risks lives on our side by pinioning one hand behind our back.

Ambassador Edward Clark's Statement on His Return to Australia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago our distinguished Ambassador to Australia, the Honorable Ed Clark and Mrs. Clark, visited Washington in order to talk with the President, the State Department, and other officials. He brought us a message of high patriotism and reminds us again how strong are the ties between America and Australia.

In his brief tenure as Ambassador, Mr. Clark has traveled more miles and visited more cities than most of the other Ambassadors to that country put together. He has brought credit to his country by his open friendliness and colorful character and his genuine interest in the people of Australia.

When he returned to Australia last week he made an arrival statement that I think again shows how deep are his feelings and his affection for the Australian people and that statement is as follows:

Arrival Statement of Ambassador Edward A. Clark on Return to Australia From the United States, January 23, 1966

Friends and allies, I bring you greetings from the President and the people of the United States. I have just returned to Australia from a 3-week visit there. I visited the President both at his ranch in Texas and at the White House in Washington. He remembers with great happiness his wartime service here and always says that the only person he'd trade jobs with is me. Next to being President of the United States, he'd rather be Ambassador to Australia than any other job in the world.

I visited our four banks in Austin, Center, San Augustine, and San Benito; my law office in Austin, Tex.; my own lands in the piney woods of east Texas; and my grandchildren in the State of Mississippi on the banks of that great inland waterway, the Mississippi River. I visited the office of the State Department (External Affairs to you) in Washington, our National Capital. I visited the big cities of Texas, Dallas, and Houston. I talked to bankers, oilmen, big ranchers, and little tree farmers—a cross section of America. The words of Sir Walter Scott reechoed in my heart. "This is my own, my native land," but oddly there was another echo in my heart, another dream intruding in my slumbers of the broad and beautiful land which is now my second homeland. My friends, I am happy to be home again with you.

Beyond your imagination is the interest and affectionate feeling I found in the States for Australia. Such words as, "Those folks think just like us." I met a man traveling around the world from Australia. He told me that next to Australia, he'd like to live in west Texas. A great musician asked two questions: "What time is it in Australia?" and "How can I buy some land—I'd like to own a small piece of that continent." A former soldier proudly introducing his beautiful wife says: "Australia gave me my greatest asset. I love that country." If the distance were not so great, I'll warrant the exchange of visitors would be so great we'd have to expand our hotel facilities to take care of them in the United States and in Australia. As Sir Stanley Burbury in Hobart said after his trip around the world, "Time and distance are nothing; only money." We are going to have to find a way to reduce that cost with group flights or some other imaginative scheme so that there can be more exchange between our two friendly peoples.

Then there was the big question asked from top to bottom; from the President to the most callow schoolboy, "Do the Australians support us in Vietnam?" I was able to look them all dead in the eye and proudly proclaim, "They do." Australians know where their interests lie, and they carry their share of the load. Diggers voluntarily, willingly, have shouldered their Mathildas again, and, just as they did at Gallipoli, at El Alamein, in New Guinea, they are marching beside American doughboys, pulling their share with equal efficiency and cheerfulness, because they know the United States and Australia are defending the same frontier; that frontier is not the Rhine, but Vietnam.

Letter From a Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. RUSSELL TUTEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a friend and patriot that expressed the sentiments of my people of the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia concerning the war in Vietnam. Under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the Record:

First Federal Savings
& Loan Association,
St. Simons Island, Ga., January 25, 1966.

Hon. J. Russell Tuten,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Russell: I note from the latest editorial of U.S. World News the Senators and Congressmen feel the war in Vietnam should be brought to a conclusion as early as possible and the military should be given the opportunity to win the war and not seek a stalemate as was done in Korea. I also note they do not feel the use of ground forces and putting our boys through the "meat grinder" by degrees is not the way to fight this war as this kind of war is the kind the Vietcong would like to fight. It is further noted the House and Senate both feel we should bomb the sources of supplies and military and power installations in North Vietnam in order to bring the war to a rapid conclusion.

The consensus of opinion seems to be this could be done without involving Red China or Soviet Russia in a third world war. Of course, I know the administration has a lot of facts we do not have but I do not think there should be any group called "hawks and doves." I am sure "the hawks" do not want to escalate the war but they do want to fight the war to win and not, as stated, continue to use up our boys fighting the war the Vietcong would like to have us fight it.

I have a married son 23 years of age who is a graduate of the University of Georgia, who has volunteered and has been accepted in the Officers Training School for Army Service. I am myself a war veteran and our family has not hesitated to serve their country and I would like to reiterate we feel they should not have to fight with their hands tied behind their backs but should be allowed to win victory for their country when our young men are giving their lives for it.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Secretary Dean Rusk and to President Johnson, but I doubt seriously if anyone in the administration will ever see it.

With warm personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

Norman A. Way.

Stanford Backs Our Policy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a poll conducted at Stanford University in which 63 percent of those polled expressed support of America's policy in Vietnam. Inasmuch as 12 percent failed to express an opinion one way or the other, actual support for our policy was 71 percent.

Steve Hoglund, who formerly served the minority as a House page, recently wrote an interesting article for the Stanford Daily, in which he analyzed the results of the poll. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including his article and the breakdown of the poll:

Poll Shows 63 Percent of Community Backs American Policy in Vietnam

(By Steve Hoglund)

Are you a Republican? An engineering major? If so, the odds are 4 to 1 that you support the present U.S. policy in Vietnam. But if you are a Democrat, or if your field is humanities, it's an even bet. These are but a few of the intriguing patterns which emerge from tabulations of the Stanford Vietnam poll taken last November 29 and 30, which indicates that a large majority of the Stanford community, 63 percent favors the war effort, while 26 percent opposes it.

The poll, sponsored by the Political Union and distributed in residences and in departmental offices, was designed not only to estimate the extent of support and opposition to United States-Vietnam policy, but also to determine, if possible, what basic beliefs account for this support and opposition. In addition, the poll sought to indicate feelings about the conditions for and the goals of negotiations to end the war. The tabulations provide a backdrop for the winter quarter FOCUS program of the Political Union, entitled "U.S. Policy in Southeast Asia," and consisting of 5 weeks of coordinated lectures and discussions of the various issues involved. A similar poll will be conducted at the end of the quarter, in order to trace changes in Vietnam sentiment.

MORE POLLS LATER

Computer correlation of general feelings about United States-Vietnam policy with class, residence, political leanings, and field of study (see table below) revealed the following:

1. A marked drop in support for U.S. policy, from the freshman to the graduate level. (Note: Difficulties in distribution and collection of polls made it impossible to obtain a sampling of graduate students and faculty either sizable or representative enough to warrant generalizations.)
2. Greater opposition, proportionately, among undergraduate women than among undergraduate men. (Note: Women are underrepresented in the poll; the percentages polled at Union (16 percent) and Lagunita (20 percent) fall considerably below the overall number of undergraduates polled (33 percent), while those at Wilbur (42 percent) and at the Eating Clubs (39 percent) are above the total percentage.)
3. A decided split among Democrats, a bare plurality favoring present U.S. policy.
4. Considerable opposition among freshmen sponsors to the war in Vietnam (Note: Compare the freshmen totals with the Branner/Roble-Wilbur totals in the table below).
5. Much greater opposition among those in the field of humanities than among those in other fields. (Note: This may, however, reflect a disproportionately large number of graduate students in this field who were polled.)
6. A significant number (8–12 percent in nearly all groupings) who are neither for nor against the present war effort.

ANTICOMMUNISM

The poll listed four possible reasons for support of U.S. policy in Vietnam and asked that they be ranked in order of their importance to each individual. By far the most important (cited first by 59 percent of those who ranked this section) is: "It is essential to the containment of communism for U.S. national security." The other three, in decreasing order of their importance, are: (2) "It promotes the freedom and independence of the South Vietnamese people"; (3) "It is necessary for us to keep prior commitments"; (4) "As a U.S. citizen, I feel it is my duty to support U.S. foreign policy."

No such clear-cut ranking emerges among those who oppose U.S. policy. "It violates my moral principles" stands out as the most important reason (cited first by 25 percent who ranked this section), and least important as a basis for opposition is the belief that "U.S. national security is not involved." Yet many stressed the danger of escalation to all-out war" (cited first by 21 percent) and the feeling that "The South Vietnamese people do not want us there (19 percent). And although the belief that the "United States has not kept its commitment to seek peace at any time in any place" received fewer first rankings than any of the other listed reasons, this response nonetheless ranked nearly evenly in all categories.

Of particular significance is the extent to which people qualify their support or opposition. Although those who oppose U.S. policy in Vietnam are, proportionately, more inclined to qualify their general feelings than are those who support the war effort, fully 10 percent of the supporters indicated a fear of escalation—though only 2 to 4 percent cited each of the other three reasons for opposition. On the other hand, those who oppose U.S. policy qualified their opposition rather evenly among the four reasons offered for supporting the war in Vietnam; each reason was cited by 6 to 8 percent of the opponents.

Yet opponents of the war in Vietnam need not be overly disheartened by the overwhelming (63 percent) support given U.S. policy. For while present policy aims at Vietcong capitulation, only 27 percent of those polled favor such capitulation as a basis for negotiations. (Could it be that some of the supporters don't understand U.S. policy?) A resounding 63 percent call for "U.N. mediation" and 9 percent desire "Unilateral U.S. declaration of a cease-fire." Furthermore, the majority (62 percent) of those polled believe that in negotiations the U.S. should "Agree to any settlement acceptable to a majority of the South Vietnamese people," while only 38 percent call for "a settlement that would guarantee a non-Communist government for South Vietnam.

Finally, when asked what they would do if drafted, only 48 percent of the Stanford men would "be willing to serve in Vietnam," while 41 percent would try "to be assigned elsewhere, but accept unwillingly service in Vietnam"; 11 percent declare that they would "Refuse to serve in Vietnam." Or, as one girl on the row wrote in the margin: "If drafted, I would burn my draft officer."

Vietnam policy poll

	Number	Percent			
		For	Against	Neither	No opinion
Overall total	1,512	63	26	10	2
Undergraduates	1,[illegible]	66	23	10	2
Men	979	68	21	9	1
Women	424	60	26	11	3
Graduates	105	39	49	11	1
Faculty	22	14	82	4	------
Political leanings:					
Republicans	612	82	8	8	2
Democrats	494	46	44	9	1
Neither	372	53	31	13	2
Residence:					
Wilbur	297	70	19	10	2
Stern	185	66	25	9	------
Fraternity	347	73	18	9	------
Clubs	129	57	31	10	2
Union	11	9	91	------	------
Bran/Roble	146	63	24	10	3
Lagunita	59	68	17	14	2
Flo Mo	111	55	31	12	3
Row	76	62	21	12	5
Br/Ro-Wilb	443	67	20	10	3
Class:					
Freshmen	466	70	18	9	2
Sophomores	307	69	23	7	1
Juniors	295	63	23	12	2
Seniors	304	57	32	10	1
Field of study:					
Social sciences	501	62	28	9	1
Humanities	313	50	38	10	3
Engineering	147	80	9	11	------
Math/science	295	67	21	11	1
Undeclared	228	65	22	10	3

Illinois—First in Soybean and Corn Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Stark County News on January 26, 1966, has reported that Illinois has become the first to produce a billion-dollar crop of any kind. Illinois corn production totaled about 912 million bushels; this is a 25-percent increase over 1964.

The State also had an increase of 22 percent in its soybean production, a total of 175 million bushels of soybeans.

The article follows:

ILLINOIS BECOMES FIRST STATE TO PRODUCE A BILLION-DOLLAR CROP

Will this year match 1965 as a good year for midwestern farmers? Maybe. But last year was an exceptional one in the Midwest, especially in Illinois. Our crops, particularly corn, were very good. And profits from livestock production were unusually high.

Corn is by far the most important element in Illinois agriculture. About half of the State farm income originates in our cornfields. In 1965 Illinois farmers produced a corn crop worth a billion dollars, making Illinois the first State to produce a billion-dollar crop of any kind.

The final 1965 official estimate of the Illinois corn crop was 892 million bushels of grain. This amount was 25 percent more than the 1964 crop and 19 percent more than the previous record output in 1963. It was enough to put Illinois in first place among the States in corn production. Corn made into silage included an additional 20 million bushels. Corn production in 1965, therefore, totaled about 912 million bushels.

At an average of $1.10 a bushel, the value of the 1965 Illinois corn crop was just above $1 billion. This amount does not include Government payments received by farmers under the feed grain program. These payments were near, or above, $100 million.

The State average corn yield was 92 bushels per acre, which was 14 bushels higher than in 1964 and 7 bushels above the previous record set in 1963. Illinois had the second highest yield in the Corn Belt. Indiana was first with 94 bushels. Yields in other States were: Iowa, 82; Wisconsin, 76; Ohio, 75; Missouri, 72; Nebraska, 67; Michigan, 62, and Minnesota, 61. Some of these States may have higher yields in 1966, but yields in Indiana and Illinois are not likely to equal those of the past year.

BIGGEST SOYBEAN CROP

Illinois farmers produced 175 million bushels of soybeans in 1965. This amount was 22 percent more than in the previous year and 6 percent more than the previous record crop produced 2 years before.

The big crop was the result of a large acreage and high yields. The USDA estimated the harvested acreage to be 6,021,000, which was 5 percent more than in 1964 and 8 percent more than in 1963. The State average yield was 29 bushels per acre, 4 bushels more than in 1964 but one-half bushel less than the record yield of 1963. Soybean production in 1966 could equal or exceed 1965 levels.

Soybean prices are receiving support from high prosperity in the industrialized nations, food shortages in the underdeveloped countries, and threats of international conflict.

Cattle feeders made unusually good profits in 1965. Prices of Choice steers at Chicago averaged about $26 a hundred pounds, the best in 3 years. Since these cattle had been bought at unusually low prices, the profit margins were very good. Cattle now in feedlots have cost much more than those sold in 1965. Consequenty, profits may be lower even if prices of fat cattle exceed those of last year.

BEST HOG PROFITS IN A LIFETIME

Hog prices advanced spectacularly in 1965. The average price of barrows and gilts at Chicago rose from $14.43 in November 1964 to over $28 this past December. Hog prices seem likely to hold up well in 1966, especially during the first half of the year. We are now in what may prove to be the most profitable period in a lifetime for hog producers.

Imaginative Measures Needed To Win War Against Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, the organizational meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis was held in Washington recently.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, former director of the food for peace program, was one of the speakers at a congressional panel discussion on ways and means to wage an all-out effort to end hunger, malnutrition, and want in the world. Other panelists included Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina; Representative PAUL

FINDLEY, of Illinois; Representative LYNN E. STALBAUM, of Wisconsin; and myself.

Senator McGOVERN's remarks were brief and to the point and I asked unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF SENATOR GEORGE McGOVERN AT THE ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS

I want to congratulate the Committee on the World Food Crisis for its leadership in planning this meeting.

We are here to concentrate new attention on the most important problem in the world—the present fact of human hunger and the mounting race between food and people. Malnutrition is public enemy No. 1. It lies close to the base of man's most fundamental concerns. It is a breeder of disease, premature death, economic stagnation, and political disorder. It is the most acute challenge to the agricultural technology, the political imagination, and the moral conscience of mankind.

I have just returned from a tour of Vietnam followed by an address to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Conference in Rome. The comparison between the tragic destruction in Vietnam and the quiet but effective crusade against hunger discussed at the Rome Conference was a painful contrast indeed.

No nation has ever sent abroad a more gallant and superbly trained group of men than our fighting team now doing battle in Vietnam. But the grim fact is that a growing number of them will face death unless the diplomats can find a breakthrough to the conference table. That is the only course that makes any sense in this bleeding land that is afflicted with so many problems that do not respond to a military effort. One wonders even if military victory should come after years of slaughter and devastation, if there could then be built on such a chaotic foundation a political structure capable of resisting the appeals of Communist cadres. It saddens one's heart to see the lives of so many brave men committed to a cause with such an uncertain political base. In the hospitals near Saigon, in the refugee camps along the coast, and with the marines in the field near Da Nang and Chulai, I found myself recalling the doubtless oversimplified words of Benjamin Franklin: "There never was a good war nor a bad peace."

But however bad war may be and however uncertain its outcome, there is one war that is a good war and that can end in victory for all mankind. That is the war against hunger—the most important war man must fight for the rest of the century. And this is the war to which this Conference is committed.

There is no doubt in my mind that we can win the race against population and famine in the years ahead. We have the tools and the knowledge to drive hunger from the earth within the next decade. We can end this century with a better fed world than we have today in spite of population growth, if we conduct the war against hunger with a fraction of the zeal and resources we now bring to military conflict. Victory over the dread killer, hunger, will require bold and imaginative commanders; it calls for the proper deployment of troops and the wise use of ammunition and logistical support; it calls for enlistment for the duration by both the developed and the less developed people of the globe.

This conference represents an important part of that commitment. We are led by Chairman James Patton, an internationally known stateman of agriculture. We are led, too, by the executive director of the organizing committee, Robert Koch, one of the most brilliant men in the field of food and agriculture today. And we are led by a distinguished committee of such respected names as Hershel Newsom, Dwayne Andreas, Pat Greathouse, Robert Liebenow, and Maurice Atkins.

These are men who have spoken clearly for a quarter of a century and more on the challenges and opportunities in the field of agriculture. It must be a source of satisfaction to them and to others that public opinion is now responding to their message.

The organizing group has given us a great American as our speaker for today's luncheon. He is one of the men whom I most admire in the entire world. If there is such a creature as the ugly American, there is also the beautiful American. And no one represents the best of America any more clearly than our distinguished speaker today—a brilliant industrialist, an accomplished public official, and international statesman, and, beginning January 1 of next year, the head of the new United Nations Development Program—Mr. Paul Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman, we are glad you are here, and we look forward to what you have to say.

Heart of the Year Award Goes to Hon. John E. Fogarty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, has handled some of the most important health legislation ever enacted by the Congress. There is no doubt that these measures, such as the Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the heart disease, cancer, and stroke amendments, the Medical Library Assistance Act, and the Nurses Training Act will help us to conquer many dreadful diseases which now take a heavy toll of lives each year.

However, we are all very much aware that it would serve no purpose to enact the authorizing legislation if we did not also provide the funds to carry out these programs. The champion in this field for many years has been our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations he has handled legislation to insure that these programs are funded in the best interest of the American people. We have all heard him speak eloquently of the need for adequate funds to insure the success of programs to wipe out disease and mental illness. Because of his outstanding work in this field, I was very pleased to note that he has been selected by the American Heart Association to receive the Heart of the Year Award. There is no doubt that he is truly a man with a big heart for all who suffer from illness and disease.

President Johnson paid a great tribute to JOHN FOGARTY last week when he presented him with this award and I insert the President's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON PRESENTATION OF HEART OF THE YEAR AWARD OF THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY IN THE THEATER

Congressman FOGARTY, Dr. Taussig, ladies and gentlemen, when we read that a fully functioning heart is possible within 5 years, we pay tribute to congressional leadership, and particularly to Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

When we finally call a halt to the wholesale murder of heart disease, all of us will bless the day that Congress took effective action. JOHN FOGARTY represents the little State of Rhode Island in the U.S. Congress, but his crusade for better health has led him often to the first house of the land.

He came here last August 4 for the signing of the Community Facilities Act. He was back again the next day at the signing of the Community Health Services Extension Act, Community Mental Health Centers one week; Community Health Service Extension Act the next week.

Four days later he came back to see us as a sponsor of the National Institutes of Health for the signing of the Health Research Facilities Act. In October he was back at the White House again for the signing of the heart, cancer and stroke amendments, to establish regional medical centers to help us in fighting these killer diseases.

Now he is back with us again this morning. He doesn't have a bill in his pocket, a congressional bill, I mean, but this, I think I can tell you: When he comes to this House, he is always welcome.

For JOHN FOGARTY knows what we all must learn, and that is that no society can be great which is not first of all healthy. The healing miracles that we achieve must not be gifts for Americans only, and that is why we have suggested another health measure for this Nation to discuss, debate, consider, and, I hope, ultimately act upon. That is the International Health Act of 1966.

That is to launch a cooperative effort by all of the world's people to make a determined and organized attempt to conquer disease wherever it exists in human beings. I don't let you in on any secret when I say I am hopeful that after this International Health Act of 1966 is considered in the House and Senate that it will not be long before JOHN FOGARTY is back here, and Dr. Taussig, paying us another visit, and waiting for his pen.

The world cannot wait. The clock is ticking.

I know that as we work on these messages, outline our hopes and our purposes, our ambitions in the world, that some people may think that we have too many goodies, that we are pretty visionary, and that we have something for everyone.

The cynical sometimes are critical. But I know of no more worthy motive or purpose that a human being can have than to try to lay out as his or her goal a program that will educate the mind and that will conquer disease in the body and that will permit your children and your people to live in an atmosphere and an environment of beauty and culture and enjoy the better things of life.

Now, we cannot conquer disease and we cannot educate all humanity and we cannot have a symphony in every town, and we cannot have a Mellon Art Gallery in every capital, but we can hope for them and we can work for them and we can give what we have to them, and we can urge them and provide leadership and ideas and try to move along.

I was reading a speech late last night that the Postmaster General under President Roosevelt made, and he talked about his first 100 days and his first 100 bills, and how most of them lived on today and none of them had ever been really repealed.

What I hope the 1960's will be remembered for are the steps we have taken in education and health and in the understanding of our fellowman, not just in the 50 States of this Union, but in all the continents of the world.

It may just be a few thousand or a few million that starts the program. The poverty program was really started with the NYA and the CCC back in the 1930's, and it has developed from there. The whole great conservation movement in our water resources in this country started with something we probably called TVA that Senator Norris did.

The health program that this man picked up when he was a lone wolf—when he got lonely he went to see Mr. Hill in the Senate, but outside of the two of them there weren't many around that could believe you could do something about it. Yet there are people in this room today that are living testimonials to the fruits of his research.

It gives me such a great satisfaction to attempt in the best way I can to pay tribute to Congressman Fogarty from the great State of Rhode Island.

Elkhart, Ind., Truth Praises the Work of the Inter-American Development Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial from the January 27, 1966, Elkhart, Ind., Truth praising the outstanding record of the Inter-American Development Bank in the advancement of hemisphere development and good relations.

The editorial follows:

DEVELOPMENT BANK HELPS LATINS

The Inter-American Development Bank has an outstanding record in the advancement of hemisphere development and good relations.

"One part of the alliance for progress that no one complains about," Time magazine has called it.

The IADB enjoyed a record year for lending in 1965. The Bank granted 66 loans last year for a total of $373,500,000—an average of roughly $1.75 for every human being in Latin America.

The old record for loans in 1 year was $325,500,000 in 1962. Since making its first loan in February 1961, the Bank has made $1.5 billion available to its clients.

Under the shrewd direction of Felipe Herrera, a Chilean, the Bank is in good condition as it begins its sixth year.

It has resources of more than $3 billion and a sound international reputation.

For many Latin Americans, the IADB was the first solid sign that the United States really cared about Latin America. The Bank represented the first major move after World War II to give special U.S. attention to Latin America.

Latins for years had wanted their own bank, arguing that the existing World Bank and Export-Import Bank failed to fill their special needs. The Bank's legal existence dates from December 30, 1959, and it formally began operations on October 1, 1960, a month before John F. Kennedy was elected President.

The United States is the principal patron of the Bank—this country has put up more than half the money for it so far, but the Latin Americans themselves have contributed more than $200 million. Mexico and Venezuela have put in more than $100 million apiece. Each of the 19 Latin American members (Cuba is not one of them) has anted up at least $9 million for the Bank to use in lending.

The U.S. voice in the operation is substantial and continuing.

But it neither has nor wants absolute control. Besides, there is Herrera: "Felipe is a strong man," says an American who knows him well. "He would never consent to sit anywhere that he was just a rubber stamp."

For 1965, the direction of the Bank's loans followed a typical pattern: $90 million for projects in Brazil, $60 million to Mexico, and $50 million to Argentina. More than 40 percent of the money loaned by the Bank since 1961 has gone into these three countries.

Nevertheless, every member has been helped a little.

So far, says the Bank, not one of the countries has failed to make its loan repayments on time. For the United States, that's an almost-unprecedented success story in an area where things often go wrong.

Rehabilitation of Wounded Vietnamese Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Ted C. Connell, former national commander in chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars, recently visited Vietnam and saw firsthand the medical facilities for wounded Vietnamese soldiers. He has also visited the group of 56 paraplegic Vietnamese patients who are presently undergoing treatment in the Veterans' Administration hospital at Castle Point, N.Y. Mr. Connell has made several recommendations which deserve consideration. Our gallant Vietnamese allies deserve all of the medical help we can give them, and they deserve the expressions of friendship which would be demonstrated by carrying out Mr. Connell's recommendations.

I am inserting below the letter from Mr. Connell regarding this:

KILLEEN, TEX.,
February 1, 1966.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Sixth Congressional District of Texas,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: As an average American citizen, I visited and talked with the 56 paraplegic Vietnamese patients and of 14-member staff of trainees who accompanied them to America.

Words will not convey the good this humanitarian act by our President has done, not only for the patients, but the doctors and staff, who after training, will return to their homeland to better serve the unfortunate in South Vietnam. You have made 70 good will ambassadors for America, for as long as they live, they will continue to tell all of the world they come in contact with, of not only the excellent care they received while here, but also of the warm heartfelt attitude of thousands of Americans who wrote them letters, sent Christmas cards, and came to visit. Prominently displayed in each patient's room is a Christmas card from the President of the United States of America.

Mr. Vincent W. Powers, hospital director, and his staff are doing an excellent job. They have nothing but praise and admiration for the assistance and moral support given them by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, director, Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation of New York University Medical Center. His valuable counselling, moral support, and untiring efforts has endeared this dedicated American to all who work with him.

I was told that the majority of the patients would be ready to return to their country in 3 to 6 months. That the doctors and nurses would be ready to return to set up a paraplegic center in South Vietnam in 9 months, a program sorely needed in that war-torn country.

I would like to respectfully recommend the following:

1. That the program be expanded to include other paraplegics and amputees in South Vietnam, as no other organization in the world has the experience in this field as our Veterans' Administration.

2. That we continue to bring a team with each contingency of patients, remembering that in a country of over 16 million people, they have less than 800 doctors, 500 who are in the army; only 28 hospitals with surgical facilities, while in 1964 the civilian population had over 11,000 casualties.

3. That out of the 20 Vietnamese nurses in our country on scholarships from USAID, several are graduating in January 1966. At least 3 or 4 should be assigned immediately to Castle Point for a period of at least 3 months to work with the 56 patients there. (Elizabeth Darden at USAID in Washington heads this program.)

4. That before the medical team leaves our country, the team be afforded an opportunity to tour Veterans' Administration rehabilitation centers in America.

Respectfully yours,

TED C. CONNELL.

The Cost of Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been written on the cost and mismanagement of the war on poverty program, yet specific items must be isolated and emphasized for us to get the proper picture.

The Hegewisch News, an independent publication serving the southeastern section of Chicago, carried a very timely and practical editorial in its issue of February 4:

THE COST OF WELFARE

"Even in the Great Society, it would be cheaper to send the unemployed to Harvard."

That wry editorial comment comes from the Charleston, S. C., News & Courier. It has to do with some revealing facts concerning training projects in Virginia, as disclosed by Senator Robertson of that State. Examples: 36 unemployed kitchen helpers were being trained at a cost of $33,601. Sixty unemployed persons were being trained as nurses' aids at a cost of $78,390. Eighteen unemployed workers were being trained as bricklayers at a cost of $70,579.

Senator Robertson did a little arithmetic and found that it cost $3,921 to train each bricklayer and $5,497 to train each plumber's helper. Even in these days of inflation, you can get a good deal of college education for that kind of money.

You may be for or against the antipoverty and other welfare programs, but one thing is crystal clear: The costs, largely because the fine and grasping hand of politics is always present, run inordinately high in the light of the results obtained. And those costs are almost invariably greater than the optimistic preliminary estimates.

Volunteers Live Among Poor and Know Their Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration's war on poverty is striking at the heart of hard-core poverty in the United States. VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—is already proving immeasurably successful in making the greatest possible gains in this area by dedicated individuals living with the poor.

The Christian Science Monitor, in its January 28 edition, ran an outstanding article entitled, "Volunteers Live Among Poor and Know Their Needs." This is but one story in a series being carried by this great paper. I commend it to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Record at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 28, 1966]

VOLUNTEERS LIVE AMONG POOR AND KNOW THEIR NEEDS

Note.—VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—is providing some of the most dedicated soldiers in the Johnson administration's war on poverty. Here is a report on what they are doing to reach the really hard-core poor.

(By William C. Selover)

Washington.—One thing Richard Bricher has learned about helping the poor—it takes hard work and plenty of time.

For almost 5 months now, this domestic peace corpsman for VISTA has spent 7 days a week, 16 to 18 hours a day, trying to help improve living standards of 87 Negroes who live in 12 shanties, one junked automobile, and a packing crate in Toby Town, Md. Results don't show up quickly.

So far he has helped Toby Town's people put in a new well, construct a sanitary outhouse, turn an abandoned building into a community center, and arranged for special tutors to help the town's 25 children.

EDGE STAYS ON JOB

Just getting this done has meant many days of discouraging slowness. But there are compensations. "The great part of my job," he says, "is that I am my own boss—all decisions are my own—that's why I don't get tired—the edge doesn't come off."

Dick was hurriedly fixing lunch in a typically nonstop day.

"You don't have time to prepare a real meal," he said, stirring a saucepan full of what turned out to be a concoction of wild rice, brown rice, canned salmon, mushroom and celery soup, diced onion, and Worcestershire sauce.

Pouring the steaming contents over a bowl lined with papito nuts, he explained smiling: "It makes a quick meal." He washed it down with grape juice drunk from a jar.

Dick, who comes from Minnesota and had his VISTA training at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, is paid a basic living wage of $168 a month. Twenty-seven-year-old Dick is one of several VISTA volunteers assigned by the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Montgomery project in several poverty areas.

During his year of service, the OEO banks $50 a month in his name, payable at his departure from the program. He can reenlist for a total of 2 years.

Dick is 1 of nearly 2,000 VISTA volunteers ranging in age from 18 to 85 at work in the United States today. They come from all walks of life. Most are between 18 and 25. But about 12 percent are over 50.

By far the greatest number of VISTA volunteers, like Dick Bricher, are working in rural settings—working to establish lines of communication between people where there has been a traditional absence of structure.

EFFORTS SUCCEED

Some 300 VISTA volunteers are working and living with migrant workers, from California to Florida; a slightly smaller number are on some 49 Indian reservations; and an equal number are in Appalachia.

Some 50 volunteers are assisting in 23 Job Corps camps.

Around 400 are working in urban community action organizations.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, run by Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., administers the VISTA program directly. But until recently the OEO made little attempt to publicize VISTA accomplishments. Officers consciously underplayed its role. They shied away from comparisons with the Peace Corps, after which VISTA is frankly modeled.

They called it the "silent service" and hoped it would be able to make a name for itself on its own merits.

And in many respects the VISTA program has succeeded in ways different from other parts of the poverty program.

From the migrant valleys of the Southwest to the desolate slums of the Northeast—VISTA volunteers are reaching and helping the poor.

Several basic factors contribute to this success to far.

They live with the poor on subsistence wages—and thus gain a real insight into their problems. And this has helped VISTA volunteers reach the really hard-core poor as has no other part of the program.

Most social scientists agree that the vastly, totally depressed poor, trapped in a "poverty syndrome" cannot be counted on to even reach out for help. Most poverty programs are designed to reach those who have at least the spirit and the initiative to call for assistance. But the VISTA volunteers go all the way to the severely depressed—not to give handouts, but to plant ideas, to open doors, to instill practical hope.

As VISTA volunteer Robert Arms, who is working in community development, explained it: "One week we drop an idea. Next week we drop it again. Then we drop it again. Finally, people will get around to doing something. It takes a long time around here," he smiled. Then more seriously, "But it has to be a group decision, and it has to come from them, or seem to."

Bob, a 20-year-old from South Dakota, is helping people in Mount Zion, a rural Negro area of about 300 people, located in the middle of wealthy Montgomery County, Md.

Bob is proud of the recreation center he has helped create out of an abandoned schoolhouse.

VISTA volunteers are not earning their living at helping people, and many people whom they help realize this and are impressed by it.

SOME SKEPTICAL

The poor, whose most intimate contact with professional helpers is very often the welfare worker, respond more quickly to the volunteer who has nothing to gain by taking a real interest and spending time helping people.

It doesn't always work out quite this way; for example, one woman in Toby Town told this reporter that she thinks Dick Bricher is a housing agent preparing to evict her and her eight children from their two-room house.

But, understandably, skepticism dies hard among those who have faced nothing but hardship and disappointment.

The VISTA volunteers are not fair-day or dilettante volunteers, who arrange their volunteering around their social life. They are on call 24 hours a day.

Dick Bricher has been to one movie since he started work in Toby Town, but even then he took along a gang of children from the town.

William (Tex) Arnold, a VISTA volunteer working at Camp Catoctin Job Corps Conservation Center near Frederick, Md., says he has calls for help at all hours of the day or night.

"I think the best work is done right here in my room," he explained, leaning forward on the edge of his bed, with his elbows resting on his knees.

THEY NEED AN EAR

Tex is combination father, mother, brother, and minister to 100 boys, 16 to 21 who often are away from home for the first time in their lives.

Nineteen-year-old Corpsman John Stover, away from home, which is Clinton, Mo., says: "If it weren't for Tex, I'd be home now."

Another corpsman, Steve Hubert, a 19-year-old from La Crosse, Wis., also testified to the work of the VISTA man: "Tex takes you to church, any religion you want. He gives you guitar lessons. If you've got a problem, you talk to him."

Tex is, in fact, an ordained Baptist minister. Born in Melissa, Tex., he graduated from Baylor, and then went 3 years to Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

"Sometimes I'm completely conked out. They come here to the room and knock on the door. They just want to talk about their problems."

Very often just a sympathetic ear is all they need, he explained.

VISTA volunteers are very highly motivated as individuals. The young ones, especially, see their roles as a younger generation working toward a more hopeful world of their own; not their parents' creation.

That's why Tex Arnold keeps at it day and night.

For Bob Arms, it offered him some constructive role, a way to make his idealism practical. "I thought I'd get involved in something more worthwhile than the pursuit of the unknown," he says. "So I decided to join VISTA. I had traveled around. I'd seen quite a bit of poverty in these United States. I wanted to do something about it."

While VISTA volunteers are almost universally motivated by high idealism, their experiences are not all as rewarding as Dick Bricher's or Bob Arms' or Tex Arnold's.

California Harvest Losses Are Confirmed by University of California Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Wirtz and Governor Brown have implied, and tried to produce statistics to verify their implications, that the Federal Government's experiment with supplemental labor in California was successful and that the harvest improved over last year or over other years.

So many untrue or half true claims were broadcast that the University of California made a survey of the 1965 harvest. The University of California report is not complete but Members of Congress may benefit from the Newsletter of the Council of California Growers, dated January 31, 1966, dealing with the University of California survey and report.

U.C. REPORT SUBMITTED TO STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE CONFIRMS GROWER HARVEST LOSSES

From the start of the U.S. Department of Labor's experiment to relocate city unemployed in seasonal farm jobs last year agriculture warned that unless adequate supplies of labor were available when and where they were needed there would be losses, losses not only to agriculture but to the entire economy.

Secretary Wirtz assured agriculture, and the public, that there would be no "rotting of crops in the fields" if agriculture cooperated with and adhered to his criteria. To the best of its ability, agriculture did cooperate, in the face of constantly changing rules and demands by the Department of Labor. Only when it became apparent that continued cooperation would not produce needed workers in spite of huge recruiting costs did some industries, such as citrus, decide that they would try to solve their problems without any "help" from the Secretary of Labor. As one grower said: "If we're going to go broke, we're going to do it on our own terms."

As the season progressed, it soon was realized that this was a season without parallel in the memory of most growers. The weather cooperated with the Secretary to an extent beyond belief. The Department and its supporters began to minimize the losses that were being sustained. They said: "Perhaps some crops were lost, but the price increases will more than compensate for any losses." As a result the public was lulled into believing the experiments were working.

Even the Governor got into the act and pointed to a new high in cash receipts—$3.7 billion—as proof that agriculture had survived the crisis without serious losses.

All along growers had been cautioning that increased gross returns did not mean increases in net returns, that the Department of Labor's experiments were costing huge amounts of money, and that general statements should not be used to prove specific points. As one State board of agriculture member said, "the release of generalities is confusing the public, and infuriating the farmer."

Because of the claims and the counterclaims, the board of agriculture asked the University of California to survey the results of the 1965 harvest season in California. The result of this survey was presented to the board last week—at the same time as a report on a survey conducted by the State department of agriculture. These two reports showed a reduction of $139.9 million in net income to a group of high labor use crops in California, with $90 million of this directly due to increased production and harvesting costs.

The asparagus industry, as an example, where a longer fresh harvest season and sharply higher prices were cited as compensating growers for any losses of crop that might have occurred. The UC survey showed on the contrary a reduction of $2.4 million in net income, much of it from the fact that growers abandoned several thousand acres in the middle of the season.

The report said "Generally grower may plow out more than a normal number of acres when (1) the weather is poor, (2) market prices are low, or (3) labor is in short supply." It continued to say that, "In 1965, the weather was good and the domestic and export market outlooks were excellent," but that "harvest labor costs increased approximately 46 percent." In other words, neither weather nor markets caused loss of crop or acreage reductions, only labor is left as the cause of the loss of crop and income to the grower.

The UC survey further documented a $3.1 million increase in the cost of harvesting and hauling lemons, and a $7.9 million reduction in net income to lemon growers, and, it added, "growers failed to obtain the additional workers needed to prevent deterioration of quality." But the report said that it had made no attempt to measure the loss to growers from "fruit left on the trees too long" nor from "spoilage of mature fruit in storage and transit" caused by the labor shortage and inefficient workers. So complete as the report is, there were still additional losses directly caused by the shortage of qualified labor and having a direct effect on the economy of California.

The report added that strawberry growers "did not keep fields properly picked to maintain quality" and that they "diverted large quantities of overmature and poorly picked berries to the processing outlets." It said growers were unable to take advantage of a reduction in crop which should normally mean a higher price because "a large proportion of the volume shipped to the fresh market was below normal quality," according to "inspection records," and "increased imports from Mexico" which "reached an estimated 4.515 million pounds of fresh berries" in 1965, more than eight times the volume of fresh fruit shipped in 1960, and almost a million pounds more than 1964.

Both the poor quality fruit picked by inexperienced help and the movement of the crop to Mexico are facts that agriculture maintained throughout the season and now are confirmed for all to see.

In commenting upon the tomato season, the one bright spot in the high labor use crops, the UC researchers said "the 1965 season was an unusual one for the California canning tomato industry."

They added that "uncertainty about availability of harvest labor discouraged many growers from planting in early 1965. Late in the planting season the Secretary of Labor indicated that the tomato crop would not be lost because of lack of labor. Encouraged, growers increased their plantings late in the season."

The almost incredible good fortune which permitted this late crop to be harvested without loss brought forth this remark from the UC economists: "The California tomato growing season is usually ended by the fall rains, which may come any time from mid-October on. In 1965, the rainy season did not begin until well into November. Late plantings of tomatoes matured and were available for harvest." The report also took recognition of the fact that "there were periods when labor shortages caused harvest losses in early tomatoes," primarily in the Merced area.

What does it all add up to? Just this. While gross revenues may have increased, yet income dropped almost $140 million in high labor use crops. Most of this was caused by tremendous increases in production and harvest costs brought about by inefficient labor, high turnover, as well as wage increases.

The report confirmed that labor shortages "caused harvest losses in asparagus, strawberries, brussels sprouts, and early tomatoes," and it said "local labor shortages for the 1965 deciduous and citrus fruit harvests caused harvest to lag behind the usual harvest pattern, resulting in some individual grower losses."

The survey did not attempt to place dollar values on these losses but where records were shown, strawberries worth $4.1 million were grown and not harvested, in addition to losses because of poor quality and asparagus worth $1.8 million was unharvested in addition to 6,500 acres plowed out during the harvest season. Allied industry suffered nearly $4 million additional losses because of the reduced volume in just these two crops the survey indicated, proving once again, agriculture was right when it said that the great social experiment was going to cost the economy of California millions of dollars.

Veto Power Over Federal Reserve Would Remove Congressional Control and Destroy System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, Mr. Allan Sproul, Sr., retired president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, delivered an address before the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject "Veto Power Over Federal Reserve Would Remove Congressional Control and Destroy System." Flashes from that address, as published in the Commonwealth, follow:

VETO POWER OVER FEDERAL RESERVE WOULD REMOVE CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL AND DESTROY SYSTEM

During most of this long-lived economic advance we have been dealing with a situation in which (overall) the level of unemployment was intolerably high, productive plant and equipment used at less than optimum rates, unit costs of production were holding steady, and fiscal stimulants strongly supported by monetary policy could be administered without much danger of creating cost increases and inflationary pressures.

That situation no longer exists. Most of the slack has been taken up.

The apparent complacency of those in high places of economic responsibility in Government, who fostered the myth that we had mastered the business cycle, and that we could continue to suppress inflationary pressures by exhortation and thereats in the area of credit, capital, wages, and prices, is reprehensible.

UNDUE INFLUENCE

They were clinging to the fiscal-monetary policies which had worked when there was still slack in the economy; playing down the economic repercussions of the Vietnam war; and professing to see no signs of overheating in the economy months after the signals had begun to change.

We have been pursuing a liberal fiscal policy during the economic upturn which began in 1961. The principle of balancing the Federal budget annually was abandoned years ago. It was followed, in theory, by the compensatory budget which aimed at rough balance over the business cycle.

NEBULOUS NATIONAL BUDGET

In 1961, we were introduced officially to the theory of fiscal drag and a budget policy which called for the deliberate adoption of budget deficits, without regard to their duration or the stage of the business cycle, so long as a gap existed between the Nation's actual production and what it theoretically could produce if unemployment did not exceed 4 percent.

This theory gained wider acceptance when, despite a budget deficit, it produced corporate and individual income tax cuts, accompanied by assurances that we were choosing tax reduction and rejecting increased Government spending as the way to economic growth.

Now fiscal policy is in a bind. The bright prospect of a constantly growing economy which would throw up increased revenues year after year which, in turn, would support necessary increases in Government expenditures while justifying a succession of tax cuts, has been completely blurred by the budgetary demands of the war in Vietnam.

With most of the slack in the economy gone, we entered a new phase last year when credit too readily available was likely to be dissipated in increased prices, instead of promoting increased production and employment.

The answer of the executive administration seemed to be to try to hold down the pressure gage while the steam under the economic boiler was being maintained. There were frequent oral injunctions against a lessened availability of credit and an increase in interest rates, and there were the so-called voluntary controls of specific uses of credit and so-called voluntary wage-price guidelines or guideposts.

TRIED TO STOP RESERVE BOARD

But as demand pressed more strongly against supply of credit, goods, and labor, this approach was bound to become more difficult and less effective.

In the circumstances, it is hard to understand the length to which the executive administration went to try to prevent the Federal Reserve System from using its statutory powers to lessen the ready availability of bank reserves, and the extent of its attempt to keep commercial banks from responding to mounting credit demands by raising interest rates on loans.

If there ever was a time for the established statutory and market controls of credit expansion to make their contribution toward sustainable economic growth, without inflation, this was it.

NECESSARY RESPONSE

The December action of the Federal Reserve System in raising the discount rate and the ceiling rates which member banks can pay on time deposits was a logical and necessary response to changing conditions in the domestic economy as well as having within it the possibility of some benefit to our international balance of payments—which is still in trouble.

Statements made at the time of the Federal Reserve action that it was regrettable that the System had acted before January were disingenuous. They smacked of counsel for delay for the sake of delay, which might have prevented, for some time, action which already was overdue. There was and is the fact that we wouldn't know any more in January than we did in December.

Expressions of regret that the action would raise costs, particularly for homes, schools, hospitals, and factories, were equally misplaced. If the costs of funds for these purposes could be held down only by an expansion of bank credit at artificial rates, the initial savings of lower interest rates would be more than offset by increased costs.

What is regrettable is that there appeared to be a breakdown of the kind of coordinated Government economic policy which we have come to expect. The breakdown was not the fault of the Federal Reserve. It made a decision which had to be made.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM RESISTS PERSONAL POWER

The greatest concentration of personal power of our Government was here resisted by one of our principal statutory agencies. Punitive reactions would be a cause for concern, no matter what their form. This would include pressure for legislation which would give the Executive, directly, or indirectly, through the Secretary of the Treasury or an Economic Council, power to direct or veto actions of the Federal Reserve System.

This would remove from the Congress final control over a function it has always firmly retained and would destroy the Federal Reserve System as we have known it for the past 50 years. Only a few times during that half century has the System had to assert the powers entrusted to it by the Congress in opposition to the publicized wishes of a President or a Secretary of the Treasury who wanted to direct its actions.

DISTORTED FIGURES

Wage guideposts are gradually being inserted into our economic system. They were initially projected by the Council of Economic Advisers in 1962 "as a contribution to the public discussion of how the national interest may be judged" with the proviso that they were only first approximations that would need to be adapted extensively to the circumstances of particular industries.

By 1964, without any public evidence that they had been so adapted, they were announced as a "standard." The competitive market of fact has been made to fit the procrustean bed of theory.

The guideposts are based on elusive estimates of complex aggregates and are applied in a hit or miss fashion—mostly hit prices and miss wages; hit some industries, such as steel and aluminum, and miss others including all those outside the glare of national publicity and the reach of administration pressures and threats.

There is something distinctly wrong going on here. These are spasmodic and capricious interferences, by hazy formula, with market mechanisms which must be responsive to the constantly changing forces of supply and demand to retain their competitive vigor.

There is a lack of precision as to when and how and to whom the controls or guidelines will be applied, which creates inequities that can lead to an erosion of good economic relations between Government, industry, and labor.

PREFER NONSTATUTORY POWERS?

There is the danger that the executive will be tempted to use these nonstatutory powers to try to suppress particular inflationary developments while neglecting the general fiscal and monetary powers which the Government possesses. And, finally, the coercive methods and threats of reprisals are creating a troublesome odor of punishment without legal sanction and without orderly procedures for redress of grievances.

Until we have a better basis than we now have, in fact and in law, for more selective controls, general controls should continue to be our main defense against economic excesses. They have served us well during the past 5 years in promoting vigorous economic growth. They can serve us now in restraining inflationary pressures.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Q. Can Federal Reserve accomplish purpose when part of financial community outside system? A. Ability of life insurance and savings and loan to contribute to liquidity does increase difficulty of making FRS policy effective.

Q. (Edwing D. Berl) How much longer can we remain on quasi-gold standard? A. Indefinitely. Need to do more to make present system work. Our gold reserves declining, Europe's increasing. Europe doing less than share in foreign aid, military defense.

Q. (John Shuman) How can President say "no inflation" when cost of BART up 70 percent. A. Construction industry has paid little attention to wage/price guides. Preliminary estimates may have erred.

Q. (Loren D. Phillips) How high will new interest rate force FHA interest rate? A. No idea. Housing next to motherhood—housing authorities probably take measures to keep rate down.

Q. True that domestic inflation creates no balance-of-payments problem? A. Our exports declining—since Western Europe now pretty well through their inflation, flareup here could be quite dangerous.

Q. (Robert de Fremery) Does our monetary system abet inflation and deflation because banks borrow short, lend long? A. Banking system ameliorates possibility of inflation, deflation, by being based on percentage of reserves; FRB can pretty well control amount of reserves available. Banks borrow short, lend short; and vice versa. Banking system can't be blamed.

Q. (John Braman) What effect continuation of current executive policies on our economy? A. If executive relies on personal exhortation and threats, remains reluctant to increase taxes and use monetary measures—we'll have handsome inflation.

A Birthday for the Boy Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the month of February is ordinarily bleak, cold, and slushy. But in spite of the vicissitudes of weather, a group that we honor perenially had its beginning in this month. And it has managed to flourish as if it were born on the kindest of spring days.

In spite of the fact that this is the 56th year of the Boy Scouts organization in the United States, the group is eternally young. Its purpose—to build honorable young men with sound minds, bodies, and characters—has been strictly and unwaveringly adhered to. Its goals and ambitions for these young men—good citizenship and good sense—have been consistently reached. The Boy Scouts of America have a batting average which would be the envy of any World Series champion.

Scouting gives a boy the well-rounded many-faceted education he needs for the world as we know it today. You might call this organization a junior university for the future. Boys not only learn about the world of nature; they learn about the world of themselves as well. They learn resourcefulness and the art of using their capacities and imaginations to the fullest possible extent. They learn independence and strength, yet they also learn how to use these gifts in concert with others. They learn their limitations while developing their full capacities. They learn the fortitude and preseverance and versatility that they will need in the challenging, exciting, and trying years of the technological space age. We as Americans have much to be grateful for to the Boy Scouts of America. This group has consistently contributed to the quality, versatility, and education of America's future leaders. Many of our Nation's present leaders were Boy Scouts in their youth. They still praise and actively support the efforts of scouting.

The alumni of the scouting school are ample proof of the quality of the Boy Scouts. I believe we can all trust to scouting's high traditions, worthy goals, and past accomplishments to continue in the years ahead.

More Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the purchase in Germany of weapons for the military forces of the United States is almost unbelievable, especially when one of the Nation's oldest and best arsenals is being closed and skilled workmen are being deprived of their jobs.

This is another in the long series of indictments of Secretary of Defense McNamara and his administration of the Department of Defense.

The following article by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff of the Des Moines Register should provide the basis for an immediate and searching investigation by the Armed Services Committee of the House or Senate, or both:

Protest United States Buying Arms From Nazis

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

Washington, D.C.—The Defense Department was accused Saturday of arranging a $50-million contract with a Nazi-operated German gun manufacturer that will put 2,300 Americans out of work.

Mayor Charles Ryan of Springfield, Mass., sent a telegram to President Johnson protesting that Defense Secretary Robert McNamara is purchasing 20-mm. automatic guns that are inferior weapons while planning to shut the Springfield Armory.

Ryan and others on a committee to save the Springfield Armory said McNamara has known for months that the German firm, Rheinmetal Co. of Dusseldorf, is under the direction of two Nazis who operated it on slave labor during World War II.

Ryan, with the help of technical experts from the Springfield Armory, has been fighting for 16 months to get McNamara to reverse his decision to close the armory.

The Springfield committee has an alliance with a B'nai B'rith organization that has expressed outrage that the Defense Department would deal with a firm operated by Nazis as a slave labor plant in World War II. The firm allegedly refused to make reparations to surviving victims of the slave labor era.

CALL IT A SCANDAL

Ryan and his committee term McNamara's dealings with this firm "a scandal" and a "monstrous infamy."

The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is investigating a Springfield contention that McNamara used erroneous cost figures in an effort to show he could save money by closing the armory. The armory has been a major center for weapons research and development since the Revolutionary War.

The mayor and his committee proved that McNamara was using erroneous figures in his initial contention that the closing would eventually save $5.5 million a year. In fact, the study claimed that instead of costing $8 million to close the armory, it would cost more than $73 million.

Instead of saving $5.5 million a year, the savings would amount to no more than $640,000 a year, and it would take 45 years for the Government to come out ahead on the closing, the Springfield group claims.

McNamara then contended that the cost of producing guns at the Government's Springfield Armory was higher by 100 to 200 percent than private industry.

SAME COSTS

The mayor and his team produced figures claiming to show that the Springfield Armory was producing weapons for approximately the same costs as private industry and in many cases was producing weapons for less money than private industry.

McNamara then had an outside study done by a management firm, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, to determine if private industry could take care of Government weapons needs if the Springfield Armory is shut.

Booz, Allen & Hamilton concluded that the Government could obtain all of its weapons and weapons system development from private industry.

Mayor Ryan and his committee contend McNamara has changed the rules in the middle of the game to try to prove that his initial erroneous decision was right.

They also charge that a "conflict of interest" existed on the part of Booz, Allen & Hamilton because it is one of the private firms competing for the job of doing weapons development work for the Defense Department if Springfield is closed.

LOWER COST

When Mayor Ryan and his committee learned that the Defense Department was negotiating with the Rheinmetal Co., they concluded that Springfield could produce a superior weapon, and could do it at a lower price.

Figures dealing with armory production costs have been submitted to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee headed by Senator John Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, and are expected to be the subject of a hearing within the next few weeks.

Mayor Ryan and his committee also have argued that if the United States is gravely concerned about its balance of payments, it should not be spending $50 million abroad—particularly in Germany, which has a thriving economy and is importing labor.

Mayor Ryan and his group were told that the two top officials of Rheinmetal—Otto Paul Caesar and Ernest Blume—were Nazi Party members.

They researched this with help from the B'nai B'rith representatives, determined that Caesar and Blume became Nazi Party members as early as 1935 and 1937 and are the two key figures in Rheinmetal.

KEPT PRIVATE

Initially, they did not use this as an argument. Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus Vance was informed. The Defense Department did nothing.

Mayor Ryan then asked the President "to take whatever steps were necessary to kill" the proposed $50 million contract with Rheinmetal.

Labor's Rightful Alarm Over the Great Society: What Place the American Maritime Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message last year, the President stated, and I quote:

> I will recommend * * * a new policy for our merchant marine.

Well, 13 months later we are still waiting for this promise to be fulfilled.

Great Society legislation, on the other hand, has come up to the Congress in a steady stream. Little wonder, therefore, that the American maritime industry is perplexed over the role it is to play in the grand scheme. Is it, for example, to be accorded its rightful place of importance? Or is the maritime industry to be treated as an unwanted stepchild? If the officials of the executive departments who authored the report of the Interagency Maritime Task Force prevail, I too, fear that it will be the latter—that of an unwanted stepchild.

The concern of American maritime labor is expressed in Resolution 161 of the Maritime Trades Advisory Committee. It was approved at the AFL–CIO convention and by the following labor organizations in my district: Shipyards and Marine Shop Laborers Union, Local No. 886; Waiters and Dairy Lunchmen's Union, Local No. 30; Office and Professional Employees, Local No. 3; Shipwrights and Joiners, Local No. 1149; Military Sea Transport Union; Metal Polishers and Platers International Union, Local No. 128; Union Label Section; Retail Clerks Union, Local No. 648; Hospital and Institutional Workers' Union, Local No. 250; San Francisco Naval Shipyard, Lodge No. 9; Marine Cooks and Stewards; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, No. 1245; International Association of Machinists, Lodge No. 68; Masters, Mates and Pilots, Local No. 89; Commercial Telegraphers' Union, Local No. 34; Bartenders Union, Local No. 41; San Francisco Stereotypers and Electrotypers Union No. 29; San Francisco Musicians Union, Local No. 6; Waitresses' Union, Local No. 48; Department Store Employees Union, Local No. 1100; Boilermakers Union, Local No. 6; International Association of Machinists and Aircraft Workers, Local No. 1305; Bay Counties District Council of Carpenters.

The full text of Resolution 161 is as follows:

> Whereas in view of the history of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee as I have outlined it and in view of the conflicting reports from the President's Maritime Advisory Committee consisting of labor, industry and public members appointed by

President Johnson and from the Interagency Maritime Task Force Committee established by Secretary of Commerce Connors, we believe it imperative that a resolution be adopted by this convention, endorsing and giving full support to the report of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee and denouncing and rejecting the report of the Interagency Maritime Task Force Committee; and

Whereas the report of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee proposes the full implementation of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 as amended, to revitalize the merchant marine industry of this Nation whereby it will always be the leading maritime power of the world; and

Whereas it proposes to increase our fleet to carry all domestic and 30 percent of all foreign borne commerce in American-flag ships; and

Whereas it calls for the construction of these ships to be by American labor in American shipyards to be operated by American seamen, governed by American laws and standards; and

Whereas it calls for a continuing and increasing cargo preference to assure substantial cargoes for American-flag ships; and

Whereas the provisions of that report would materially alleviate the deficit balance of payments that is steadily becoming a greater problem; and

Whereas the Interagency Maritime Task Force Committee report is contrary to and in conflict with the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; is contrary to and in conflict with the directions of President Johnson to the Maritime Advisory Committee he appointed; is contrary to and in conflict with the resolution adopted by the President's Advisory Committee at their first meeting which set forth clearly the purpose of the Advisory Committee and the scope of their study, deliberations, and findings; in direct conflict with statements made to the Advisory Committee by Secretary of Commerce Connors and is contrary to and in direct conflict with all the basic principles set forth in the President's Maritime Advisory Committee report: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the AFL-CIO and all its affiliated unions endorse and give active support to the report of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That the AFL-CIO and its affiliates go on record to do everything possible to reject and defeat the report of the Task Force and denounce the Maritime Task Force Committee for creating the untenable and unexplainable situation that President Johnson and the administration is placed in by their conflicting report.

National Avocado Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from California, BOB WILSON, and I have today introduced a resolution which calls upon President Johnson to proclaim May 14, 1966, as National Avocado Day.

The growing of avocados has become a major industry in the fertile valleys and hills of San Diego County, Calif., in which our congressional districts are located. More than 7,000 acres are devoted to the production of this delicious and nutritious fruit.

Center of the avocado industry is Fallbrook, which has sponsored three festivals. The last one attracted 8,000 people, and indications are that the fourth in 1966 will be the biggest and best attended yet.

Fallbrook is the "Avocado Capital of the World." Mr. WILSON and I believe that it is entirely fitting and appropriate that President Johnson proclaim this day, to bring national recognition to a truly all-American industry. The growing of what many call "alligator pears" has been developed to today's major industry by the skills and perseverance of dedicated orchardists, not only in California, but also in the State of Florida.

I am hopeful that our colleagues in the Congress will act favorably on this resolution, which seeks to provide deserved recognition to the avocado industry and the people who have made it an American agricultural success story.

Text of our resolution is as follows:

Whereas the fourth annual avocado festival will be celebrated at Fallbrook, California, on May 14, 1966; and

Whereas seven thousand acres devoted to the production of avocados justifies the pride of Fallbrook, California, in its title of "The Avocado Capital of the World": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating May 14, 1966, as National Avocado Day in recognition of the benefits resulting from community enterprise and inviting the attention of the people of the United States to the observance of the fourth annual avocado festival on that day at Fallbrook, California.

The Other Side of the "New Economics"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Maurice H. Stans, recently wrote a highly timely and thought-provoking article entitled, "The Other Side of the 'New Economics'," which appeared in the December 13, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report.

Mr. Stans explores and discusses the underlying purposes and goals of the so-called new economics, motivations, and assumptions on which this type of economic planning is based and the risks involved.

It is a sobering, perceptive analysis which I believe will be of interest to the Congress and public.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE "NEW ECONOMICS"

(From a key man in the Eisenhower administration comes a challenging appraisal of the Democratic administrations' "new economics."

(Maurice H. Stans, Budget Director, for 3 years and now a well-known investment banker, says the system offers "a pleasant euphoria of irresponsibility" that obscures severe risks.

(Mr. Stans recognizes some "temporary success" of the "new economics," but warns against accepting this as proof for the long term.

(Where will it all lead? Only time will tell, he says, but he points to many dangers, including "disastrous inflation" and government controls—"a dictatorship of economic planners.")

(By Maurice H. Stans)

We are witnessing in Washington a daring attempt to devise new concepts for a solution of the persistent problem of the uneven distribution of the national wealth and output.

There is, in fact, underway in our seat of government the biggest economic experiment the world has ever seen. It is important that each of us understand clearly what it is and what it seeks to achieve, and what risks are involved, for our personal fortunes and our national future are at stake on the outcome.

The national economic policy which is now so aggressively being tested is not designed as a temporary expedient to meet a momentary difficulty. It is an avowed way of life.

If it succeeds, it will be a major turning point in the economics of government. Historians will record it as a complete reversal in direction for the science of political management.

If it fails, it will be an equally historic event that may forever shatter the strength of our free democratic processes.

These wide-scale economic experiments are the brain children of a present generation of liberal economists holding considerable influence in government affairs. They do not comprise a compact group, and their ideas are not uniform, but in general they endorse and support these propositions of governmental economics:

1. That a government can spend a nation into prosperity and assure full employment of its manpower and resources—by a process of force-feeding the economy through planned deficits;
2. That a limited amount of inflation is good for the country—or, at least, does no harm;
3. That a tax cut, when a deficit exists, will stimulate the economy and thereby enhance total revenues—enough to achieve future surpluses;
4. That the national debt need never be reduced—and should, in fact, be increased as the national output grows.

Behind the principles is the confident belief that the future of a nation can be successfully assured through closely designed economic blueprints, enforced by a system of central control valves that regulate the economic stream to accomplish desired social objectives.

In short, government should intervene more in economic planning and management. Only then can we gain a satisfactory annual rate of growth and a suitable level of living.

All this is usually described as the new economics. To the advocates of these precepts, anything else is an incantation from the forgotten past, an ancient cliche, a worn-out tradition. There are immediate questions that these propositions bring to mind:

Can a government successfully cast out the long-accepted tenet that, to be financially strong, it must live within its income?

Will persistent deficit spending really provide enough steam to iron out the wrinkles and gaps in employment of manpower and resources?

To what extent and for how long can annual deficits be suffered and national debt be accumulated without imposing severe inflation, with its consequent loss of values and of security, especially harsh for those on fixed incomes?

Can a small degree of inflation be encouraged without serious risk that it will get out of control?

As part of all this, how safe is it for a government to offer its people the attractive carrot of recurring tax reductions when there is already an existing substantial gap between revenues and expenses?

If the new economics succeeds, it would without a doubt create a new era for the United States and, in fact, for the entire community of nations. Never again would a national government need to be inhibited in the scope of its services to the people by old-fashioned thinking. Central economic planning would became a major tool of progress, and a planned full economy for the United States would be a key weapon against the Soviet threat of domination. This is apparently what the liberal economists hope and believe.

It may be boldness even to question these policies when, after a few years, they already seem to be highly successful. But a few years of success do not insure their longtime survival in the face of the inevitable pressures of a democratic society, and it is over the long term that their ultimate value will be judged.

WHAT HAPPENED IN BRAZIL

Take the case of Brazil as one example:

José Pereira, down in São Paulo, Brazil, doesn't know much about the theories of economics. Except for the complaints he hears from his fellow workmen in the glass factory about the stupidity of the politicians way off in Brasilia, he doesn't understand much about his Government's affairs. And he wouldn't recognize a fiscal policy at any distance.

But José knows some things about his own income and outgo. He knows that when his wife, Maria, goes to the market she needs three times as much money to fill her basket with groceries as she did 2 years ago. He knows that the medicines he needs when the doctor comes are nine times as expensive as they were 5 years ago. He knows that the huaraches that cost him 20 cruzeiros in 1953 have gone to 70 cruzeiros in 1955, to 200 cruzeiros in 1960, to 2,000 cruzeiros today.

José has had increases in his pay during all this time, but they never seem to catch up. What good is a 50-percent increase in pay when living costs have gone up 60 percent since the last one, less than a year ago? There is nothing left to save now, and the 3,000 cruzeiros he put away in the big bank for a nest egg 10 years ago are hardly worth going after. They will barely pay for one piano lesson now for little Marquita, and he and Maria had once had such hope that someday it would grow to buy a piano for her so her musical talents could be developed.

To José, his meager pay must be spent quickly before it loses its value. Saving is useless, and the future is dark and foreboding.

There are some things we could tell José that might make him understand his plight:

1. In the last 12 years, the cruzeiro has dropped from 18½ to the dollar to 1,850 to the dollar. It has lost 99 percent of its buying power.

2. In the same period, the Government of Brazil has consistently operated with large deficits, financed with borrowed and printed money. The national debt is astronomical, and foreign obligations cannot be met even with large amounts of new aid.

3. Meanwhile, the cost of living has been spiraling. It increased 23 percent in 1960—43 percent in 1961—52 percent in 1962—75 percent in 1963—85 percent in 1964—and is still going up, despite all efforts of a new reform Government.

Until the present administration, the successive Governments of Brazil were following exactly the same new economic philosophy that is being urged on the United States today. It started about 10 years ago when a President of Brazil called the traditional economics "fuddy-duddy" and set out to use deficits and inflation as a purposeful economic device. He promised 50 years of progress in 5. But, in the words of one expert a few years ago: "He achieved 40 years of inflation in 4. Today, the only thing behind the cruzeiro is the printing press. Fiscal irresponsibility is at the root of Brazil's present problems."

Is this a typical case or is it unusual? Does this prove that our present fiscal policies will have the same consequences?

Perhaps not, standing alone. But there are other places we can look, too, for evidence.

Uruguay, a "welfare state run wild," with annual budget deficits and with two out of five people of the working force on a government payroll of some kind, has had three currency devaluations in 3 years. Living costs jumped 38 percent in 1964 and are rising even faster this year. Since 1960, Montevideo's prices have soared more than 300 percent. For years considered a worker's paradise and an example of successful socialism, Uruguay is now broke and facing the same strict reforms that Brazil is undergoing in order to bring its economy back to a solid base.

Ecuador, Argentina and Chile have had large budget deficits and large doses of inflation in the last decade. In Colombia, the cost of living has advanced 60 percent in the last 3 years. Other Latin American countries have suffered in lesser degrees.

France has had to tighten its belt and invoke controls after an increase of 25 percent in the cost of living in a 5-year period.

In Italy, the cost of living moved up 20 percent between 1961 and 1964, and it, too, led to stringent measures.

Denmark and Sweden are fighting inflationary spirals.

Indonesia's money has fallen heavily in value in the past few years.

South Korea's inflation this year is about 25 percent.

In India and the Philippines, a rising cost of living is bringing bitterness, frustration and insecurity.

GROUNDS FOR SKEPTICISM

Certainly in these experiences, and many others around the globe, there are grounds for skepticism about the optimistic and confident assurances of the liberal economists. The evidence is that they may well be overlooking or minimizing some imposing risks involved in their propositions. Perhaps among the long-term risks of the "new economcis" in the United States are these:

1. The risk of failure—with a high penalty in accumultaed debt, loss of value of our currency, disastrous inflation, and loss of our position of world leadership.

2. The risk of success—which might, paradoxically, bring about another epidemic of failures in weaker nations tempted by the sweet smell of our achievement, but unable to keep their programs in bounds, and might also tempt us to demand too much of a good thing and thereby bring about our downfall.

3. The risk of degradation of the national purpose and spirit—which would be an inevitable accompaniment of a reversal of the deep-seated traditions of thrift, self-responsibility, freedom of choice, and driving ambition that built a great nation out of a mixture of insecure racial and ethnic strains.

4. The risk of loss of personal freedoms—a price which most likely would have to be paid for the all-powerful Central Government that long-range economic planning and controls would bring and high spending would create.

In the absence of proof that the new theories are workable, these risks need careful evaluation. As a matter of fact, it can be said, to a degree, we have already tested this new economic philosophy in this country. All through the 1930's our Government promised to balance the budget "over the cycle," and tried to reduce unemployment and "prime the pump" of the economy by running deliberate deficits—some as much as 50 percent of the revenues.

The adoption of the economic ideas of compensatory fiscal policy, of deliberate spending to "prime the pump," of "a little inflation is good for us," were moves of desperation at the time, to induce a recovery from the depression of the 1930's. They failed. The cycle never came around, there were 13 consecutive deficits in 13 years, unemployment held at 10 percent or more, and it took a world war to pull the economy out of the doldrums.

RISK: DEPRECIATION OF OUR MONEY

The risk of failure, therefore, is the risk that, after a period of years, we will find what we have really achieved is an ever-increasing debt, continued depreciation of our money, a flight of capital, loss of our gold, and loss of our national strength and international prestige.

Even deeper than its impact on today's living costs or tomorrow's debts and taxes is the potential danger of weakening the national ability to fight communism. We may be playing right into their hands by extravagant fiscal policies that carry such overwhelming risks. How do we preserve the flexibility and reserve strength to meet emergencies if we constantly pursue a course of fiscal brinkmanship, of government by credit card?

The chances for successful use of the "new economics" depend on finding a delicate thin line of overspending that nevertheless does not tip the balance to disaster. No country has ever found that formula.

The proponents of the "new economics" deny the validity of the American traditions. They characterize our national beliefs in frugality, thrift and self-responsibility as archaic, primitive and Puritan. A balanced budget, they tell us, is an old cliché.

But these roots are deep in American history. In establishing their Government, the American people adopted the principle of frugality and sought to avoid the accumulation of debt. This was not a casual policy. It was expressed as the national will by every President from Washington to Eisenhower. And it was effectively carried out for 155 years after independence. The early debt of the Revolution was paid in full in 1834. The new debts incurred in later wars were progressively reduced in peacetime.

Despite the massive expenditures of World War I, the national debt by 1930 had been brought down to a mere $16 billion. It is only since then that we have defaulted in our direction: Since 1930, we have paid our bills only 6 times and have added to the debt in the other 30 fiscal years.

WE WERE TAUGHT TO BE THRIFTY

This tradition of thrift in government was paralleled in the personal lives of our people. We were taught to be thrifty, to be self-reliant, to provide for our future. The savings of individuals became the capital that built the vast industrial complex that carried us safely through our wars and brought us from a primitive rural economy to the world's most advanced. Until the recent few decades, we heard no economic principles in conflict with this kind of progress.

All of this we are now asked to abandon. All of this, we are told, is an illusion, a repetition of stale phrases, an inheritance of stereotype, a hoary tradition to be buried. There is an easier way and we have missed it all along.

The "new economics" dismisses all this as mythology. It asks the Nation to give up its moral legacy from the past. In offering the primrose path, it may be risking the destruction of the Ameriacn spirit that built American greatness.

Perhaps most serious of all, the liberal economists, right or wrong, may be risking the loss of our personal freedoms in advancing their new policies.

Of all the instruments which subvert personal freedoms, inflation is the worst. Millions of people today know this lesson. But almost as bad are the controls that will seemingly be necessary to hold us together if the new economics becomes the new order.

Where does the new economic planning stop? We know that it includes deliberate expenditures to stir up the economy, that it includes tax cuts regardless of deficits, that it includes artificial interest rates, that it includes a growing national debt, and that it includes some "acceptable" inflation.

We know also that, sooner or later, it necessarily involves Government influence or control over prices or wages, over conditions of work, over investment and investment returns, over business policies and practices, over the flow of money and credit, and over economic education.

And we know that the control mechanisms themselves and the bureaucracies that grow to superintend the flow of spending add up to ever-enlarging power over the lives and actions of the people.

Certainly not all Government growth or Government control is to be condemned.

The population explosion and an accelerating pace of existence require more agencies to protect rights and balance out opportunities. National defense in a threatening world requires manpower and money. These are proper Government functions.

A PLEASANT IRRESPONSIBILITY

In summary, the new economic theories have the attractions of promising much, providing a pleasant euphoria of irresponsibility and postponing the reckoning to other generations. But the evidence of experience is unanimous in showing that they cannot be sure of success.

The case for the "new economics" has never been proved. It rests on a sandy foundation that has never in history supported a nation's long term progress. It has failed under every test. It is failing right now in many other countries.

Yes, the liberal economists may be overlooking some things in advocating this course: the likely risks of failure and its disastrous consequences; the intoxicating pitfalls of temporary success; the deep-seated beliefs of the American people in fiscal integrity, both in government and in their personal affairs, and the loss of national character that will ensue if these beliefs are brainwashed; the danger that by pursuing their course they may build over us a dictatorship of economic planners and of central bureaucratic Government, destroy our freedoms, and in the end make us easy victims of communism.

Is the "new economics" a blueprint for Utopia or a temporary mess of economic pottage?

Only history will tell, but the signs so far suggest that there are more reasons for skepticism than seem to be generally recognized.

"International Aviation Agreements"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics I am most interested in all legislation which will benefit our country in these fields.

The international airline industry of our country is a great dollar earner. Since each of our international flag carriers can take off or land abroad only pursuant to international agreements, the subject of our international air transport outlook in negotiating these agreements is a most important one.

It is for this reason that I am including in the RECORD today the remarks of Mr. Richard M. Jackson, president of our only U.S.-flag transatlantic all-cargo carrier, Seaboard World Airlines, Inc., given recently before the International Aviation Club in Washington. Mr. Jackson is to be commended for his aggressive and successful leadership of Seaboard World Airlines. I know that his views will be given consideration by those of us in the legislative branch as well as those in the executive branch.

While on the subject of international cargo, it is my earnest hope that IATA—the International Air Transport Association—will take steps to eliminate the disparity between transatlantic cargo rates on shipments from Baltimore and New York, for example. A Baltimore shipper must pay 6 cents more a pound for a shipment from Baltimore to Europe than a New York shipper, and if the Baltimore shipper manages to put together a shipment of about 37,000 pounds, the disparity is still 4 cents a pound.

There is a basic inequity in this situation, particularly when shipments from many points in Europe are common rated. For example, cargo rates from Milan, Italy, to New York are the same as the rates from Zurich, Switzerland, to New York. The distance between Zurich and Milan is actually greater than the distance from Baltimore to New York, yet there is an added cost to the Baltimore shipper, but there is no added cost to the Milan shipper.

Perhaps the answer is to give the U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board authority over international rates and fares so that this type of discriminatory practice will cease. Certainly, if IATA cannot eliminate these inequities, the governments should step in.

The text of Mr. Jackson's speech follows:

NEEDED: A NEW U.S. INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT OUTLOOK

(By Richard M. Jackson, president, Seaboard World Airlines, Inc.)

U.S. international aviation has outgrown the proverbial beanstalk in the last 20 years and has the potential to do it again in the next 10 years, provided that the policies recently laid down in Government studies and administration statements are conscientiously followed by the aviation representatives of the U.S. Government.

U.S. foreign policy and U.S. international aviation policy must develop with the times, and must be proper vehicles for accomplishment of U.S. economic and political goals. To do this they must be in consonance with the immediate and long-range national objectives as enunciated by the President. Let us look at U.S. international aviation policy as it has evolved over the past 20 years.

U.S. foreign policy in immediate postwar years was centered on the theme of helping with material means the free world nations which had been weakened by the ravages of war. In certain respects this aid to foreign countries might have appeared to be contrary to the best interests of U.S. industry and commerce in that it would build and strengthen foreign competitors of the United States. However, it has proved its point and it has shown the potential of developing as much growth in markets as it has in competition.

It was the U.S. carriers that were able to get the first start in the immediate postwar period and in many respects the U.S. international air transport policy paralleled the Nation's overall foreign policy. For years the U.S. Government has been exchanging airline franchises with foreign governments allowing their airlines to operate to and through the United States of America without too much regard to the relative market sizes. This liberal policy has been condemned by many who felt it was no more than a giveaway program. However, it fitted into the general framework of the then-existing U.S. foreign policy. And it has been highly successful in strengthening the weak. Seventeen foreign airlines which were almost nonexistent 20 years ago, today operate a $300 million plus transportation business on the North Atlantic alone and this highly profitably segment of their operation has spawned a $2 billion a year U.S. tourist industry within their countries, which contributes substantially to their economies. This is how much this beanstalk has grown.

The U.S.-flag international air carriers, meanwhile, have also thrived and today account for more than 40 percent of the North Atlantic air transport revenues. The largest of these U.S. airlines grossed $69 million in revenues in 1945 and should top $670 million in 1965—almost a ten-fold increase.

The great majority of the travelers, shippers and spenders are American citizens—some two-thirds, and, as such, are individually responsible for the tremendous growth and success of the airline and tourism industries. Twenty years ago nobody reckoned that these individual Americans would some day exercise their personal desires and pocketbooks to the extent that their expenditures would replace Uncle Sam to a very large extent in the multi-billion-dollar postwar reconstruction program of Europe. And yet they have. U.S. direct aid to Europe has dropped from $4 billion a year in the Marshall plan days to one-tenth of that in 1965—a transition made possible by the travels of U.S. tourists in conjunction with the bootstrap efforts of the countries themselves. This tourist flood appears to have been an unpremeditated, extraordinarily fortuitous change of events, with almost no precedent in world history.

Partially offsetting the outflow of gold from U.S. tourism in foreign travels has been the purchase by foreign countries' airlines of some $3.2 billion worth of U.S.-manufactured airplanes, engines and components and several billions more are on order. This superior American equipment has played no small part in obtaining general public acceptance of modern air transportation and, in fact, has been one of the prime reasons for the spectacular industry growth.

This has been the metamorphosis of international political and aviation relationships among the major nations of the free world since the close of World War II. Marshall plan and other aid grants were successful catalysts in making it possible for these nations to pull themselves up onto their feet and now we are dealing among economic as well as political equals. Early U.S. policies were successful in setting up these nations and their industries as competitors, but even more importantly as markets for the United States.

I said just now that we are dealing among economic and political equals. This does not mean that we all deal from equal competitive strengths. Each of us has to use his own advantages to his own benefit. We say in our Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, but it is an equality of opportunity rather than a fixed equality of strength and position. Each uses his strength at the moment to get the best for himself, which certainly is not considered unduly detrimental to the rights of his fellow men. So it is an international political relationships—and so it should be in international air relationships.

The strength and maturity of the major foreign carriers is today an unquestioned fact. Although some may not show spectacular earnings, their operations to the United States are almost invariably their most profitable routes. Their relative competitive positions with respect to each other and the U.S. carriers reflect the extensiveness of their route patterns, the inherent attraction of their countries to tourists, and the industrial strength of their commerce. These relative positions have changed considerably in recent years, but for fundamental reasons which are today's commercial facts of life.

The U.S. international carriers also have done very well in this postwar period and are recording the highest profits in their histories. To some observers these results apparently mean that all is well everywhere and that not a single change should disturb the rigid status quo.

It is not surprising that this status quo philosophy is widely accepted, since the major U.S. international carriers advocate it to protect themselves from further competition. I reach the opposite conclusion and believe that U.S. international air policy should continue to reflect the growth needs of the United States of America.

As a matter of fact, the U.S. International Air Transport Policy Statement issued in April of 1963 pointed the way to liberalism and competition on air transport routes and to a matter even closer to my heart—cargo routing flexibility. Since then, the international policy statements of both Presidents Johnson and Kennedy have explained the necessity for our Government planners to think big in order to keep their plans apace with the growth potential of the Nation.

President Johnson has called for measures to boost U.S. economic growth, to expand exports, to compete with lowered prices and improved techniques against foreign products, to expand markets and develop new ones. None of these things can be accomplished with a policy of status quo or with a policy of not exercising our inherent bargaining strengths.

Moreover, a U.S. international aviation policy of status quo in effect would mean that the status quo would restrict only U.S. carriers and U.S. carrier routes. It cannot have an appreciable effect on foreign airlines, since they are agents free of U.S. controls and many of their countries have treaties assuring them of transport rights to and from the United States of America.

With the diminishing need for foreign aid programs came the emerging need for a new U.S. policy primarily based on the welfare of U.S. national, economic, and commercial interests and the U.S. traveling and shipping public. The new objective then is not to first help the other fellow, but to first help ourselves—a policy religiously pursued by other nations.

Let's take the international airline industry out of the diplomatic-political-military arena and put it in the commercial arena where it belongs. Let's permit the commercial facts of life, the relative market strengths and weaknesses to become the primary issues at the bargaining table.

For example, if two-thirds of the air travelers between two countries are citizens of one, that country should have the stronger bargaining position. Too often the words "equality of rights" are erroneously interperted to mean a 50-50 split of services. "Equality of rights" in a race qualifies the runners to be at the starting line. It does not mean that they all have the right to tie at the finish.

It makes no commercial sense to give "beyond rights" to a foreign carrier in competition to a U.S. carrier without a solid "quid pro quo." Swapping a horse for a rabbit makes no commercial sense although in the past it may have been necessary for other than commercial reasons.

Certain foreign carriers claim "squatters' rights" on routes they have flown to the United States but which are not included in their air bilateral agreement. These operations are detrimental to the U.S. airlines and should be stopped or swapped for equivalent U.S. rights.

The United States has been threatened time and time again by foreign countries with proposed restrictions on U.S. airline operations in terms of frequency, capacity and even time of day for operations, and then the offer is made to remove the threat if the United States will restrict itself further in valuable traffic rights. What gall.

The facts of the matter are that the United States in almost every case of international airline franchise negotiation, holds the major commercial bargaining cards for the simple reason that the U.S. markets are more valuable than those of any other country. The threat of cancellation of rights, even though mutual between the United States and another country, would be far more damaging to the other country and its airline. Can you visualize the effect of the mutual cancellation of air traffic rights between New York on the one hand and the capital of any major European country on the other? It would not be too harmful to the U.S. carriers since the traffic would funnel via other European gateways, but it would be almost fatal to the foreign carrier and disastrous to that country's economy, because of the tourist money lost to it. Although this is clearly a situation that should never occur, the threat of cancellation and the will to follow through should by no means be dropped as a bargaining position by the United States.

It is not sinful to possess the most valuable inventory of airline franchises, because this is indigenous to the United States and is the product of the United States relative size, location, and economic standards. It is one of the fruits of our initiative and labors. We should be proud of these attributes and use them as required to obtain the international airline franchises needed by our carriers. Our foreign friends understand America's strength and yet play the game far better than we do with fewer tools at their command. It's time that we learned a lesson from them.

There is another very critical point which has hamstrung our negotiators in the past. They have gone to the bargaining table without the ultimate weapon—the authority to take commercial punitive action against the other party. Incredible as it may sound, our Government agencies involved believe that they do not have sufficient legal power, for example, to retaliate against a foreign carrier whose government has imposed arbitrary restrictions on U.S. carriers. It is obvious that someone in the U.S. Government has such authority—at least the President—but the delegation of appropriate authority to a lower level is apparently so fuzzy or nonexistent that our negotiators are forced to gum their way through these talks in a toothless condition.

I recommend that appropriate legislative or rulemaking action be taken to correct this deficiency and I note that a proceeding to do so has laid dormant before the Civil Aeronautics Board for 3 years. Such authority should be designed for defensive purposes only and not offensive.

I favor a liberal approach to granting traffic rights and I apologize for having talked with you just now about the negative aspects such as punitive actions and cancellation of rights. There has been so much recent talk of this sort of action by foreign countries against the U.S.A. that I had to address myself to it.

On the affirmative side, the United States should try to expand its international air commerce to keep pace with projected national growth and should not listen to the "status quo seekers" who are only trying to protect their selfish interests. It should deal fairly with foreign governments in expanding routes, capacities and rights. But most importantly, it should not let a foreign government obstinately stand in the way of economic growth through air commerce for both countries.

Why should this sort of thing be allowed to go on when the United States of America has the markets, the bargaining strengths, the need for air route expansion, and the clearly expressed national policies in favor of such increased competition and economic growth?

One reason I can think of for this state of affairs is that U.S. negotiators in the past have hesitated to step out boldly and advocate what is right and necessary for U.S. economic growth, as well as that of the free world generally. Maybe they have felt they would be overridden by higher political considerations, but I doubt that any such considerations should outweigh our basic drive for economic expansion and balanced payments. Perhaps they are concerned over the lack of a clearly spelled out legal power to take action. But surely this cannot be too difficult to arrange in view of its importance. It could be that top level policies just have not filtered down. Nothing is more important in international relationships than to insure that policies set at the top are followed by those who are supposed to implement them.

What would be the effect on U.S. international air commerce of implementation of established U.S. policies by U.S. air bilateral negotiators?

First, the successful prosecution of these policies will reduce the harassment, the attempts at restrictionism too often applied against U.S. carriers today by many countries, which inhibits the natural growth of U.S. international air commerce.

Second, it will permit the existing U.S.-flag carriers to obtain approval from the U.S. Government for needed extensions of their route systems.

Third, application of the new policy will show the need for additional U.S. carriers on the largest routes of the world which have a predominance of U.S.-origin traffic.

Fourth, and perhaps most important, will be the effect on U.S. interests other than the airlines themselves—the effect of helping the economic well-being of the United States by improvement of adverse gold flow and the effect of improved quality of service to the U.S. shipping and traveling public. Both of these result from added U.S. carrier services and increased percentage participation in the worldwide markets.

The beanstalk has grown under liberal policies in the past and it can continue to grow with renewed vigor under similar policies in the future if only the U.S. Government in all its many facets resolves to implement established national economic and air transport policies without getting sidetracked by irrelevant considerations. Let us hope that President Johnson's proposal to establish a Department of Transportation will permit this new Department to join other responsible agencies in formulation of policy for bilateral negotiations, and to insure that such policies are promptly passed down—and implemented.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 7, the New York Post started a series of articles entitled "Vietnam: The Endless War" by correspondent Pete Hamill, who writes with great insight about this cruel conflict. I urge my colleagues to read this article as well as the rest of the series which I will insert in the Appendix of the RECORD as they appear.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, Feb. 7, 1966]

VIETNAM: THE ENDLESS WAR

(By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—There are, of course, no good wars. But today, in a small country on the far side of the world, the mightiest military power on earth is engaged in one of the dirtiest, most frustrating, most casually brutal wars of modern times, and can see no immediate prospects for victory. As a nation, we are spending billions of dollars, and permitting the deaths of thousands of young men, but the most optimistic progress reports say only that we are no longer losing the war. We have 200,000 troops scattered across the Republic of South Vietnam and they are still not enough.

They are battling as I write this, those young men, in some of the cruelest terrain soldiers have ever been asked to fight upon. They are fighting in the filth of rice paddies, in the dark crawling recesses of trackless jungle, in the mosquito-ridden Central Highlands, on the spits of barren beaches. They are using the most destructive weapons in man's history, short of nuclear arms, yet each day the enemy grows in strength.

That enemy—whether called the Vietcong or the National Liberation Front—is one which specializes in assassination, terror, and refined cruelty. The countryside of South Vietnam has been fertilized for 8 years now with the bodies of murdered hamlet chieftains, schoolteachers, priests and anonymous citizens. Every day of every week, the Vietcong destroy bridges, schoolhouses and the homes of people who have committed the sin of disagreeing with them. For the Vietcong, the most potent political weapon is terror. A village which has seen its chieftian ripped from neck to navel, his children smashed against a wall and his wife bleeding to death with her breasts cut off will not oppose these people the next time around. They are doing all of this, they claim for the greater good and future happiness of Vietnam. If one needed at this date a case study in the ruthlessness of the committed Communist revolutionary, the Vietcong would certainly provide it.

Each day, these young Americans are a fraction more brutalized by this war, just a bit more cynical. In Da Nang several weeks ago, I asked a marine sergeant whether he had any solution for the problem of South Vietnam. "Yeah," he said. "Pave it."

This country we are spending our national treasure on, and allowing our young men to die for, has been in existence only 12 years. It was carved out of the remnants of French Indochina, along with Laos, Cambodia, and North Vietnam. It runs about 450 miles from the southern tip of the Mekong Delta to the 17th parallel above Hue, which slices it away from North Vietnam. The majority of the 15 million people live in the delta and on the coastal plains which run off from the long mountain range that traverses the republic from north to south.

Americans have been involved in the fighting in South Vietnam since before the fall of the French at Dienbienphu in 1954. Originally, our military men were advisers in the true sense of the word: we helped train the South Vietnamese Army, which was then fighting with the French against the Vietminh. By the time the Geneva Agreements were signed in 1954, we had some 600 military men and civilians there on official business. The number has grown yearly since then. It happened gradually, so gradually that we did not really seem to see it happening at all. Today, whether we like it or not we are engaged in a growing undeclared land war in Asia.

Most people I talked to in this country are aware of, and disturbed by, the moral dilemmas posed by this war. They see it as the inevitable confrontation with Communist China. Some of them admit that we are acting in our own self-interests and that the interests of the South Vietnamese themselves don't really matter. They know that the war will be a long one. The most conservative estimates I heard have the war lasting at least 10 years, at the cost of billions of dollars and thousands of American lives. "This," said one top political officer in Saigon, "will be the longest war we've ever gotten ourselves into. We could be fighting it still in 1990."

The more one probes into the can of worms in Saigon, the more acute that moral dilemma becomes. The Government of South Vietnam—like its Communist counterpart in the north—has never held a free national election, allows for no dissenting political parties, censors the press. Its ideology is anticommunism. It is led by the latest in a series of military juntas.

The credentials of these men for leading a nation into war seem to be only a desire for power and quick fortunes, and the ability to express a glib anticommunism. The more unstable the Government of South Vietnam becomes, the stronger our commitment. That of Nguyen Cao Ky is no better and no wores than its predecessors.

In Saigon, the small talk says Ky himself will soon be out. President Johnson's trip to Honolulu looks like a desperate measure to prop up the government. It doesn't seem to matter; our policy is like betting more and more money on a horse which falls farther and farther behind. On the Vietnamese lunar calendar, this is the year of the horse, but no one with sense is betting on it.

It would be a mistake to believe that the Vietcong are a band of hardy, noble Robin Hoods marching out of Sherwood Forest to do battle with the wicked Sheriff of Nottingham and his American allies in Saigon. But unfortunately they have recognized that South Vietnam is a country ripe for revolution. They know that the social structure of the country is a tangle of feudalism and corruption and their popular support rests on that and a crude form of nationalism.

"I would hate to be the man in the White House, given the true facts in South Vietnam," said one civilian political officer, who has worked in the country for several years. "It is one thing to send money to a country, if that country is prepared to fight for its life. But when we decided to send in a large army last year we admitted that Government could not fight its own battles. So we have young Americans here now, dying in larger and larger numbers, for a Government which does not really care."

These young Americans are dying, among other reasons, to allow the merchants of Saigon a continuing free lunch at the trough of American wealth.

While supplies for our soldiers are backed up in the Saigon River, and loaded ships are forced to wait at enormous expense in harbors as far away as Manila, the merchants of Saigon refuse to move goods from their jammed warehouses until the prices are driven up or the rental becomes sufficiently huge.

They, at least, never had it so good. They are dying to make sure that no rice paddie farmer's son will ever have the effrontery to ask for a university education. They are dying to make sure that one of the most incompetent groups of civil servants anywhere can continue its long, slow suck of the country's marrow.

They are dying so that the daughters of the members of the Cercle Sportif can vacation at Cannes in the summertime, while the children in the countryside die in stunned silence, their stomachs distended by disease.

The young men are dying, some military strategists have told us, because if South Vietnam falls to the Communists, the other nations of southeast Asia will follow, like so many dominoes. Cambodia, Laos, Thailand will go, followed by Malaya, the Philippines, Indonesia, even—I do not exaggerate—Australia. Eventually, this theory goes, we will be fighting the Chinese Communists in Hawaii or San Diego. This might be true, and certainly the United States, as a world power, must make clear to China that it will not fold up before the rhetoric of violence. But while we are pouring arms, money, and men into the war in South Vietnam, the other pieces in the domino theory are falling anyway.

The guerrilla war has been fought in South Vietnam since 1958. But Cambodia is already a dead loss, in the hands of one of the prime sovereign clowns in the Orient; Laos is split betwen a soft neutral government and the Pathet Lao Communists along the Vietnamese border, and guerrillas are already prowling the countryside of Thailand. Obviously, something is going wrong.

Something is wrong when the Vietcong, who had about 5,000 men in 1960, can expand to an estimated 150,000 after 6 years of defoliation, bombing, napalm, heicopters, and all the rest of our modern arsenal.

Something is wrong when some of our Congressmen make brave speeches about bombing Hanoi and Haiphong, while the Vietcong already have in their control 75 percent of the territory and 50 percent of the population of the South.

"It's too late in the game to think we can solve this problem by bombing the North," one American political officer told me here several weeks ago (before the resumption of bombing). "Sure, their weapons are coming from the North, and we should continue to bomb the Ho Chi Minh Trail. But hell, our Vietnamese are getting their weapons from us. Under those terms the North Vietnamese Government should have the right to bomb Seattle.

"The fight for South Vietnam is right here, in the countryside, and you don't solve that problem by blasting Hanoi off the map."

We have been told for years now that we are involved in South Vietnam for simple reasons. At the request of the legitimate government, we have been asked to help defend that republic against armed aggression from North Vietnam. But in the opinion of most observers, there never has been a legitimate government of South Vietnam.

Even more debatable is the extent of actual aggression being committed by the North against the South. It is certain that North Vietnamese regulars took part in last November's fierce fighting at Pleime and the Ia Drang Valley. And in the recent battle for Bong Son I personally saw dead men in

North Vietnamese uniforms. But almost every expert on this war—in Saigon and Washington—agrees that the initial revolt in 1958 was spontaneous. It was Communist-led, to be sure, and received moral support from North Vietnam and China. But it was South Vietnamese revolt. Today, of course, it is being sustained by Communist China and North Vietnam with arms, trained cadres, and since last year, with regular troops from the North Vietnamese army. There is some evidence that Ho Chi Minh joined the conflict with a certain reluctance, but like our own government found it difficult to extract himself without losing face. It is simpler, of course, to say that the whole revolt of the Vietcong was planned and executed according to orders from Hanoi or Peiping. The Communists do not have a lock on the good guy versus bad guy theory of history.

Meanwhile, the war is stepping up. The Vietcong is now drafting young men with the same brutal press gang methods used by the Vietnamese Government. The area of battle is widening.

We may have a half million American troops here before the year is out, and somepeople think the number will rise to a million by the next Presidential election. The napalm is skidding across the mountains, villages are burning, schools are being bombed and young men are dying.

Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that Caterpillar Tractor Co., whose home office is in Peoria, has announced that 75 percent of its $607 million in sales outside of the United States were products exported from American plants. This will result in a $461 million improvement of the Nation's balance-of-payments problem. The company also reports that for the 10-year period 1956–65 the net contribution of Caterpillar was $2.9 billion.

This is an impressive achievement, which underlines the necessity of mutually advantageous international trade. Foreign nations use dollar earnings from their exports to increase their purchases of American-made equipment. The healthy flow that results from this exchange contributes to new markets and greater profits for industry, more employment opportunities for the workingman, and an increasingly stronger balance of trade surplus for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the article, Peoria Journal Star, February 4, 1966, that reports Caterpillar's contribution toward easing our balance-of-payments problem follows:

Cat Aided Balance by $461 Million

> More than 75 percent of Caterpillar Tractor Co.'s $607 million in sales outside of the United States were products exported from American plants, the company reported yesterday.
>
> Primarily as a result of this, the company said that it helped to improve the Nation's balance-of-payment problem by $461 million last year.
>
> The company's contribution, its largest for a single year, was 20 percent more than the $373 million contributed in 1964, according to Caterpillar President William Blackie.
>
> For the 10-year period 1956–65, the net contribution of Caterpillar, the largest private employer and industrial exporter in Illinois, was $2.9 billion.
>
> Blackie noted that Caterpillar has been cooperating with the Federal Government in its request that major exporters and firms with substantial investments abroad try to improve their net contributions to a more favorable balance of payments.
>
> In an effort to maximize its own balan of payments, he said, Caterpillar began building facilities abroad in the early 1950's. These have contributed materially to an increase in exports from the United States because products manufactured abroad use substantial quantities of U.S.-built components, Blackie said.

Arrows and Olive Branches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times, on February 1, accurately analyzed the course of events which required the resumption of U.S. bombings in North Vietnam. The Times has consistently demonstrated a responsible attitude toward the President's policies in Vietnam. Their editorials have reflected the sentiments of an overwhelming majority of Americans that we must continue to be firm in our resistance to Communist aggression while always remaining ready to negotiate a peaceful solution. The Times' admonition that there are "just no easy answers" to the present crisis is a sound one and it is my hope that this reality will be accepted by my colleagues as we undertake to formulate national policy in southeast Asia.

The editorial follows:

Arrows and Olive Branches

> The U.S. bombing of North Vietnam has resumed after a pause of 37 days, during which time the American effort to sound out Hanoi on mutual steps toward de-escalation met with total failure.
>
> Indeed, even if the bombing suspension had lasted 37 weeks, it is doubtful whether the Communists would have given any concrete indications—not necessarily an agreement to negotiate—that they were prepared to diminish the tempo of the war.
>
> Secretary of State Rusk said yesterday that Hanoi had been told the United States was willing to continue the bombing pause if some quid pro quo were offered. Ho Chi Minh gave his answer the other day when he called U.S. peace overtures an "impudent threat."
>
> In the face of such intransigence, both military and political needs dictated a resumption of the air raids. The future course of events may in fact require an expansion of the air war. This is for the Commander in Chief and his military advisers to determine.
>
> Meanwhile the United States will continue to pursue diplomatic steps aimed at securing a reduction in the level of confrontation or in bringing about talks to end the war.
>
> The first move is scheduled at a U.N. Security Council meeting today, called at U.S. request. Recourse to the United Nations at this time, however, is somewhat puzzling, particularly since both U.S. and U.N. spokesmen have recently made it clear that no practical role in the Vietnam issue is seen at this time for the world body.
>
> Quite probably the U.N. move, along with other continuing diplomatic initiatives, is intended to demonstrate that even while the war goes on, the United States remains prepared to talk peace. There is nothing mutually exclusive in pursuing both the military and political paths, nor anything dangerous, so long as the military effort is not compromised in any way by false hopes about what the Communists are willing to do.
>
> It must be recognized, though, that prospects for a political settlement at this time are slim indeed.
>
> The Communists have been told with no ambiguity that they will not be permitted to gain by negotiations what they are trying to gain by force, control of South Vietnam. Continuing military pressures, in the air and on the ground, may eventually convince them they can't win by fighting. This conviction won't necessarily propel them to the conference table.
>
> The domestic debate on Vietnam meanwhile goes on. Liberal critics of the administration's policies have not been silenced by the bombing pause, but in Hanoi's response they at least were answered. Nor will more belligerent critics—particularly those who see air power as the answer to everything—be silenced or satisfied by the limited resumption of bombing.
>
> What this means is that Vietnam as a political issue will be very much with us this year, and perhaps for some time to come. The dangers of demagogy on both sides are great. Perhaps the best standards of judgment for the listening public to keep in mind is that in Vietnam, there are just no easy answers.

The Record Is Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, before resuming air strikes over North Vietnam, this country tried every conceivable way to get Hanoi to the conference table.

We went the second mile, and the third, and the fourth.

The limits to which this country did go in its search for peace is best summed up in an editorial I read in the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle.

"The Story of 37 Days," the editorial states, is the story of how we suspended bombing in North Vietnam to prove our devotion to peace; of how we sent 6 of our best diplomats to 32 capitals of the world, of how we contacted 115 governments in all, plus various organizations and the Vatican in a search for peace.

This editorial says:

> It is the story of how we kept a check with scores of governments and groupings of governments to see if Hanoi had made even the tiniest of responses. It had not. Only insults.

According to the Gannett newspapers:

> The story of 37 days has not been in vain. We have gained allies, we have made our cause clear, we have proved that peace cannot be unilateral.

Here is a clear statement of the facts on an issue of vital concern to us all and, because many will want to read and study this editorial, I herewith submit it for publication in the RECORD:

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Feb. 2, 1966]

The Story of 37 Days

Something of a mantle of sadness, of resignation, but no doubt of understanding and, perhaps even of pride, must have settled upon the Nation when first President Johnson, then Secretary of State Rusk, explained why we have resumed bombing of strategic targets such as supply lines in North Vietnam.

What they told was the story of 37 days.

It is a story unprecedented in the history of mankind.

No matter what went before, no matter if or how much we erred in the past, the story of 37 days is an epic of a great, outgoing search for peace at any price short of abject surrender and flight.

And the fact that strategic bombing has been resumed is not the end of the story of 37 days.

On the contrary, it is a continuing story; it is being pressed dramatically through the United Nations; it gets its power from a dictum of unmistakable clarity, expressed by the President in such phrases as "We have made it clear there are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace * * * our decision to stand firm has been matched by our desire for peace."

What is the story of 37 days?

It is the story of how we suspended bombing in North Vietnam to prove our devotion to peace, despite evidence that Hanoi was using the pause to beef up its infiltrating forces.

It is the story of how we sent 6 of our best diplomats to 32 capitals of the world to explain our cause and our goal, and why it is also their goal.

It is the story of how we contacted 115 governments in all, plus NATO, plus the Organization of American States, plus the Organization of African Unity, plus the Vatican; and of how we met with understanding and support from the great majority.

It is the story of how we kept a check with scores of governments and groupings of governments to see if Hanoi had made even the tiniest of responses. It had not. Only insults.

It is the story of how the President repeated again and again, in only slightly different language, that we were willing to sit down anywhere, anytime, with anybody to discuss peace, with or without a pause in the fighting.

The story of 37 days is a satisfying story, if a sad one.

But it is a great story for what it has shown.

It has shown that Hanoi will listen to no peace bids of any sort.

It was imperative that this be determined.

Hanoi has rebuffed direct American pleas.

Rebuffed pleas from nonalined nations to negotiate.

Rebuffed the Vatican.

Rebuffed pleas from nonalined nations to negotiate.

Rebuffed pleas from India to negotiate.

Rebuffed pleas from the United Nations (as Hanoi had as far back as 1964 when Russia asked Hanoi to come before the Security Council).

Its answer has always been the same: The United States (and presumably allied forces aiding the South Vietnamese) must get out of Vietnam first; then there must be recognition of the Vietcong as the sole bargaining power from the North.

Those stipulations are inhumane and unnecessary.

They are inhumane because they spell mass slaughter of South Vietnamese, and impose communism on South Vietnam without a vestige of democratic process.

They are unnecessary because the United States, even as the United Nations, is committed to permitting any nation to decide its political future as long as this is done by free and bloodless election. And we have said we will talk with the Vietcong.

The story of 37 days has not been in vain.

We have gained allies, we have made our cause clear, we have proved that peace cannot be unilateral.

Whatever happens now, the story of 37 days stands in our favor. We can do no more than what we have done and are now doing.

Wasted Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, representing as I do a Chicago area district, I found our metropolitan papers devoting considerable space in the past year to the trial of Drs. Ivy, Phillips, and Durovic in the Krebiozen matter.

It is unfortunate that this long expensive trial has still not answered the fundamental question of the value or impotence of this drug.

The Suburban Economist, in an editorial on February 6, emphasized this point of view in a most practical fashion:

Wasted Effort

After a trial in Federal court lasting 9 months in local history, the most important issue still remains unsolved.

That issue is whether Krebiozen has any merit in the treatment of cancer.

The four defendants were tried on charges of using the mails to defraud, submitting false statements to the Government, violation of the Food and Drug Act, and refusal to permit a laboratory inspection.

Although 178 witnesses testified, the jury was not asked to decide whether the drug itself was a fraud. Certainly during the 9 months that issue could, and should, have been explored. Of course, some witnesses testified the drug relieved or cured them of cancer, other witnesses, principally Government personnel, testified the defense witnesses did not have cancer or that surgery ultimately effected a cure.

As a consequence, the acquittal of Drs. Andrew Ivy and William F. P. Phillips and the Durovic brothers is not surprising. The world is hoping and praying for a cure for the scourge ailment, and the average person believes any effort to find that cure should be encouraged instead of being tied to redtape regulations.

A suspicion also prevailed that a fortune awaits the discoverer of a cure and that certain interests were more concerned in sharing in such a gain in developing the drug, just as the original biotics were improved through use and further experimentation.

Now that the costly trial is over, with great financial loss to the Government and defendants, the Food and Drug Administration or some other suitable Federal Agency should begin at once whatever tests and research are necessary to not only determine the worth of Krebiozen, but also to improve upon it if possible.

The original Salk vaccine against infantile paralysis and the original vaccines against diphtheria and other diseases were improved upon after being first introduced.

Lincoln and the War With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, over a century ago, a great American who had opposed our entry into the war with Mexico did all he could, not to obstruct the war effort, but to aid in its successful prosecution toward victory. Abraham Lincoln disagreed with President James Knox Polk, but as a Member of this body he voted for whatever was necessary for the support of the war.

In these critical days, when so many—but by no means all—of the civil rights leaders are making common cause with those who are hindering our war effort, the words of the Great Emancipator are well worth reading.

On February 1, 1848, in a letter to his law partner, William H. Herndon, Congressman Lincoln wrote:

> I have always intended, and still intend, to vote supplies; perhaps not in the precise form recommended by the President, but in a better form for all purposes, except locofoco party purposes * * *. The locos are untiring in their effort to make the impression that all who vote supplies, or take part in the war, do, of necessity, approve the President's conduct in the beginning of it; but the Whigs have, from the beginning, made and kept the distinction between the two. In the very first act, nearly all kept the distinction between the two. In the very first act, nearly all the Whigs voted against the preamble declaring that war existed by the act of Mexico, and yet nearly all of them voted for the supplies.

Mr. Lincoln wrote another letter to his partner June 22, 1848, in which he discussed the subject further:

> You ask how Congress came to declare that war existed by the act of Mexico. * * * The news reached Washington of the commencement of hostilities on the Rio Grande, and of the great peril of General Taylor's army. Everybody, Whig and Democrat, was for sending them aid, in men and money. It was necessary to pass a bill for this. The Locos had a majority in both Houses, and they brought in a bill with a preamble, saying—whereas war exists by the act of Mexico, therefore we send General Taylor men and money. The Whigs moved to strike out the preamble, so that they could vote to send the men and money, without saying anything about how the war commenced; but, being in the minority they were voted down, and the preamble was retained. Then, on the passage of the bill, the question came upon them, "shall we vote for preamble and bill both together, or against both together." They could not vote against sending help to General Taylor, and therefore they voted for both together.

Representative Lincoln addressed the House of Representatives on July 27, 1848. The following paragraph conconcerns the Mexican War:

> The declaration that we have always opposed the war, is true or false, accordingly as one may understand the term "opposing the war." If to say "the war was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by the President" be opposing the war, then the Whigs have very generally opposed it. Whenever they have spoken at all, they have said this; and they have said it on what has appeared good reason to them. But if, when the war had begun, and had become the cause of the country, the giving of our money and our blood, in common with yours, was support of the war, then it is not true that we have always opposed the war. With few individual exceptions, you have constantly had our votes here for all the necessary supplies.
>
> And, more than this, you have had the services, the blood, and the lives of our political bretheren in every trial, and on every field. The beardless boy, and the mature man—the humble and the distinguished, you have had them. Through suffering and death, by disease, and in battle, they have endured, and fought, and fell with you.

The Chicago Times—not to be confused with the present-day Chicago Sun-Times—of June 23, 1858, charged that Mr. Lincoln had voted against a bill appropriating money for the purchase of medicine and the employment of nurses for Mexican War veterans. The following day Lincoln wrote from Springfield to Henry C. Whitney:

> Give yourself no concern about my voting against the supplies, unless you are without faith that a lie can be successfully contradicted. There is not a word of truth in the charge.

On June 25 Lincoln went into detail about his votes in a letter to Joseph Medill, one of the Chicago Tribune's two copublishers:

> I was in Congress but a single term. I was a candidate when the Mexican War broke out—and I then took the ground, which I never varied from, that the administration had done wrong in getting us into the war, but that the officers and soldiers who went to the field must be supplied and sustained at all events.
>
> * * * * *
>
> When I came into Congress, money was needed to meet the appropriations made, and to be made; and accordingly on the 17th day of February 1848, a bill to borrow $18,500,000 passed the House of Representatives, for which I voted.
>
> "Again, on the 8th of March 1848, a bill passed the House of Representatives, for which I voted. * * * The last section of the act * * * contains an appropriation of $800,000 for clothing the volunteers.
>
> "You may safely deny that I ever gave any vote for withholding any supplies whatever, from officers or soldiers of the Mexican War.

The first debate with his famous rival, Senator Stephen A. Douglas, was held at Ottawa, Ill., August 21, 1858. Douglas, referring to Lincoln, said:

> Whilst in Congress, he distinguished himself by his opposition to the Mexican War, taking the side of the common enemy against his own country.

Here is Lincoln's reply to the charge:

> I think my friend, the judge, is * * * at fault when he charges me at the time when I was in Congress of having opposed our soldiers who were fighting in the Mexican War. * * * Whenever the Democratic Party tried to get me to vote that the war had been righteously begun by the President, I would not do it. But whenever they asked for any money, or land warrants, or anything to pay the soldiers there, during all that time, I gave the same votes that Judge Douglas did. * * * When he, by a general charge, conveys the idea that I withheld supplies from the soldiers who were fighting in the Mexican War, or did anything else to hinder the soldiers, he is, to say the least, grossly and altogether mistaken.

While engaged in the fourth debate with Senator Douglas at Charleston, Ill., September 18, 1858, Mr. Lincoln turned to the crowd on the platform and selected Orlando B. Ficklin, led him forward, and said:

> Mr. Ficklin * * * was a Member of Congress at the only time I was in Congress, and he knows that whenever there was an attempt to procure a vote of mine which would indorse the origin and justice of the war, I refused to give such indorsement, and voted against it; but I never voted against the supplies for the army, and he knows, as well as Judge Douglas, that whenever a dollar was asked by way of compensation or otherwise, for the benefit of the soldiers, I gave all the votes that Ficklin or Douglas did, and perhaps more.
>
> * * * * *
>
> You know they have charged that I voted against the supplies, by which I starved the soldiers who were out fighting the battles of their country. I say that Ficklin knows it is false.

There is of course no parallel between the origins of the Mexican and Vietnamese wars, as the latter conflict was already in progress when Lyndon Johnson assumed the Presidency. Just as the Whigs of over a century ago joined the Democrats in voting the necessary funds and supplies for the war with Mexico, so will the Republicans of today join with their Democratic colleagues in voting whatever is necessary for fighting the war in Vietnam to a victorious conclusion.

"Christian Responsibility in the Political Order"—An Article by Congressman John Brademas, of Indiana, Together Magazine, December 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most thoughtful article concerning the relationship between the Christian faith and political action. The article, which appears in the December 1965 issue of Together, a publication of the Methodist Church, was written by our distinguished colleague from Indiana, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS.

Congressman BRADEMAS, himself a Methodist, spoke on this same subject earlier this year at the annual service in honor of Members of Congress at the Cleveland Park Congregational Church in Washington, D.C.

The text of Congressman BRADEMAS' article, "Christian Responsibility in the Political Order," follows:

CHRISTIAN RESPONSIBILITY IN THE POLITICAL ORDER

(By JOHN BRADEMAS, Congressman, Third District, Indiana)

It is less necessary than it once was to persuade Americans of the importance of politics in the modern world. We live, whether we like it or not, in a time when the lives of all of us are touched in some important way by the actions of government. Moreover, because of our country's immense power, the lives of millions of people all over the world are affected significantly by decisions of the officials in our Government.

I represent a congressional district in northern Indiana with nearly a half million people, and the problems they bring to my office typify the broad impact of government today: Social security and veteran's pension cases, small-business loans, defense-contract problems, manpower-retraining projects, new post offices, immigration bills.

Nearly 2 years ago, I experienced firsthand the ways in which the resources of the Federal Government can be mobilized to meet a crisis that directly touches the lives of thousands of people in a local community. I represent the district in which the Studebaker automobile plant was shut down, throwing several thousands of people out of work and creating serious human hardships as well as economic distress. But we were able to bring together assistance from an extraordinary variety of Federal agencies—and not even the local chamber of commerce was decrying Federal aid 2 years ago in South Bend, Ind.

We know, of course, that Government plays a most important role in the economy of every modern country. Two world wars, a depression, the cold war, and the general acceptance of the welfare state are the principal reasons for the vastly increased importance of government in the United States. A year ago I traveled extensively in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia, all Communist nations, where nearly the entire economic effort is under government direction. And in the world's newly developing nations, government is often the focal point not only of economic planning but of nearly every important decision that is made in the entire society.

My point is simple: in modern societies in nearly every part of the world, big government is here to stay.

But if government is an increasingly important factor in the lives of people, it is imperative, at least in a society that claims to be free, for government to be the servant, not the master of the citizens. And in a free society this means recognition of the central—and legitimate—place of politics, of competition and conflict, of struggle for control of power which government is.

Surely then, there can be no denying the significance of government. Similarly, most of us can give at least tacit assent to the proposition that every citizen in a democracy has some obligation to participate in politics.

OUR CONCERN AS CHRISTIANS

The essential question for us as Christians, however, is this: why should we be concerned about politics, about government? Is there a religious responsibility incumbent upon Christians for action in the political order?

Some say no, that the Christian as an individual and the Christian church as an institution must stand aside from the hurly-burly of politics. Separation of church and state, they argue, is the same as separation of politics from religion.

I strongly disagree with this contention. Moreover, I often find it a thinly disguised argument for maintaining the status quo. I am profoundly afraid of preachers who never preach on anything but how to find personal happiness. The theme of the great World Conference of Christian Youth in Oslo some years ago was "Jesus Christ: Lord of All

Life." This means that our religious faith must touch every dimension of man's existence—social, economic, and political as well as private and individual.

If this is true, we must then have a specifically Christian perspective on responsibility for action in the political order. Surely one of the reasons Christians have such a difficult time coming to grips with politics is that they lack a perspective which is intellectually honest, theologically consistent, and realistic in the world.

Some Christians suggest—in a kind of sentimental, utopian way—that if only all men were to become Christians, we would be able to resolve the many social and political problems that afflict mankind. But even if we were all Christians, there would still be Republicans and Democrats, business and labor, black and white. We still would have problems, for there still would be conflicts of geography, of interest, of viewpoint.

DILEMMA OF RELATIONSHIPS

The core of the dilemma, as I view it, is that many Christians do not understand how they can relate the law of love to the world of politics. On the one hand, they see Christian love, agape, represented by Christ on the cross—utterly self-sacrificing, self-giving, other regarding love. On the other hand, they see the calculating world of politics, where "accommodation," "negotiation," and "compromise" are the words we characteristically use to describe what happens, for example, in a Congress composed of 435 Representatives and 100 Senators, working with or against one President—not to mention the other participants in the governmental process. Yet these are precisely the words which we ought to use if we want to get something done.

But many Christians view these seemingly irreconcilable realms of religion and politics—of the selfless Christ on the cross and the horse-trading Congressman—and conclude that there can be no link, that the two worlds can have nothing to do with each other.

Let me put the same point—that never the twain of politics and religion can meet—another way in the words of Arthur E. Walmsley, an executive of the Protestant Episcopal Church whose field is Christian citizenship. Writing in "The Church in a Society of Abundance,"[1] he says:

"In the new era, decisionmaking takes place increasingly within the context of ever larger structures: the modern corporation, the automated industry, the welfare state—group settings in which decisionmaking by teams or task forces reduces individual accountability to a minimum.

"How," he asks, "is power to be exercised responsibly in this setting? Traditional approaches of personal accountability, as expressed in the Protestant ethic, fail to come to grips with the nature of structure and context of the new era. * * * The humanization of the social order does not reduce itself, in situations such as this, to the categories of Christian love."

Christians, sensing the extraordinary complexity of the modern age, notes Walmsley, look with nostalgia to a simpler era when men made most of their important decisions face to face, and felt a sense of personal choice and personal accountability.

But we live in a different time, in a more vast and complicated society, where men's lives are determined in large measure by powers and principalities—corporations, government, unions—rather than by their next door neighbors or the family who lives down the road a piece.

What, then, has the law of love—of utterly un-self-regarding love—to say to such a world, to a President or a Congressman?

Does it say to withdraw? Does it say we must reject making decisions about the use of power in such a world? My answer is "No." My answer is that there is a link between the law of love and the practice of politics, a concept which relates the two. That concept is justice.

The concept of justice varies in human history, but I suggest that at the very least justice means guaranteeing to every man his due, assuring that he gets what is coming to him—what he is entitled to as a man.

JUSTICE IS NOT LOVE

Now justice is not the same as love. Love does not count or reckon—but justice does. Justice must be calculating. It is not love, therefore, but justice that should be the immediate objective of political action.

As Walmsley says, "The balance of the rights and responsibilities of one group against those of another involves issues of justice." This "balance of rights and responsibilities" of competing groups, of course, is the very stuff of politics. Justice, then, is not a hand-me-down kind of concept.

"Justice seen in this light," Walmsley declares, "is not a crude approximation of love but the means by which the Christian cooperates with the will of God precisely in the midst of life."

As Theologian Reinhold Niebuhr puts it, "justice is the instrument of love."

And as the late William Temple said: "Associations cannot love one another; a trade union cannot love an employers' federation, nor can one national state love another. The members of one may love the members of the other so far as opportunities of intercourse allow. That will help in negotiations; but it will not solve the problem of the relationships between the two groups. Consequently, the relevance of Christianity in these spheres is quite different from what many Christians suppose it to be. Christian charity manifests itself in the temporal order as a supernatural discernment of, and adhesion to, justice in relation to the equilibrium of power."[2]

Look at the greatest issue of our time here at home, civil rights, and listen to Martin Luther King:

"I'm not asking for a law to make the white man love me, just a law to restrain him from lynching me."

Listen to the language of legislation: parity for farmers, equitable tax laws, fair labor standards—and we hear echoes of the concept of justice.

Is love then irrelevant to political action? No. On the contrary, it is our love for our fellow man—commanded us by Christ—that generates in us a concern that our fellow man be treated justly. Love is the force that motivates our commitment to justice.

So we now have in the concept of justice, I believe, a link that binds together the worlds of Christian faith and political action—and does so in an intellectually honest, theologically consistent and realistic way.

MEN ARE SINNERS

Let me turn to yet another reason beyond the love commandment which imposes on us as Christians a religious responsibility to strive for justice among men.

It is that men are sinners—that men, you and I, tend to put ourselves rather than God at the center of life.

This is, of course, simply another way of stating the doctrine of original sin. It is this doctrine, rather than the idea that man is naturally good, that is the unarticulated view of human nature on which most politicians—at least the successful ones—proceed.

This is not, I must emphasize, a cynical view, not one that declares men are evil through and through.

You may recall Machiavelli's comment: "Whoever organizes a state and arranges laws for the government of it must presuppose that all men are wicked and that they will not fail to show their natural depravity whenever they have a clear opportunity, though possibly it may be concealed for a while."

Not so, for to paraphrase Niebuhr: Men are good enough to make democracy work. Men are bad enough to make democracy necessary.

It is in part this more skeptical but uncynical view of human nature that caused the Founding Fathers to write into the fabric of our American Constitution a system of checks and balances. We do elect Members of Congress and entrust them with certain powers, but for only 2 years. And even Senators of the United States are required to have their credentials reviewed every 6 years. The President has the veto power, but he can be overridden. Men are good enough to make democracy work but bad enough to make democracy—with all its checks and limitations on the rulers—necessary.

It is this propensity of men to injustice—to unwarranted self-seeking—that is a chief purpose of political action to curb and channel while at the same time promoting a wider degree of justice, a fair share for all men.

I do not say that all political questions can be resolved readily into simple issues of justice or injustice, for many problems facing government are primarily technical in nature, requiring expertise and know-how.

Nor do I say that all political issues have two equal sides although sometimes, as with civil rights, there is clearly greater weight on one side than the other.

THE POLITICIAN'S TASK

In my view, it is the task of the politician to seek in the given circumstances—with all the skill and imagination he can muster—the greatest measure of justice for all concerned.

I believe Christians have a particular obligation to seek justice for the disinherited. As Dean John C. Bennett of Union Theological Seminary has said, "Christ himself concentrated on the people of greatest need, the people whom respectable society neglected or despised." It is this aggressive caring for the people who cannot defend themselves which is essential when the Christian makes political judgments. It is, I suggest, at least one of the major motivations behind the present war on poverty.

The disinherited are now being heard both at home (witness the Negro revolt) and in the developing nations of the world. Paternalism will not do as an answer to this cry.

I have said that all men's lives are today immensely influenced by what governments do, and that Christians have a religious responsibility, motivated by love, to seek justice for their fellow men. I conclude, therefore, that if the church of Christ is to say anything to men today, it must speak to them not only in their individual and family capacities but also to the social, economic, and political dimensions of their existence.

Niebuhr tells the story of how, at the beginning of this century, the late Bishop Charles Williams of Michigan was approached by a young clergyman with a plan for organizing a Christian layman's league. Learning that the league's chief objective was to close all movie houses on Sunday, the bishop said, "I should think that could wait until you have solved the weightier matters of the law."

Niebuhr warns that: "The church, as does every other institution, sinks into triviality when it fails to deal with the weightier matters of the law, particularly the law of love or the basic concern of the self for the neighbor."

If the Christian church today fails to touch on the "weightier matters of the law"—on the outrageous treatment of Negroes in both North and South, on the paradox of poverty in the richest Nation in human history, on the slums still festering in our great cities, on the problems of devising a tolerable peace

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

in a nuclear world—then on what matters will it touch?

If the church has nothing to say on these great issues, it has little of significance to say about anything, because these are the crucial issues of our time.

CHURCH VOICES ARE HEARD

Fortunately, voices are being heard within the church of Christ which speak out fearlessly and eloquently to urge the church and Christians as individuals to touch on the "weightier matters of the law."

We hear one such voice in Dr. King who, more than any other American of our time, has moved our country toward realization of the conviction which we vaunt in words: that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

Indeed, I would single out two contemporary developments as the most influential forces shaping the present reawakening of social and political concern on the part of the Christian churches of America.

The first, without question, is the civil rights movement. The Christian churches were a long time awakening to the sin of segregation, but they were stabbed awake by the Negro revolution. Most Members of Congress in 1964 knew full well that the church leaders brought genuine religious commitment—and, I may say, some political muscle—to the battle for civil rights legislation. For the first time in a long time, we heard from the church on a major national issue—and it made a difference.

The other event that shook the world—Christian and non-Christian, Catholic and non-Catholic—was the papacy of John XXIII. Pope John gave new meaning and fresh urgency to the Christian's responsibility for the social and political order. Read his encyclicals on poverty, on race relations, on peace in the modern world, and you will find a spirit speaking with relevance and power to the "weightier matters of the law."

THE CHRISTIAN IN POLITICS

Although I do not advocate Christian political parties and although I find the phrase "Christian politician" suspect as both self-serving and inaccurate, it must be obvious that I believe Christians should get into politics.

For Christians, subject to the limitations of all men, can nonetheless be inspired by the law of love to enter the struggle for justice and be ready, even eager, to use political action as a legitimate weapon (but not the only one) in that struggle. The point is that politics, seen from a Christian perspective, can be a Christian vocation just as much as being a minister or missionary.

May I be bold enough to offer some guidelines to Christians in politics:

1. It is not sufficient to be a good Christian to be effective in politics. You must also be a good politician—that is, know your job.

2. You must have or develop a thick skin. The other day I chanced upon a sermon preached on an election day in Hartford, Conn., by one Nathan Strong. Mr. Strong's admonition to politicians nearly 175 years ago is, I think, worth repeating today:

"A ruler needs religion much more than his unofficered brethren, to support his mind under trials, and to guard him against temptations. When the respectable citizen rises from private into public life, he must expect to exchange quietness for trouble; honor, though alluring, has its bitterness and its dangers; enemies, before unknown, will rise up; the jealous will sift all his actions, and what man can be so guarded as to have his behavior escape censure? The ambitious, thinking him in the way of their own progress, will be his enemies. To support the mind under these evils, and lead it into the exercise of prudence and patience, religion is necessary."

3. All policies, societies, governments, and all politicians are under God's judgment. None must be absolutized or defiled as incarnating God's will—for none is righteous—no, not one. The Christian in politics will, therefore, always live under tension, always aware that he measures political achievements by standards that require ever greater effort. He can never be satisfied.

4. The Christian in politics must be outgoing and must actively seek justice and combat injustice. I should add, however, that there is no mandate on him to ride at full armor into every battle that comes along. If he does, he will soon deplete his forces and diminish his effectiveness. He must make realistic judgments on when and where to move.

5. The Christian in politics is armed with a unique understanding of human nature. He realizes that man is made in the image of God, yet prideful; he is aware of the role of self-interest in politics, of his own as well as that of others. He knows that, as an active participant in politics, he often will find himself in morally ambiguous situations. But as Dean Bennett said, "Instead of being unnerved by guilt or despair in their midst, Christians do know the experience of receiving grace and forgiveness while they take responsibility."[3]

It is this forgiving love of God which above all will sustain the Christian in politics as well as in every other work of life.

---

[1] Quotes from "The Church in a Society of Abundance" by Arthur E. Walmsley (Seabury Press, $3.95) used by permission of publisher.

[2] From "What Christians Stand For in the Secular World," as published in Student, 1944.

[3] Quote from "When Christians Make Political Decisions" by John C. Bennett, a Reflection Book (Association Press, .50 cents).

U.S. Policy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Rabbi Juda Glasner, spiritual leader of Congregation Mishkan Yicheskel, Sunland-Tujunga, Calif., I insert in the RECORD for the benefit of those who are interested in the debate on U.S. policy in Vietnam, his views as reflected in a recent public statement.

As U.S. prosecution of the war in Vietnam gains momentum, so does debate here in Congress and elsewhere throughout the country and the free world—and, yes, even behind the Iron Curtain where opinion on the Vietnam conflict varies among those representing different ideological factions in the Communist enclave.

I do not think anyone—with the possible exception of the President—expects to reach a consensus on any issue which holds forth such grave and far-reaching ramifications as Vietnam.

While not everyone will embrace Rabbi Glasner's position as their own, he does represent a viewpoint which is shared, either in part or in whole, by a substantial number of his fellow Americans. As one who supports full and open debate on our Vietnam policy, and who believes that all manner of opinion on this critical issue deserves to be heard, I submit Rabbi Glasner's statement for the benefit of the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY RABBI JUDA GLASNER ON THE VIETNAM WAR

It is with deep concern that we learned about the endeavors of some religious organizations in urging the President of the United States to prevent any escalation of the war in Vietnam if present peace efforts fail. Religious leaders throughout the country are greatly disturbed about this statement since it does not reflect the thinking of the entire Jewish community throughout the Nation.

Many religious leaders, including myself, believe that our primary task is to foster religion and to safeguard the religious way of life. In pursuing this objective we could serve our country much better by limiting our activities to the promotion of these spiritual and moral goals. In offering advice to the authorities whose responsibility it is to conduct the affairs of our country, we are intruding into a field in which we do not have sufficient background of knowledge and experience. The President and his Cabinet are eminently qualified to weigh the pros and cons of this grave situation and to determine which course of action will best serve the interest of our Nation.

Any statements from religious organizations suggesting policies to our Government are beyond the scope of such religious organizations and will only emasculate the efforts of our Government to win peace with honor and dignity.

We believe that we need to embark upon a program designed to rally around our Government in support of those endeavors which will promote peace with justice and secure our own freedom as well as that of other nations.

Retain Popular Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, since the President expressed his support for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives, there has been considerable discussion on this subject.

This is, of course, a complicated question. I recognize the value of the 2-year term and the desirability of keeping the House responsive to the people of the Nation. The following editorial from Paddock Publications, Inc., Arlington Heights, Ill., publishers of 16 suburban newspapers, presents a forceful argument in favor of retaining the 2-year term:

RETAIN POPULAR CONTROL

Attention has been focused on the role of Congress as the result of President Johnson's proposal to elect U.S. Representatives for 4-year terms, the election to take place during presidential election years.

The chief argument for the change is that it would free Congressmen from frequent reelection campaigns and therefore give them the time and peace of mind needed to become more effective legislators.

This sounds good in a text-bookish sort of way. But a second look at the proposal reveals it would do more harm than good.

Men who are good legislators will be good not matter how long their terms, and those who are bad won't be cured by giving them longer tenure. Perhaps they would become even worse.

The aim of freeing Congressmen for legislative activity can be achieved just as well by giving them greater clerical and research help.

The fatal flaw in the President's proposal is that it would remove Federal Government even further from popular control. Congressmen find it difficult enough now to assert their independence of the White House. If Congressmen were elected only in presidential election years, they would be still more beholden to the President.

A popular check on the Federal administration every 2 years is not too often in these days of fast-moving events. Four years would be too long an interval.

The effective Congressman does not fear going to the voters frequently. Part of his job is to know what his constituents are thinking and to inform them how he is voting and why. This activity is not a waste of time, but rather is a positive good.

Two-year terms for U.S. Representatives should be retained.

"Education: The New Frontier for American Business"—An Address by Congressman John Brademas, Sales Executives Club of New York City, February 8, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BRADEMUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of an address I delivered on February 8, 1966, to the Sales Executives Club of New York City on the subject: "Education: The New Frontier for American Business."

The address follows:

EDUCATION: THE NEW FRONTIER FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

(An address by Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, Sales Executives Club of New York City, February 8, 1966)

I am here today as a practicing politician, one who sits on the committee of the House of Representatives with primary responsibility for legislation in the field of education and, as a member of this committee I have, during the past 7 years talked with college and university presidents, students, and teachers here in our own country as well as in Buenos Aires and Berlin, London and Djakarta, Warsaw, and Moscow.

This experience has given me at least some awareness of the challenges which now confront the schools and colleges and universities of the United States and which therefore confront not only us in Government but you, as leaders of business and industry, as well.

I say "therefore" because it seems to me increasingly clear that the relationships among education and Government and business are growing more intimate in this country rather than less.

Let me make my point by citing some random events of recent days:

1. A few weeks ago John Maynard Keynes appeared on the cover of Time, a posthumous tribute to the new economics which has helped make possible Government policies that are now sparking the greatest business boom in history.

2. Next week Congress celebrates—and I use the word advisedly—the 20th anniversary of the passage of the Employment Act of 1946.

3. Yesterday the House of Representatives passed the cold war GI bill, which will bring to veterans of Vietnam educational benefits approaching half a billion dollars annually by 1970.

4. Last week President Johnson urged Congress to pass the International Education Act of 1966 and companion measures designed, said the President, "to rid mankind of the slavery of ignorance and the scourge of disease."

5. A Harris poll reported yesterday that 72 percent of the American people believe the country can afford both guns and butter but that if domestic reductions should become necessary, the last two programs to be cut are aid to college education and health care.

6. The titles of two front page stories in last Sunday's New York Times financial section read, "Technology Stirs Search for Profits" and "Electronics and Books: Merger Path," and the Times spoke of the "race for a probable multibillion-dollar prize."

I was not at all surprised then when this week's mail brought me and other Congressmen a printed copy of a recent lecture by President Joseph Wilson of the Xerox Corp. entitled, "The Conscience of Business."

GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS, AND EDUCATION DEPEND ON EACH OTHER

For today, ladies and gentlemen, Government, business, and education are like three men in a boat, and all three depend in significant ways on each other.

I spoke of the challenges which face our institutions of education. Here are just a few:

The landing of Luna 9 makes clear the man's exploration of space, including a visit to the moon, the stuff of science fiction a few years ago, is now within reach.

During our lifetime, man has learned to unleash against his fellow man destructive forces beyond the power of most of us to imagine.

Here at home, one long century after Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, Negro Americans have burst into the national consciousness to insist that our country—and theirs—make real the bright promise of freedom.

Each day's newspaper reminds us of new nations of the world pressing their claims not only for political independence but for a fairer share of the material benefits of the planet as well.

Surely it must be clear that our capacity for coping with these challenges is directly related to the strength and resiliency of our system of education.

PRESIDENTS KENNEDY AND JOHNSON AND 88TH AND 89TH CONGRESSES RESPOND TO CHALLENGES

It was to increase the Nation's investment in education and thereby help respond to those challenges that, with the leadership of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, both the 88th and present Congresses enacted into law a whole series of education bills.

Even a partial recital of the litany of new measures may weary you. The Higher Education Acts of 1963 and 1965, the Vocational Education Act, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Library Services and Construction Act, the State Technical Services Act, the National Defense Education Act and subsequent amendments, the Arts and Humanities Foundation Act, the Historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and all the programs embraced within the war on poverty.

From fiscal 1964 to fiscal 1966, Federal spending on education has soared from $4.5 to $8.7 billion, and the expenditures of the Office of Education have jumped over fourfold in 3 years.

My point here is simple. It is that the Nation is now making and will continue to make an enormous investment in education. But the passage of all these laws by no means solves all our problems.

AMERICAN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY HAS GREAT STAKE IN EDUCATION

Surely American business and industrial community has a great stake in this investment—for at least two reasons. As businessmen, you can see very clearly that the revolution in American education offers remarkable profitmaking opportunities.

As citizens, you have a responsibility for helping our country meet the challenges of which I speak.

I believe that education is, for both these reasons, the new frontier which should command the best genius and enterprise of American business and industry. Let me try to explain why.

I have suggested that education is big business. It is. We now spend about $40 billion annually for formal education in this country.

Seventeen billion dollars of this amount are spent on purchasable manufactured items; desks, buses, paper, chalk, textbooks, maps, basketballs, cosmetics for school, blackout curtains, slide projectors, shop tools, insurance, toilets, easels, pianos, and globes. Schools are consumers and they consume in almost every area of industrial production.

But there are other substantial if less tangible benefits which education holds for industry.

The progress of the American economy, as of every other sector of our national life, depends in very large measure on education. It is clear that our increasingly sophisticated economy requires an increasingly sophisticated work force. This is one reason I introduced the Technical-Education Bill of 1963, subsequently made part of the Higher Education Facilities Act of that year. The purpose of this bill was to help produce more 2-year college-level, semiprofessional technicians to help our scientists, physicians, and engineers.

Education has long helped the American farmer achieve extraordinary feats of productivity. The land grant colleges and the rural extension programs are the most famous symbols of the contribution of education to economic growth.

With the passage of the State Technical Services Act last year, we hope in like fashion to help make available to American business and industry the latest findings of science and technology. For example, your firm under this new program could arrange with a local university seminars to upgrade your engineers.

All the recent legislation to strengthen colleges and universities and to enable more qualified young people to become students is aimed at producing well-educated men and women, a fundamental manpower requirement for American business and industry.

EDUCATION IS GOOD FOR BUSINESS

Certainly educated men and women mean a better market for business. The high school graduate earns about $35,000 more during his lifetime than the dropout, and the college graduate earns $138,000 more than the high school graduate. And as the educational level of the consumer rises, so does his receptivity to new ideas, new products, and new services. We educate to a steadily rising standard of living.

Educational expenditures not only lead to bigger markets for businessmen but also help cut production costs. For example, the better high school preparation young people get in mathematics, science and English, the faster—and more cheaply—they can learn new techniques in on-the-job-training programs.

I think it relevant here to note that a number of modern economists have begun to lay more stress on human as distinguished from physical capital as a contributor to economic growth. Theodore Schultz of the University of Chicago and Edward Denison of the Brookings Institution are among the best known students of this relationship. Both agree that education, as it affects the quality of labor, has been responsible, over a given period, for over 20 percent of the annual rate of growth in the gross national product.

I can tell you by citing only one example—and I could cite many more—that politicians certainly recognize the close link between education and business. I refer to the mad scramble for the Atomic Energy Commission's new 200-bev accelerator. Every Senator and Congressman knows that major scientific installations in his State or district mean better business and more jobs.

So let us agree without my having to offer any more evidence, of which there is an abundance, that education attracts and holds business and industry, creates new resources, and builds new markets: the basic commodity of the civilized world is knowledge and the educator is its retailer. With the greatly increased financial support which government, especially the Federal Government, is now giving education, it is, I think, self-evident that we must develop a triangle of close cooperation among government, business, and education.

And there are hopeful signs. Major corporations seeking to diversify now look to the textbook and educational equipment firms as sound investments. You know the list better than I do.

Private industry, with its long history of productive research programs, has already begun to develop and test teaching machines, data processing, audiovisual and other advanced and experimental teaching equipment and materials for the Nation's schools.

Industry is only now becoming a major contributor to the network linking basic research to new educational tools, equipment to curricula, teaching methods to school organization, preschool training to postdoctoral results.

WHY EDUCATION IS THE "NEW FRONTIER" FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

And all the bills we have been passing in Washington are obviously further stimulus to American business and industry to move more and more boldly into the education market.

But the sudden availability of substantial sums of money to be spent on education is only one of the reasons that education is the new frontier for American business.

You must believe me therefore when I tell you that the best educators of the country are ready for innovation; they want new ideas. You have consumers yearning to be sold and, as I have said, they have the money to buy, much of it Federal.

Indeed, a careful study of the major provisions of the recent education legislation will reveal that Congress, too, shares this desire to encourage new and better ways to teach and to learn. A preoccupation with raising the quality of education at every level runs through the hearings on nearly all these bills. It was, for example, the principal motivation of the Teacher Fellowship bill I authored last year which later found its way into the Higher Education Act and which is aimed directly at improving the quality of education in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools by improving the quality of the teachers.

Congress and the educators of the country not only want more education; they want better education.

Surely this concern to stimulate innovation and quality should spur the spirit of enterprise of American industry.

Another reason the hour is ripe for American business to ride with all flags flying on to the field of American education is the sudden confluence of major social forces making for change: the civil rights movement, the ecumenical movement, the papacy of John 23d, the war on poverty, and an activist, hard-driving President committed to education as has been no other President in American history and supported by strong majorities in both Houses of Congress who share his commitment.

AMERICAN EDUCATION NEEDS EXPERIENCE AND IMAGINATION OF AMERICAN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

I hope that by now I have made clear to you that if war is too important to be left to the generals, education is too important to be left solely to the educators. For to solve the problems that face American education today, we also need the intelligence and experience, the imagination and inventiveness of American business and industry.

Frankly, I believe it would be immensely valuable for those of us in Washington with responsibility to make decisions about education, both in the excecutive and legislative branches, to consult more often than we now do with you in the business and industrial communities. We need your ideas on how we can attack some of the problems that beset us, and, if I may say so, I would hope that you would not suffer too greatly for having had coffee with a Congressman.

SOME TROUBLESOME QUESTIONS ABOUT AMERICAN EDUCATION

Let me here give you just a sampling of the kinds of questions about American education that are troubling some of us in Congress, questions where we need your counsel and advice and questions which I hope you will consider as you and your firms do your planning for the future—and the future is right now.

These are all questions the answers to which—if there are answers—are likely to lead to profits for business and will surely be to the advantage of the Nation.

In architecture: What are the best kinds of buildings for teaching the children of the poor, for teaching other children? Are there optimum size classes for various teaching conditions? Should we be building playgrounds on rooftops in crowded inner cities?

In teaching: How do you teach the individual child with his individual strengths and weaknesses? How do you discover those strengths and weaknesses? How can a teacher teach a variety of kinds of children in one classroom? When is the best time to introduce children to new fields of study? Are there better ways of teaching the mentally retarded?

Integration: How do you overcome de facto segregation in northern schools? What is the relationship of patterns of Negro mobility to the school systems in big cities?

Poverty: How do you best teach poor children? What kinds of materials? How do you motivate these children? How can you get at the deprivation that extends into the rest of their lives in terms of inadequate food and clothing and housing? How do you reach and teach the parents of the children of poverty?

Vocational education: How do you bring it into line with the manpower needs of today's business and industry. Can we restructure vocational education to appeal more effectively to dropouts?

Materials: What course materials, audiovisual aids, are best in enabling children of different ages, backgrounds, abilities, to learn?

Teachers: What is the best way to teach teachers? How to reeducate them? How to bring new materials and methods to both teachers and administrators? How to recruit good teachers?

Preschool education: Should we undertake a massive investment in preschool programs for all children? only poor children? Do we have enough child-development specialists? Are special buildings and equipment required?

Adult and continuing education: Should we have continuing education programs both to retrain workers in new skills and to enhance the value of their leisure time? What kinds of programs? teaching methods?

International education: What kinds of education can we provide to the underdeveloped countries? What can we learn for American education from educational methods and programs in foreign countries?

There are many more questions I could raise. These are only examples, and perhaps not the right ones. I hope you have others.

But above all, you should be thinking and thinking hard about the best ways to teach and to learn, and you should not wait until tomorrow.

EDUCATION: BOTH A MARKET AND A RESPONSIBILITY FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

For I must reiterate that the new frontier for American business is education.

In the first place, education is a market which should excite and stimulate your profitmaking instinct, a wholly legitimate and nonsubversive instinct.

In the second place, improving American education is a responsiblity which, as citizens of a democracy, you should enthusiastically welcome. For I am sure you want to do more than make money. It was that great philosopher of education, Alfred North Whitehead, who said, "* * * a great society is a society in which its men of business think greatly of their functions."

I hope you will think greatly of yours.

Editorials Say President's Peace Efforts Brand Reds as Aggressors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's peace offensive and the implacable refusal by North Vietnam to discuss peace have exposed the Communists as the aggressors in southeast Asia. This is the substance of a perceptive editorial recently published in the Nashville Tennessean.

The Knoxville Journal in an editorial on January 18 has a telling analysis of the alternatives President Johnson and our Nation face in Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent, I insert these editorials in the Appendix of the RECORD because of their broad general interest to my colleagues and to the Nation.

The editorials follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean]

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE MUST STILL BE PUSHED

President Johnson has sent American bombers back over North Vietnam, ending a 37-day lull during which he pushed peace talks around the world. The peace talks will continue—will perhaps be intensified—but the President has decided that the situation can no longer remain static while the Communists build up new stocks of men and material in South Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson coupled his order to resume bombing with instructions to Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to act as quickly as possible to promote peace through the United Nations.

The President's appeal to the U.N. represents a departure from past policy, and indicates that this country will now give more emphasis to convincing the U.N. that Communist aggression in southeast Asia is a world problem, and not one just for the United States alone to deal with.

Heretofore, the administration has welcomed the U.N.'s concern over the Vietnamese war, but it has appeared cool to any suggestion that the U.N. be given a major hand in settling the dispute. Yesterday, however Mr. Johnson called for an immediate meeting of the U.N. Security Council in an effort to bring the Vietnam conflict to the conference table.

It is uncertain what role the U.N. can play. It seems unlikely that a peacekeeping force could be the answer. But there is no doubt that the problem should be before the U.N. for discussion and for the purpose of engendering whatever pressure the free nations may be able to bring to bear upon the Communist aggressors.

It is widely regretted that the 37-day lull found no favorable Communist response to the President's peace efforts and that he found it necessary to resume the bombing.

However, according to Mr. Johnson, his advisers had told him that if continued immunity were given to those who support Vietnamese aggression the cost in American lives would be greatly increased.

"In the light of the words and actions of the government in Hanoi," he said, "it is our clear duty to do what we can to limit these costs."

Although it is regrettable to see the lull in the bombing come to an end, it is clear that the 37-day period—in which Mr. Johnson sought unsuccessfully in many places for a way to end the fighting in Vietnam—has exposed the Communists before the world as the aggressors in southeast Asia.

Their refusal, even to talk about peace, and their denunciations of Mr. Johnson's efforts, have left most people with the impression that peace is the last thing the Communists want.

The resumption of the bombing is consistent with the President's policy of impressing upon the North Vietnamese this country's determination to remain in southeast Asia, while pursuing every path that might lead to peace.

It is not an easy choice in Vietnam for Mr. Johnson—or for the Nation. It is hoped a way will soon be found to end the fighting, but in view of the latest developments it seems the Nation must be prepared to see the situation get worse before it gets better.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal]

L.B.J.'s COMPREHENSIVE OFFERS

Most Americans, and people in other countries as well, must have by this time come to the conclusion there are three choices for the President where the Vietnam war is concerned.

One of these is to pull out all American forces and thereby undermine confidence in our commitments throughout the world.

The second choice would be escalation of the war against the Hanoi regime, with the possibility of finally undertaking a ground war against the Red Chinese.

A third one would be the continuation of the war at its present level from the concentration of troops and airpower that have been built up over the past year.

The third choice presumes a war of indefinite length, for one of its end purposes would be to outstay Ho Chi Minh and his hard core of Communists who now control the Hanoi regime. Ho is 75 years of age and, as the saying goes, he can't live forever. Whether he will have hard line successors equally dedicated to communism and anti-Americanism, only time will tell.

Actually, it was reasonably clear, a fact which the President no doubt took into consideration before he launched his "peace offensive," that nothing short of abject surrender would satisfy the Hanoi Communists.

Not every reader has in mind the depth and breadth of the offers the Johnson administration has already made in volunteering to talk with Hanoi without conditions. Following is a summary of what the President has already conceded:

This country wants no military bases in southeast Asia.

The United States does not want to keep troops in South Vietnam, once peace is assured.

Free elections are desired in South Vietnam to give the people a government of their own choice. Reunification of the country can be determined by free decision.

Countries of southeast Asia can be nonalined or neutral, if that is their wish.

The United States is prepared to contribute to reconstruction in southeast Asia at least $1 billion in which North Vietnam can share.

The Communist National Liberation Front, or Vietcong, can be represented in talks, once aggression stops.

The reader may well ask what other offer, or reward, could be held out to the Hanoi regime short of complete surrender. The answer seems to us to be that there is not a place for any other decoration on the Christmas tree.

American Labor Movement Joins War on Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, more than 300 persons from 32 States came to Washington recently to attend the organizational meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis.

One of the best speeches given at that meeting was delivered by Pat Greathouse, a vice president of the United Autoworkers Union.

Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, will start holding hearings next Monday on the world food crisis. On the eve of these hearings on one of the most important matters before Congress, I believe that Mr. Greathouse's excellent speech will be of interest to my colleagues:

SPEECH BY UAW VICE PRESIDENT PAT GREATHOUSE AT CONFERENCE ON WORLD FOOD CRISIS

I am here as a spokesman for the union that makes the tractors, the combines, the haybalers, the milking machines, and the trucks that have made American agriculture the marvel of all times. And I am here as a spokesman for the American labor movement, which believes we cannot live on a high hill with good food and housing, surrounded by starving millions upon millions of people.

The world food crisis is here. It is a terrifying day-to-day fact. Other speakers here today will document what it means in caloric intake per person, to young children, to whole nations, to vast continents. All I can say is that there is no longer any debating of the facts. Worldwide hunger is a desperate, agonizing fact. I am here to say that the UAW and the American labor movement are ready to respond with action, with compassion, and with readiness to serve as hunger fighters in this noble cause to sustain life for all mankind.

The food-for-peace program is more than 10 years old now, and I submit that food for peace has demonstrated in a small way what can be done on a much bigger scale to feed the hungry, to mobilize resources, to help developing countries get on their feet. Food for peace has helped to build railroads, fertilizer plants, schools, hospitals, and agricultural training centers. But now we come to a time in history when we must rethink the dimensions of world hunger, see clearly what our American responsibility is, and then set out to do what needs to be done.

We all know what the faultfinders will say. They will point to the bloopers. Shipments will rot on docks. Road machinery will rust in the jungle. Some high-priced personnel will go astray. These things happen and will happen again. But they are absolutely no argument for putting our heads in the sand and ignoring our responsibilities to the rest of the world.

You know, we've been pretty lucky in this country. We took this huge country, chopped down the trees, cleared its rich land, harnessed its waterways and power, laced it with roads of every kind. Our cities have never been bombed; we've never known mass starvation; and while life has not always been a bed of roses, Lady Luck has been with us most of the time.

Today we are locked tightly in a war many miles away where our sons and our fortunes are being lost in an ever-escalating cost in human lives and money. The war in Vietnam is a tragic conflict for us, for the Vietnamese, and for the world. I mention this now to remind us all that history does not stand still. If we had been willing to invest the time, the money, the very lives that are now spent in war 10 years ago in a worldwide war against want and hunger, who knows—perhaps there would be no war in Vietnam today.

The president of our union, Walter P. Reuther, has said many times, and it always bears repeating, that we must learn to dedicate to the positive cause of peace and brotherhood what we so readily give to the negative cause of war.

I tell you today that it is better for us to send our people overseas armed with tractors and plows, slide rules, welding machines, irrigation rigs, and tool kits—than to draft them to go overseas with flamethrowers, bazooka guns, napalm bombs, and automatic rifles. We in the UAW said this 20 years ago—it is more true today than it ever was.

Some people may say you will raise food prices at home. Others will say we should abandon all farm programs, take off all restraints. Neither is the answer. We can protect farm income at home, and we must. We can do what needs doing without jeopardizing our economy. And we can still give the American consumer bargains in food.

What about the charge we are trying to dump our goods on foreign shores, wipe out or discourage necessary food production in countries with huge food deficits?

Any program to be successful must combine emergency feeding with increased development and production. It was with this in mind that the decade of the sixties was named the decade of development.

We have now reached the point in time where we have the technical knowledge and resources to build any kind of a society we want, barring nuclear war. We are spending over $50 billion a year for defense, and it is not hurting our economy. In fact, many people mistakenly feel that we need this as a stimulus. A defense program by its very nature only buys us time. We must use that time to improve conditions and lessen the need for defense. We have the knowledge and manpower to produce equipment and methods to increase agricultural production in all parts of the world, and it is our moral duty to use them.

We have advocated for the past 4 years use of skilled mechanics and operators by the Peace Corps to help operate and maintain equipment to build farm-to-market roads and to increase agricultural production.

I might point out that the UAW will shortly have a Peace Corps auto mechanics program—the very first of its kind—in full operation in Guinea. We expect this to demonstrate that the Peace Corps has just begun to tap the great reservoir of technical know-how waiting to serve around the world where needed.

Our problem is not so much how to accomplish this, but when, or how soon. My answer to that is—the sooner the better.

Over 3 years ago at the World Food Congress here in Washington, I proposed a plan which could easily fit into any new program to step up food production. I proposed six courses of action, which I'd like to enumerate again very briefly.

First, establish regional depots and distribution centers of capital equipment—where tractors, plows, pumps, road machinery, and other equipment to improve food production could be available on short notice and could be properly serviced and maintained. These regional centers could be within a given country or serve nationwide, depending on the geographic circumstances.

Second, I propose regional universities—like our own land-grant colleges—to intensify seed experimentation and other scientific plans for improving farm productivity. This would be done to spread learning throughout the countryside. While there is still suspicion of new ways in many primitive countries, there must be better ways to pass along information to improve productivity.

Third, closely related to this, regional concentration and distribution centers for scientific equipment. As I said to the World Food Congress, "We are separated by only a very thin wall from a breakthrough into a world of plenty no science fiction has ever imagined."

Fourth, we favor regional research centers focusing on the resources and needs of the area. This again is closely related with the other two proposals.

Fifth, a coordinated worldwide effort to utilize wealth locked up in every human being as investment capital. This is really why we are concerned about full employment in the United States and eradicating hunger in the world. People—educated, well-fed people—are the greatest resource of all because it is people who ultimately fashion computers, cranes, bridges, turbines, and all the other wonders of this industrial age.

Sixth and finally, we proposed a commitment by the United Nations and ourselves that the social and economic progress we seek can be accomplished only by a new worldwide agency to help establish free and forward-looking institutions so democracy can prevail.

If we are to be successful in conquering poverty and hunger, there is another important resource we must develop. We have the know-how to split the atom. We will go to the moon. We can conquer disease. But we have not learned to make one drop of water. There is the same amount of water in, on, and around the earth that there has been since the beginning of time. We can change the form, pollute and purify—we cannot produce water. We must find a way to provide an abundant supply of fresh water in all parts of the world. This in itself can stimulate and increase agricultural production.

President Johnson, speaking to the delegates to the desalinization symposium at the White House on October 7, 1965, said:

"Over various areas of the world today water is the key to man's prosperity or man's poverty—the key to his comfort or his misery. Every 24 hours there are nearly 200,000 more people on this earth. A billion human beings also live on the ragged edge of starvation. Water is a prime necessity, for only if we have water can our growing population ever be fed. Only water can give future generations a chance to escape wholesale misery and wholesale starvation.

"My country, as you know, supports with enthusiasm a continuing food-for-peace program. We support an atoms-for-peace program. We are committed to harnessing the awesome power of nuclear energy for the betterment of humanity.

"And today I want to announce the beginning of a water-for-peace program. Under this new program we will join in a massive cooperative international effort to find solution for man's water problems."

I urge this Conference to endorse this proposal and pledge assistance toward the achieving of these goals.

Any massive program to provide food for hungry people is a target for people whose favorite pastime is to give speeches against spending money. Let me say here and now that the members of the UAW are of a generation which had jobs on WPA, worked in the CCC camps, ate from surplus food boxes, had their children eat school hot lunches, fought in World War II and Korea, and went to school on the GI bill of rights. In spite of all that Government "coddling" and spending, our gross national product has kept growing, and we are all a stronger Nation because of it.

I submit, therefore, that if we want a world where human beings can live full lives, where their bodies grow strong, where there is light and sunshine, where little children can go to school instead of suffering in misery and darkness—then we must face up to the world food crisis.

Since the end of World War II, we have now 20 years of experience in using our resources overseas. We have made our share of mistakes and will make some more. Let's not now turn our backs on the world. Let's not now say it can't be done. Either we conquer poverty or poverty will conquer us.

We know that there are few obstacles in the world today which man's ingenuity cannot master if he sets his mind to it.

We have the land, farm machinery, and technical knowledge to feed additional millions of people. We have the know-how to help other nations develop seeds, fertilizer plants, and insecticides to enormously raise their food output. We should also consider cultivating those crops which are in short supply in the world. The only thing we are not sure about is—Do we have the will to do these things that need to be done?

In the words of a UAW resolution on world peace at our last convention, let me conclude by saying:

"We should not expect the rest of the world to shape itself in the American image. In the struggle for equality and against poverty we must remember that the world cannot be made according to American patents, or conquered with American advertising slogans. Because the world is hungry both for food and equality, we must join with the people of the world, as coworkers and equals, in a search for a path out of present needs and troubles toward our hopes and visions."

Fighting the War on Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding highlights of the Committee on the World Food Crisis conference on December 9 of last year was the presentation of Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, managing director of the United Nation Special Fund, who outlined the complexities of overcoming the hunger problem existing throughout the world of today.

He praised the expanded program of technical assistance in agriculture of underdeveloped nations and urged renewed determination to speed up the battle against want and the elimination of hunger and the elimination of illiteracy.

For the benefit of my distinguished colleagues who were not in attendance at this excellent program, I include the full text of Mr. Hoffman's remarks:

ADDRESS TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS, BY PAUL GRAY HOFFMAN, LUNCHEON SPEAKER, DECEMBER 9, 1965, WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL

Distinguished Congressmen and Governors, ladies and gentlemen, certainly the first responsibility of a speaker is to cut himself down to size. And I think I can do that best by telling you an anecdote about a grandson of mine who at the time this happened was 5 years old. We were living in California at the time, and he came out, 5 years old I think I said, fully equipped with chaps, two guns and a hat—a real cowboy outfit—and he made himself quite obnoxious running around the house saying, "stick 'em up," which is apparently the kind of teaching we get nowadays from television. At the proposed time to go back home his mother said to him, "Bruce, I think you ought to have a ride on a real horse before you go back home."

He thought that was wonderful, so the next morning he got himself all dressed up again; but as he approached the corral he began to have—to quake a little bit, and as the groom lifted him on the horse, he leaned over to him and said, "You know, I'm not a real cowboy, I'm just a little boy from Libertyville, Ill." and that is just the way I feel Senator.

But believing as I do, that there is no task more urgent than feeding the hungry, you'll know how glad I am to be here today, and how encouraged I am by the evidence that there is spreading through America an understanding of the kind of a problem the world is facing. Of the world's 3 billion people approximately 500 million are perhaps overfed, and about a billion are fairly well fed, and about a billion are underfed.

Now those of us who are well fed should be very much concerned about those who are underfed; not only for reasons of compassion, but in this world; this new world of ours, hunger on that kind of a scale is a genuine menace to peace. Now there is nothing new about hunger, the high percentage of people in the world, since history began, have been hungry; perhaps a higher percentage than there is today.

The two new facts that we have to face, one of which has already been commented on by Senator MCGOVERN, is that it is possible today to feed the world's population, because we have had such advances in technology and such advances in science that no longer can we hold back and say it can't be done. It can be done. Now the second fact that we have to face, and this bears on peace, is that up to very recently, very recently, the people who were hungry in the world bore their hunger patiently because they didn't believe anything could be done about it. Then, too, inventions came in; the airplane and the radio. And farmers in faraway lands listened to their radios.

Farmers who were living miserable lives suddenly learned that farmers in other lands lived lives of peace and dignity, and they are determined to have better lives for themselves and their children. That, of course, is what is meant by the well-known phrase, "revolution of rising expectations." Having been in a great many of the less-developed countries where hunger still persists, I remember very well, I was in one African state where hunger was a real problem, and civil war was threatening, and I said to the chief of the state, "I hope you can get things under control here, because you know that civil war will set you back 10 years in your development." He said, "Yes, Mr. Hoffman, we know that," but he said, "unless we can make the evolution somewhat more dynamic, we are going to have violent revolution." And there are many places in the world where that holds.

It is really difficult to grasp the fact that this world of ours has become one neighborhood. Why? Because it has all happened so fast. I can remember way back around 1900 hearing William Jennings Bryan, who was the great orator of that day, and one of his attributes was the fact that he could speak without any aids whatsoever—to 10,000 people. Today a speaker with laryngitis can get in front of a microphone and speak to 300 million people and tomorrow he will be able to speak to a billion people and his image will be projected at the same time.

Also, although none of you are old enough to remember it, but I am, the great furor that built up when Nellie Blye went around the world in 80 days. Now we can go around in 80 hours and the astronauts go around in 80 minutes. So this has all, this all has compressed the world into a neighborhood. But it is a very hard idea to grasp and I was having trouble with it because I presumed, you can't quite visualize 3 billion neighbors. That's very hard to do—they are neighbors.

I think that it was made plain to me because I was talking to a friend of mine and I said, you know this is a very difficult idea for me to grasp and a much more difficult one to get across to anybody else. He said, well stop trying to talk about 3 billion—that kind of a world. Talk instead about a country with 3 million people in it, each person representing a thousand, similarly placed socially, economically, and let's take a look at that country and see what it would look like. Well there would be a millilon people in it, mostly white, living in either comfort, a good many in affluence, almost all literate, with a life span of 70 years. But in that same country, there would be 2 million people, mostly dark skinned.

Of that 2 million people, you would have 1 million going to bed hungry every night, and you would have 800,000 who couldn't read or write and you would have a life span, average life span of under 40 years. Now how long would that country last without exploding? And that is the kind of world we are living in, only it is just hard to get our minds around. Now the need for speedy action, in combating hunger, is highlighted, I think, by certain facts.

Among them are these: first, that our per capita basis, our per capita basis, there is less food in the world today than there was in 1900—that is annual production of food. There are twice as many children today in the world who are undernourished than there were 15 years ago and there are 50 million children in India, this was perhaps before the President made his announcement, but I think it still holds, that are in danger of starvation; within the next 10 years.

These are terribly hard facts to wrap your mind around when you've just had a good lunch—but they are crude facts and we've got to really face them. Now the task of combating hunger is many sided and among the elements—are first, this galloping population explosion that we have; and second, learning how to use surplus foods, if I dare use the word surplus. And third, insuring a much more abundant agricultural growth in all through the world, in all the countries than we have today.

I don't think there is any reason to be discouraged, because I think that almost for the first time we now see a genuine interest in this matter of population control. I think we are not going to have the 7 billion people that are being predicted some 30 years from now. And second, both on the national basis—I think the food-for-peace program in the United States, and out of the United Nations food program has come much knowledge of how this can be done and this strangely enough, and I'm sure every one here would agree with me, is much trickier than it sounds.

The people say with all that surplus food and with all the capacity to grow more food, why can't we solve the problem by just shipping it. Well believe me, the situation in every country differs. Unless food surpluses are very carefully handled, they can cut down the total amount of food because they can discourage the local producers. So you have a problem in unique techniques. I say we should be encouraged because those techniques are being learned.

Now as far as the supply of food is concerned, here I find myself at some odds with some people who say that it is impossible to grow enough food on this planet in order to feed its present population; let alone a population twice its size. This I don't agree with for these reasons: No. 1, I don't think, I know that these were given to me by the Department of Agriculture's facts, that the Asian farmer, outside of Japan, produces 10 percent as much as his American counterpart, remember that he has an average one-third the land to work; but that is only one factor. And the average African farmer produces 4 percent as much as his North American counterpart.

Well, one of the reasons that this production is so low is the revolution of agriculture, which is one of the great revolutions in America, if not the greatest. I don't know if Herschel will agree with me but if I remember correctly, in 1900 the country had 75 million people we had about 18 million people on our farms producing enough food to care for us—and some export. Today we have 200 million people; we have between 6 and 7 million people on our farms and they are producing so much food that sometimes it is an embarrassment.

That, just in a nutshell, gives a picture of what has happened as a result of this revolution, in other words, it's the new farming methods, it's the insecticides, it's better fertilizer; it's all of one of a hundred things that go into make this startling revolution take place—and this revolution has not been imported. You can't export anything; it has to be imported.

But there hasn't been enough curiosity raised about new farming methods to really bring this about. It's happening though. It's beginning to happen in various places in the world. It's beginning to happen in a small way in India. I think India perhaps illustrates this point very well, because some 6 years ago, a group of agronomists went to India to make a study of the agricultural situation; came back and reported that as far as water, land and water were concerned, India had enough land and water not only to feed her present population, but a population twice the size of the present population.

What she lacked was one simple thing—and that was storage, the rats were getting 20 percent. She had almost no fertilizer, she had never used insecticides, pesticides, and her farming methods were those of a thousand years ago.

Now all of this revolution has got to be imported. It is being imported slowly—not because farmers are obstinate, but because farmers, most farmers outside of America live, have marginal existence, in other words, they can't take the chance of just getting by.

We've always known that you had to show and not talk to farmers to get them to change their ways. But this revolution is going on. So I am very hopeful of that. I think also that this is a new attitude developing through the world.

I've been involved to some extent in assisting these developing countries into speeding their development, and when I first got started in this, you go into every country and they want to talk to you about a new airline, or a new steel mill—they were just not interested in agriculture.

Well today, this is all changing. We have today on our special fund; we have had some 522 projects; we cover the whole field—industrial, agricultural, institutes, research institutes for applying science and technology to all processes including agriculture. Of those of our projects requested by the governments, over 200 are in the agricultural field.

Those projects total about $500 million, of which the countries themselves are putting up $300 million, and we are putting up $200 million. They are agricultural projects; they are institutes in various countries; and I must say, I don't know too much about agriculture, except that I am intrigued by what is going on in these laboratories.

There is a laboratory in Yugoslavia where they were testing plant growth with radio isotopes and apparently were able to tell the exact mixture of soil, water, fertilizer, necessary to get maximum growth. I happen to believe, and I may be wrong, that there is at least a great speeding up in knowledge of agriculture that is going on right now, day by day, and that is going to be applied to the produce of the land.

The final reason, that I am encouraged, as I said, because the attitude toward agriculture has changed and there is a recognition that if you are going to speed the development of these developing countries which is our business, you have to have a balanced program and the program starts with feeding people; in other words, people cannot work unless they have some strength. I recall very well when I first came to Washington in 1948; having come out of industry, I was quite determined that no Marshall plan dollars should be wasted on food because what we wanted to do was get industry back on its feet and sooner or later it would take care of the situation, of the feeding situation.

I met Dr. Fitzgerald, who many of you must know, and he made just one point, he said, "Well to tell you Mr. Hoffman, the Italians are getting a day 1,600 calories, the Germans 1,250 calories and the French 1,600; and they can't work unless we feed them." So the first $5 million we spent on the Marshall program was spent for wheat. For the workers of Europe, because we couldn't possibly get work, even though we built up the factories unless they had the strength.

Now there is this recognition and there is a close relationship between industry and agriculture; in other words they work together. If you want to increase productivity on the farms give the farmers something to work for; it may be a bicycle—but its got to be something they can see and also as you industrialize, you can take care of what is a great surplus, and that is the surplus in labor—farm labor.

Most countries have a great excess. This you only can take care of as you industrialize. So your program must be balanced.

It must start however, with seeing that the people have enough to eat, putting an end to hunger. That's where it starts. At the same time, concurrently if possible, start building up industry so you can meet these other problems. I'd like to close by telling you that the United Nations and its agencies are with you in this, what the other gentleman called "war." We are with you in the war on want to the hilt. And we think we can do quite a bit about it. This new program, which is really a combination, a merging rather, of the programs, the expanded program of technical assistance, which has sent 30,000 people in the field.

I should explain, that this special fund, the expanded program and the new United Nations development program are financing operations. We help finance operations. The actual operations in the field for example, agricultural field, are carried out for the most part by FAO. They have over 200 of our projects for which they are executing agents. There are the other types of projects that are taken up by other specializing agencies. But we have today a United Nations family of specialized agencies; a United Nations family of financing agencies.

The financing agencies are of course the World Bank, which helped supply the capital investment needed. UNICEF which finances primarily projects that improve the lot of children in the world and the special fund, which up to now has financed projects in three fields, first; is identifying the natural resources that are present in these countries; and, ladies and gentlemen, this is a rich, rich planet.

Let me just, for just a second of your time, tell you what we mean by that. We have as I say 522 projects, I'd love to tell you about each one of them—I'll just tell you about one. And that is the Niger River project—it just more or less tells the story.

The Niger River has been there for quite a while—its waters have been used very little. We were asked to make a survey of the Niger River to see if we could locate a dam on the river in such a way that the dam would be feasible. And we did. Two great engineering firms made the study under the direction of the World Bank, came out with the conclusion that they could locate a dam about 100 miles north of Lagos which would result in the building of a lake 15 miles wide, 70 miles long, improve greatly navigation in Nigeria, improve agriculture by providing irrigation for thousands and thousands of acres; make possible inland fisheries; which would give low-cost protein, which is badly needed in Nigeria; and provide Nigeria with as low-cost power as there is in the world.

That's industrial based for Nigeria's development. This was all. As soon as this project was completed we succeeded, not me, not me personally, but $230 million of capital was forthcoming to build that dam that is now being constructed.

I could give you example after example, after example. This is a rich, rich planet. One thing we have got to do is to make up our minds that we are going to carry on this war against want and eliminate hunger, eliminate illiteracy; and also provide people generally with a decent standard of living. Now I think that the work that we are doing at the United Nations and through national programs is in the preinvestment field, which is where we finance.

And the preinvestment field is of great importance; because I think it is preparing the way for investment in sufficient volume to get this job done. I can only refer to a report made in 1951—by the—some of the most imminent economists who estimated it would take about $19 billion-plus a year of capital investment to bring about a 2-percent increase per year in the net incomes of people in less developed countries.

The problem has not been lack of money, the problem has been largely a lack of where the money could be usefully and profitably spent. I think we are going to get to that $20 billion as soon as we can.

When people hold back on 20 billion I think we only need to remind them of one thing—and that is that this world of ours at the present time, you can get two figures on the cost of armaments in the world today, and one figure is $120 and the other figure is $140—that is that nobody knows within $20 billion of what it is costing at the present time to provide armaments and to take care of the services of army and for us to say for a minute that if the money can be used profitably and usefully that money cannot be forthcoming, I think makes no sense whatever.

Thank you very much.

H.R. 12410

SPEECH

OF

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the veterans of past wars have not forgotten the benefits they received from the World War II and Korean GI bills.

Early in January, I introduced H.R. 11981 to provide benefits for the cold war and Vietnam veterans. Today the House demonstrated its support by passing a revised bill to 381 to 0.

This bill received the support of all the major veterans organizations, and I am inserting the letters I received from the national commanders:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 4, 1966.

HON. RAY ROBERTS,
Washington, D.C.:

We understand that H.R. 12410 reported by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee will be taken up in the House on Monday, February 7. While this bill does not completely satisfy the American Legion's proposals as set forth in H.R. 12186 it does, among other things, provide immediate benefits to the servicemen now returning to civilian life.

We are grateful to the committee for its efforts and hope that the House will act promptly so that a readjustment program for our veterans can be enacted without delay.

L. ELDON JAMES,
National Commander,
American Legion.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1966.

HON. RAY ROBERTS,
U.S. House of Representatives, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS: The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported H.R. 12410 which will be considered under suspension of the rules by the House, Monday, February 7, 1966.

This cold war GI bill provides for education and training benefits; GI loans; presumptive service connection for tropical and chronic diseases; medical care; job counseling and placement, and other miscellaneous benefits.

The Disabled American Veterans urge your support of this bill.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 5, 1966.

HON. RAY ROBERTS,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Amvets strongly urge the early passage of H.R. 12410 which embraces substantive veterans benefits programs. We feel that the intent of this bill will justify the mandates of our organization and we urge the continued support of you and your colleagues to accomplish this end.

RALPH E. HALL,
Amvets National Commander.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 4, 1966.

MEMBER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to H.R. 12410, the cold war GI bill, which is scheduled for your consideration and vote on Monday, February 7.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States favors the extension of wartime veterans rights and benefits to all who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States since January 31, 1955, the official end of the Korean conflict.

H.R. 12410 is more than a GI bill. Besides educational training and home loan assistance, the bill proposes entitlement to VA hospital care, job counseling assistance, veterans preference in Federal employment, wartime presumptions for service-connected disability for chronic and tropical diseases and other provisions.

Accordingly, H.R. 12410 represents a giant step in the direction of carrying out our national resolution to elevate cold war service in the Armed Forces to wartime status so far as veterans programs are concerned.

Your support and vote in favor of H.R. 12410, therefore, will be deeply appreciated by the 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Sincerely,

ANDY BORG,
Commander in Chief.

It is a source of personal pride to me and the other members of the Veterans Affairs Committee that a companion bill, H.R. 12410, received the unanimous vote of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Next Big Step in Space—The Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the article by Richard Lewis in the Chicago Sun-Times, Sunday, December 26, 1965, brings into sharper focus the achievements of this past year in the manned space flight program. Mr. Lewis points up the most important features of this effort and the important problems that NASA faces in its progress in reaching the national space program goal of a lunar landing in this decade. This thoughtful article does much to place in proper prospective the operational capabilities that have been achieved as the program progresses. The article follows:

NEXT BIG STEP IN SPACE: THE MOON

(By Richard Lewis)

This was the year the United States proved that a round trip to the moon of 8 days was physically tolerable to human beings.

It was a new discovery. Yet, the fact it was expected dulled its impact.

The entire Apollo program of landing two men on the moon and bringing them back was based on the assumption men could withstand the trip. That had been so since President John F. Kennedy had declared Apollo a national goal in 1961.

However, it remained for Astronauts Leroy Gordon Cooper, Jr., and Charles Conrad, Jr., to prove it on the 8-day flight of Gemini 5 in August.

Then, in the grand climax of a year filled with surprises and triumphs in space, the case was clinched by Astronauts Frank Borman and James A. Lovell, Jr., on their 14-day ride in Gemini 7 December 4 to 18.

Theirs was the greatest American ride since Paul Revere. Gemini 7 was a shot not only heard but seen around the world by intercontinental television, another product of the space age.

THE SPIRIT OF '76

Further proof of the feasibility of the lunar voyage was provided by the spectacular rendezvous of Gemini 6 with No. 7. Astronauts Walter M. Schirra, Jr., and Thomas P. Stafford accomplished the task with such precision they made it look easy.

It was inevitable that the double mission of Gemini 7 and 6 should be linked with the spirit of '76. Symbolically, it showed that man could free himself from the ancient rule of Mother Earth and strike out for himself in the cosmos if he dared.

His physiology enabled him to adapt to weightless flight. By the fourth quarter of 1965, his technology enabled him to perform it for periods of time up to 2 weeks.

But would the American economy permit the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to pursue its goals to the Moon, to Mars and beyond?

With the escalation of U.S. military effort in the Vietnam war, it became obvious that expendable projects in space would have to be cut or deferred.

That was started as the year ended. The space agency dropped a $39 million project to develop an advanced orbiting solar observatory.

ARGONNE PROGRAM CUT BACK

Development of the mighty M–1 engine, designed to deliver 1 million pounds of thrust from the combustion of hydrogen and oxygen, was shelved for a second time in 2 years.

Nuclear rocket development, proceeding at Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago, in the design stage, and at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in New Mexico as actual hardware, was to be cut back.

Within the space agency, there was a determination to save Project Apollo at any cost and keep it moving on schedule. Not only was American prestige most intimately linked with it but by the end of 1965 the economic well-being of much of the South depended on Apollo and post-Apollo programs.

More than 300,000 men and women in 7 Southern States were on payrolls in Apollo as skilled workers, technicians, engineers, and scientists. It was the largest development program since men first fashioned a wheel.

In 1965, manned space flight ceased to be a stunt. In most segments of American society, it was regarded as bound up with technological development and national wellbeing.

FOR ENTERTAINMENT ONLY?

Even so, a commercial television network had equated the launch of Gemini 7, as a species of Saturday afternoon entertainment, with a college football game. Both were shown on the same screen.

There was a conspicuous failure here to distinguish between what is entertainment and what is history. The outlook which teamed Gemini 7's launch with the Penn State-Maryland football game December 4 might just as well have double-billed the siege of Pleiku and the Tonight Show.

Because of growing war, a failure in the Gemini program this year could have derailed Appolo.

The failure actually did appear October 25, when Gemini 6 was stalled on pad 19 by the blowup of its Agena target rocket, with which it was supposed to rendezvous and dock in a 185-mile orbit.

The McDonnell Aircraft Co. of St. Louis helped pull this blazing chestnut out of the fire. Its top engineers convinced NASA to compensate for the setback by a double flight of Gemini 6 and 7. NASA's boss, James E. Webb, sold the idea to President Johnson.

L.B.J. RUNS SHOW—AND WELL

If there was any doubt who was running the space program, it was resolved by this series of events. Mr. Johnson was running it. As matters turned out, he was running it mighty well. The debacle of October 25 became the smashing success of the Spirit of '76.

Ironically, the Agena that couldn't in October was merely a minor transformation of the Agena that could earlier in the year.

Agena is an upper stage rocket developing some 16,000 pounds of thrust. It fits on top of an Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile. The combination had scored the great successes of the lunar and interplanetary sweepstakes during 1965.

Following the success of Ranger 7 in 1964, Rangers 8 and 9 photographed the Moon's surface in February and March of 1965. Altogether, more than 20,000 brilliant photographs of the Moon were radioed back to Earth.

They showed what a few astronomers had always suspected—that the lunar surface was not the rough and jagged landscape Earth-based photographs suggested, but that contours were rounded and smooth and slopes were gentle. There had been erosion, perhaps from the solar wind that blows a stream of protons among the worlds.

The nature of the surface—dust, crushed rock or hard lava—continued to be a matter of debate. But striking evidence of volcanism appeared. The Moon was or had been dynamic, like the Earth, for there appeared great rills or splits in the surface showing movement.

BELIEVE MOON SURFACE OK

Despite the lack of surface definition from the Ranger photographs, a consensus developed among most students of the Moon. The surface would hold the weight of a spaceship like the ungainly, spider-legged LEM, or Lunar Excursion Module. Astronauts could land without sinking into a treacherous sea of dust.

The Atlas Agena had scored another brilliant success in boosting Mariner 4 to Mars. Launched November 28, 1964, Mariner flew past the Red Planet on the evening of last July 14.

The message it sent back to Earth startled the world of science. Cratered like the Moon, Mars, with only a wisp of an atmosphere, showed little signs it had ever developed living organisms, or could support them if it had at some earlier phrase of its history.

Although it rotates as rapidly as the Earth does, Mars displayed no magnetic field. This was interpreted as evidence it had no liquid nor any solid iron core, as the Earth has. It was different from the Earth. Mars was more like the Moon.

The 22 pictures Mariner sent back from Mars showing a desolate, lifeless looking landscape, rent and torn by crashing meteorites, evoked a new feeling of awe among scientific and politcial leaders.

LIFE UNIQUE?

When he saw the photos projected on a screen in the White House, President Johnson observed:

"It may be—it may just be—that life as we know it with its humanity is more unique than many have thought."

In several respects, the discovery of the Martian landscape eclipsed the feat of the Gemini program in orbiting 10 men during the year. And yet, it is to man that the space program is tied, not to machines.

For that reason the clamor of influential scientists calling for more emphasis on unmanned scientific satellites and less on manned orbital or lunar flights was ignored.

The biologists got their way with the activation of Project Voyager, the program to deposit a scientific capsule on Mars in 1971 with a life detector to see if bacteria might live there. The debate on whether there is primitive life on Mars illuminated half dozen scientific seminars.

ATMOSPHERE TOO THIN

The Mariner 4 data showed that the Martian atmosphere was too thin to soft-land a Voyager spacecraft by parachute. A braking rocket system would have to be built into the vehicle, significantly raising its weight.

That meant the Saturn 1B launch vehicle could not be used to boost Voyager to Mars. Instead, the booster would have to be the mighty Saturn 5, the moon rocket.

Using the Saturn 5 would greatly increase the cost of Voyager, from $1.2 billion to possibly $3.2 billion or more. The increase placed the program in jeopardy if the economy ax came down, as nearly everyone expected it would.

In the meantime, Russian experiences in trying to soft-land lunik capsules on the moon showed that this feat was much more difficult than expected. Three Russian attempts failed during the year and made American project planners more cautious in starting their own lunar soft-landing project, Surveyor.

The first Surveyor, scheduled to ride to the moon aboard an Atlas-Centaur in the autumn, was postponed until 1966.

More work had to be done on the Surveyor landing system.

The Lunik crashes showed up a problem which engineers had suspected—ambiguity about the location of the lunar surface. Was the surface that reflected radar waves tens of feet below a layer of soft material that did not reflect?

Radar tells the Surveyor landing system computer where the surface is. The computer controls the firing of the braking rockets to slow descent. If the true surface does not reflect, radar cannot see it. Then the vehicle must crash.

Whether this was the reason for the Soviet crashes was speculative. No one knew. The problem of how to land softly on the moon was the major unsolved one in Project Apollo at the end of 1965.

Gemini had proved that the trip was physiologically feasible for men. The rendezvous of *Geminis 6* and *7* had shown that the technique could be mastered. It is essential for the return. LEM lifts off the moon on the return journey and must rendezvous and dock with the orbiting Apollo spaceship for the voyage home.

The actual landing, soft-style was the next step in Apollo.

NATIONS GO OWN WAYS

The delay in Surveyor indicated how much the space accomplishments or failures of each of the space-faring powers influence the other. There was talk of more international cooperation, but each nation went its own way.

There was vigorous display of one-up-manship. No sooner had the Communications Satellite Corp. orbited Early Bird to provide a TV and telephone relay between the United States and Europe than Russia orbited its communications satellite.

They called it Molniya I (lightning). It relayed color TV between Moscow and Vladivostok.

After Cosmonaut Alexei Leonov made the first space walk in March on the flight of Voskhod 2, Astronaut Edward H. White II took a longer walk on a longer tether during the June flight of Gemini 4.

The U.S. Air Force fired its mighty booster, Titan 3C with 2.5 millon pounds of thrust. The Russians fired one with an estimated 4.2 million pounds, lifting a 13-ton satelite, Proton I.

PRESTIGE IN ORBITS

The race for whatever prestige space prowess confers upon a people was close in 1965. The Russians sent Zond II to photograph Mars but its electronics failed. They made no significant advance in manned space flight, except for the space walk.

With Geminis 6 and 7, the United States soared ahead of the Russians in the manned effort, chalking up new records in both man hours and vehicle hours in orbital flight. Ours was the first rendezvous between two piloted space vehicles.

Meanwhile, when Cape Kennedy closed down for Christmas, the first Apollo spaceship (unmanned) was being readied for its *maiden voyage aboard a Saturn 1B in* January. The Apollo program flight test program begins in 1966, as Gemini ends.

By the end of 1965, we were starting the last lap of the 9-year program to put men on the moon. There was every indication we would make the schedule unless the war in Vietnam bogged it down.

Why the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty Should Be Rejected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of economics at Georgetown University and chairman of the National Captive Nations Week Committee, has written a scholarly article on the proposed consular treaty between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of the article, in which Dr. Dobriansky discusses two reasons for rejecting the treaty:

A PORTION OF AN ARTICLE BY DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

V. THE VERY DIFFERENT DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY

The preceding three reasons for nonratification of the pact received far less attention last August than the next two. Yet in the broader context of understanding the contemporary struggle, its prime sources of tension and long-run dangers to world peace, they carry greater weight than the next two objections, which by themselves, of course, are adequate to justify nonratification. It is noteworthy how much more adept and knowledgeable the Chinese Reds are in utilizing essential facts concerning the inner Soviet Russian Empire, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, Moscow's russification program, and the captive status of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. than we are.[28] Their ends are different, but they at least do not accommodate the Russian totalitarians in their worst features.

Contrary to the baseless contention that this consular convention is no different or is even slightly different from other conventions, the pact is very different not only in its relation to our prime enemy in the cold war but also in its incredible provision of diplomatic immunity to consular personnel *for all crimes, including espionage.*[29] It is sad enough that the treaty's assumptions and contents seriously depreciate our general political posture as a democratic free world leader, but this provision is an open invitation to Red subversion of our Nation. Every other existing convention grants im*munity only from punishment for misde*meanors. The reader can now understand why I entitled an article on this subject "The Second Treaty of Moscow." The pact was made to order—in Moscow. Even our allies don't enjoy this unprecedented consular privilege.

In view of the concentrated discussion on *this point last August, it is unnecessary to* belabor it further. Mr. Leonard C. Meeker, the State Department's legal adviser, admitted in unqualified terms that this immunity from criminal jurisdiction "is not present in other consular conventions to the same extent."[30] Mr. Meeker, who is under the illusion that some "Soviet national" animal *exists, tried to moderate the immunity pro*vision by pointing out that it "will extend only to those consular officers and employees who are agreed to by the two Governments."[31] As though in actual practice this would make any significant difference.

The views expressed by opponents to the treaty in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are quite firm on this immunity provision.[32] Publicized discussion of the point led many to the conclusion which one Senator put in these words: "It is this last section that is inimical with the best interests of the United States. It is the last section that clearly indicates that this convention was negotiated by the Soviets, not as a bilateral pact for improving Soviet-American relations, but as a cold war maneuver to enhance and expand the intelligence-gathering network of the U.S.S.R."[33]

Mr. Rusk and others argue that the treaty would offer greater protection for Americans touring and visiting in the U.S.S.R. This protection argument, covering some 12,000 Americans annually, is supposed to counterbalance the lapse in it as concerns the immunity provision. Much is made of the notification and access provisions regarding arrests. Actually, this so-called Russian concession should have been demanded long ago on the purely ambassadorial level, and should be so demanded on the simple principle of reciprocity. U.S.S.R. representatives and tourists are accorded the privileges and benefits of our democratic criminal code; pure reciprocal relations would demand the same for our people. To hook the notification and access provisions as a notable Russian "concession" to the consular treaty indicates that our negotiators had already walked into the beartrap. It is as much a concession as a thief giving up stolen property.

VI. INTENSIFIED POLITICAL WARFARE IN THE UNITED STATES

Espionage was the leading word for the next popular objection to the treaty last August. Our FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, was quoted at length in support of this criticism. In earlier testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. Hoover had emphasized that U.S.S.R. "consulates in many parts of the country * * * will make our work more difficult.[34] A later statement by him stressed the following: "One Soviet intelligence officer in commenting on the agreement spoke of the wonderful opportunity this presented his service and that *it would enable the Soviets to enhance their* intelligence operations."[35] So effective were these points that the President subsequently issued a directive to officials to support administration policies, aiming it particularly at Hoover.[36]

There are several aspects to this sixth reason for nonratification that need some clarification. First, though public hearings were barred, it *obviously* behooved the Foreign Relations Committee to invite Mr. Hoover, as another Government witness, to testify on the pact. Surely he is far more qualified to discuss the likely espionage effects of the treaty than is Secretary Rusk. Second, it is certainly no strain on one's imagination to *envisage the expanded opportunities for So*viet Russian espionage with consulates ranging cross-country from New York to Chicago and San Francisco.

However, considering the huge spy apparatus now maintained by Moscow in this country, one can rationally allow for only a *relatively* small increase in overall effective*ness with the presence of consulates.* The economic law *of* diminishing returns applies in this field as in others. Doubtless the establishment of consulates would make Hoover's work more difficult, but it is doubtful that the condition as concerns espionage activity would be unmanageable. Moreover, as I argued elsewhere, spying is a two-way street. *On the other hand, since alternatives* for different diplomatic arrangements exist, there is no reason whatsoever to accommodate the Russians in this risky respect.

Especially is this so when a broader view is taken of Soviet Russian activity in this country. The problem entails more than just espionage. It can best be described as one of intensified political warfare, *signs of* which have already appeared in civil rights riots, campus agitation, peace demonstrations, overt U.S.S.R. embassy propaganda on the Watts riot,[37] and a variety of actions striking against civil and political authority. Strategically situated consulates would not only be additional spy nests but also active sources of conspiracy, propaganda, blackmail and intimidation against those with relatives in the Red Empire, and media for undermining ethnic and other anti-Communist groups. With the type of immunity offered them, they should make bold efforts along these lines.

Mr. Rusk and others talk glibly about our "open society" and the espionage risks we have to take. They fail to see the broader problem involved here, with long-arm ramifications extending to our actions in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and almost everywhere else. Regarding espionage solely, a more naive observation by the Secretary cannot be found than when he testified, "I do hope that the convention will reduce misunderstandings and particularly be of assistance in not letting private citizens, tourists, businessmen, exchange people, and others get caught up in the atmosphere in which this other type of problem arises."[38] Projected into the future, this type of uncritical thinking would virtually guarantee the closing of our open society.

Footnotes at end of speech.

---

[28] See "Sino-Soviet Border Potential Powder Keg," the Ukrainian Bulletin, New York, Apr. 1–15, 1965, p. 35.

[29] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 12.

[30] Ibid., p. 22.

[31] Ibid., pp. 34–35.

[22] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," minority views, Aug. 10, 1965.

[23] Senator NORRIS COTTON, "The Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 26, 1965, p. 21185.

[24] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," minority views, p. 2.

[25] Ibid.

[26] "L.B.J. Policy Edict Tied to Hoover," the Washington Post, Aug. 21, 1965.

[27] "Top Soviet Intellectuals Castigate United States on Riots," the Washington Post, Aug. 22, 1965.

[28] "Consular Convention with the Soviet Union," p. 29.

Move Toward Vietnam Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's effort to continue the peace offensive at the same time that he is protecting our commitment in Vietnam is discussed with great insight and perception in an editorial published in the New York Times last February 3.

The consideration of the Vietnam conflict in the United Nations opens new avenues for discussions and negotiations and brings to bear the prestige and influence of this international organization for a peaceful settlement.

Under unanimous consent I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, believing it to be of broad general interest to my colleagues and to the Nation.

The editorial follows:

MOVE TOWARD VIETNAM PEACE

Despite the mountainous obstacles still to be overcome, the vote to place the Vietnam war on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council provides an opening for international action to move the conflict from the battlefield to the conference table. The formal debate that has been authorized is far less important than the informal consultations now opening to prepare for that discussion.

The objective must be to draft a resolution that can be adopted unanimously or, at least, will obtain a Soviet abstention. Moscow can be expected to use the threat of a veto to influence the shape of that resolution. Yet, there is reason to doubt that the Soviet Union will veto a responsible effort to bring about a negotiated settlement, even though it may feel obliged to stand aside initially.

What would a responsible effort comprise? No one is suggesting that the United Nations enter into the substance of the Vietnam dispute. Hanoi has just repeated its position that Vietnam "falls within the competence of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina, and not of the U.N. Security Council." As Senator MANSFIELD pointed out yesterday, the task now is for other participants in the Geneva settlement to move to reconvene the Geneva powers.

France, as a key participant, has a special responsibility to join with Britain for this purpose, if Soviet reluctance rules out action by the two Geneva cochairmen, Britain and Russia. Nothing in the Geneva accords limits initiatives to the cochairmen. The challenge that faces the United Nations—and, particularly, the African nations that joined France in abstaining yesterday—is to find a way around the obstacles that block a Geneva meeting.

What are those obstacles? The bombing of North Vietnam is one. But the United States already has suspended that bombing on two occasions. It may be surmised that Washington would not have initiated a United Nations debate were it not prepared to suspend the bombing again, if prospects for a peace conference could thus be improved.

The chief bar to a new Geneva conference is the refusal of Hanoi to participate unless its Four Points are accepted and the United States agrees "to recognize" the Vietcong's National Liberation Front. But Hanoi maintains that the Four Points are nothing but "a concentrated expression of the Geneva accords"—accords the United States supports.

Hanoi's insistence that the Liberation Front is the "sole genuine representative" of the South Vietnamese people has all the outward marks of a bargaining maneuver to obtain maximum status for the Vietcong in the negotiations. The right to attend a reconvened Geneva conference cannot—by this maneuver or any other—be denied to the Saigon Government, which attended not only the 1954 conference but also the one on Laos in 1962. Both groups will have to be represented.

A Security Council resolution could well combine a request for suspension of the bombing of North Vietnam with a proposal that France, Britain and the African members consult the Geneva participants on a way out of the impasse. It could also call upon the International Control Commission in Vietnam to assemble the military commanders of all the combatant forces on the ground in South Vietnam to discuss a cease-fire.

Such a move, if successful, would open direct contact between the major political as well as military forces in South Vietnam—the South Vietnamese Army and the Vietcong. And they undoubtedly would have to discuss a political settlement along with a cease-fire, since the two are inextricably intertwined in any guerrilla war.

A resolution of this type could not be opposed by Washington, which has expressed its willingness to discuss a cease-fire prior to a Geneva conference or as the first order of conference business. It would be difficult for Moscow to veto such a plan, even if Hanoi's reluctance to go to a conference prevents an affirmative Soviet vote.

This is not the only resolution that could help advance negotiations on Vietnam. Now that the United Nations has been brought into the Vietnam conflict, the way is open for fresh minds and the freest exercise of diplomatic ingenuity. Peace is a world responsibility; the U.N. was created to fulfill that responsibility. Vietnam could become its finest hour.

In Your Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of the Congress I again introduced a truth-in-lending bill that is designed to protect would-be borrowers or credit users from some of the machinations practiced by moneylenders.

At the present time the borrower is too often victimized by unscrupulous lenders who engage in wily subterfuge in stating the nature of finance charges and interest rates.

I hope that favorable consideration will be given to my bill H.R. 8332 so that the would-be borrower is dealt with truthfully and honestly by those who lend money or extend credit.

I recommend to my colleagues the following article on lending practices which has been prepared by the Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO:

IN YOUR INTEREST: THE NEED FOR THE "TRUTH IN LENDING" BILL

"I recommend enactment of legislation requiring all lenders and extenders of credit to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amount of their commitment and the annual rate of interest they will be required to pay.

"The antiquated legal doctrine, 'Let the buyer beware,' should be superseded by the doctrine, 'Let the seller make full disclosure.' "—President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his message to the Congress, "The American Consumer," 1964.

"Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public. Legislation should therefore be enacted requiring lenders and vendors to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amounts and rates which they will be paying for credit."—President John F. Kennedy, March 15, 1962.

Had any debts lately? Of course you have if you are like most Americans. But do you know how much interest or other financing costs you are paying for those loans and installment purchases?

If you do know, then chances are you are paying only a half or a third as much in financing costs as the person who doesn't know the rate of interest he is paying, according to a recent study. This study showed, for example, that among persons who had taken out loans for $500 or less, those who were told or took the trouble to find out the true interest rate charged were paying only 12 percent, while those who did not know the rate they were charged, actually were paying 37 percent. Just knowing makes a big difference. Do you?

TRUE RATES

The true annual interest rate isn't always what you think. Do you know, for example, that:

The 3-percent-per-month plan of small loan companies is really 36 percent per year?

The 4½ percent new car financing plan of some commercial banks is really 9 percent per year?

The advertised 5-percent rate on home improvement loans is not less than a 6 percent first mortgage, but nearly twice as much, or almost 10 precent per year?

The so-called 6-percent rate for financing used cars offered by some dealers is at least 12-percent per year and sometimes very much higher—18 to 25 percent per year or more?

The cost of teenage credit now being promoted by some retailers as only "pennies per week" is sometimes as high as 80 percent per year?

Don't feel bad if these facts puzzle you. Another recent study revealed the shocking news that at least 4 people out of every 10 don't know how much they are paying in credit charges. But this study was only of persons with college educations. Probably closer to 8 out of 10 don't know the rates of interest they are paying.

Unfortunately, it is frequently very difficult for you to find out the true cost of what you pay to borrow money or to buy on an installment plan. You know how it goes. You and the family really want that new TV or that late model automobile. By the time you get to looking seriously, you want it and need it right then—not later after you have taken the time to read the fine print in the sales contract. And the salesman or loan official makes those small monthly payments sound like a "breeze" to repay. Then, after you think, "I must have paid that off by now," and the bills still keep coming, you may wonder how much that purchase really cost in credit charges.

EAGER BORROWERS

Consumer credit has become one of the Nation's biggest businesses. Nearly everybody is a consumer of credit. Long-term consumer debt, primarily in the form of home mortgages, now amounts to more than $209 billion while short- and intermediate-term consumer debt is $83 billion, or a total of $292 billion. This is almost the size of the entire national debt.

What is even more startling is the dramatic rise in consumer debt in the last 20 years. Long-term consumer debt has increased 1,123 percent during that time; short- and intermediate-term consumer debt has increased 1,449 percent, while the national debt has increased by only 18 percent. To make the comparison another way, if the Federal Government had increased its debt at the same rate as the American consumer increased his, the national debt would be nearly $3 trillion.

Perhaps the most striking figure of all, however, is the interest paid on consumer debt. The interest payments on long-term consumer debt are conservatively estimated at $11 billion a year, while short- and intermediate-term debts account for at least another $11 billion a year. Thus, the American consumer, with a total debt slightly less than the national debt, is paying at least $22 billion a year in interest, or nearly double the annual interest charge on the national debt.

TOTAL OF 229 PERCENT PER YEAR

A U.S. Senate subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, recently held investigative hearings in Louisville, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, and Boston to learn the practical effects of borrowers not knowing the cost of credit. These are only a few typical cases which witnesses described to the subcommittee:

A man in Jersey City bought a TV set for $123.88. He was given a coupon book which called for 24 monthly payments of $17.50. The interest rate turned out to be 229 percent per year, or more than twice the cost of the TV for interest alone. What is even more tragic, he had to keep up the payments or lose his job.

A housewife on the Lower East Side of Manhattan purchased a couch from a door-to-door salesman for $300. The payments were set at $12 every 2 weeks for 2 years. The total interest charge was thus $324 and the annual rate was 107 percent, although not a word of this was mentioned at the time of the sale.

A New Jersey bus driver borrowed $1,000 from a small loan company. He was told the interest rate was 4.5 percent. The actual rate turned out to be 29.5 percent, or more than 6½ times the claimed rate. Had the borrower known this at the start, he said, he would have dealt with a lower cost lender.

A similar case occurred in Pittsburgh when a witness testified that he borrowed $900 from a small loan company and was told that his monthly payments would be $58.10 for 24 months. The interest rate in this case was 52 percent per year.

Another New York witness bought a television set on credit for 30 months. The interest rate on this transaction turned out to be 143 percent. The committee asked the witness whether she would have signed the contract if she had known the interest rate. The witness replied, "Never in my life."

Testimony before the committee also revealed that Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York were systematically and automatically charged a higher rate of interest, regardless of their individual credit standing.

NOT JUST THE POOR

These examples and hundreds like them have been disclosed which show how not only the poor and the wage earners but salaried, middle class, and very well educated Americans are often misled when they borrow or buy on time. Recent investigations disclosed a very sorry field of deception in the case of college education loans. While Federal education loans are available for 3 percent and various State plans run from 3 to 6 percent, Senators were shocked to learn that some of the private loan plans which are offered to students and parents by our leading colleges and universities involved an interest rate as high as 60 percent per year. Interest rates on "low-cost education loans" frequently ran from 26 to 54 percent a year.

Or consider the facts revealed during a 1965 hearing before the House Banking and Currency Committee about a small-loan finance company which has systematically bilked our American servicemen. This company specialized in auto loans and masqueraded under an official-sounding name as though it were a Government agency. It charged interest rates as high as 100 percent over a 2-year period. It also added an excessive charge for insurance which sometimes didn't even exist.

TRICKS OF THE TRADE

Consumers simply do not know what rate of interest they are being charged on an installment purchase or small loan. This brings terrible and sometimes tragic burdens on people and their families. Most of the blame for this lies not just, or even primarily, in the ignorance of the buyer. The responsibility, as Mr. DOUGLAS' Senate hearings have shown, lies with the confusing practices of the seller.

An economist who is a top executive with one of the largest automobile manufacturing companies once told a Senate committee:

"The variety and complexity of finance and insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as almost to defy comprehension. It is impossible for the average buyer to appraise the rates for finance and insurance services offered, as compared with alternatives available elsewhere."

A credit union manager with many years of experience in the lending field vividly described the dilemma of today's consumer. He said:

"The average borrower is caught in a wonderland of credit where percentages multiply and divide at will, where finance charges materialize on command and fees are collected on the way out; where sharp practices and rackets not only inflate the costs of credit, but also impose enormous financial hardships on the debtor, particularly those who can least afford it."

Consider some of the practices used by many lenders which the DOUGLAS subcommittee has uncovered and described after 5 years' study.

No rate quoted

Often no rate at all is quoted to the consumer. This is the simplest and most direct method of obscuring the cost of credit. The borrower is, for example, merely told that he will pay $10 down and $10 a month. Neither the total finance charge nor the interest rate is evident. Unless the borrower is a persistent questioner and skillful mathematician, he will not discover the true facts.

The add-on rate

The borrower is told that the finance charge will be $6 on a 1-year, $100 loan, repayable in equal monthly installments. The lender represents this to be a 6-percent loan, but such a claim is merely a play on the number 6. The actual rate is almost 12 percent, or nearly double the stated rate, because the borrower is constantly repaying the loan over the year and does not have the use of the $100 for a full year. His average debt over the year is only about $50. In other words, the interest rate is quoted on the original amount of the debt and not on the declining or unpaid balance as is the custom in business credit, government loans, or mortgage transactions. In reality the borrower is asked to pay interest on amounts he has already repaid.

The discount rate

This is a variation of the add-on rate. In the case of the add-on, the borrower receives $100 in cash or goods and must pay back $106. In the case of the discount technique, the consumer "borrows" $100 but only receives $94. The finance charge again is $6 and is often represented as being 6 percent interest. Again, the actual rate is slightly more than 12 percent, or twice the quoted rate because the borrower is periodically repaying the loan.

A simple monthly rate

This rate statement method is usually quoted by small loan companies and by retailers using revolving credit plans. The finance rate is represented as being 1, 2, 3, or 4 percent per month. The true annual rate in this case is 12 times the quoted figure, or 12, 24, 36, or 48 percent per year, if the interest is based upon the unpaid balance at the end of each month. If it is based upon the entire original amount of the loan which is being gradually repaid, the simple annual rate is approximately 24 times the quoted figure, or in the illustrations cited 24, 48, 72, or 96 percent per year.

"Loading the camel"

Sometimes lenders compound the camouflaging of credit by loading on all sorts of extraneous charges, such as exorbitant fees for credit life insurance and excessive fees for credit investigations, processing, and handling. These charges are a cost of doing business, and should rightfully be figured in with the interest or finance charges. By excluding them in a separate list, the interest rate can be superficially reduced. When these charges are separated from the interest, a comparison of the cost of the credit with other rates becomes impossible. This, of course, could be the purpose of all this sleight of hand in the first place.

Some dealers are even unwilling to use the word "interest." They prefer to call it a "small monthly charge."

TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

The confusion—and subterfuge—which characterizes the world of credit, along with his concern for the effect on the economy of the tremendous growth in consumer credit, led Senator DOUGLAS to propose, with the cosponsorship of many of his Senate colleagues, his truth-in-lending bill. The purpose of the bill is simply to give the consumer the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the charges he is asked to pay when buying on time or taking out a loan.

In brief, the truth-in-lending bill requires that anyone who lends money or extends credit must supply the would-be borrower or credit user with two simple but vital facts:

First: A statement of the total finance charge in dollars and cents; and

Second: A statement of the finance charge expressed in terms of a true annual rate on the outstanding unpaid balance of the obligation.

The bill does not attempt to regulate or control the rate of interest or the cost of credit.

The bill would enable the typical consumer to compare the cost of credit from various sources and make an intelligent decision. It would also assist him in deciding whether or not to borrow, pay cash, or save toward the purchase instead.

Suppose, for example, a man wants to borrow $1,500 to finance the purchase of a car. Assume he goes to two lenders and the first states the payments will be $53.40 a month over 36 months. While the second quotes payments of $60 over 30 months. Which credit plan is the cheapest? How can the buyer judge between these two lenders?

The truth-in-lending bill would require the lenders to provide the information the buyer needs. The first lender would be required to disclose that monthly payments of $53.40 over 36 months actually amounts to a total finance charge of $422.40 at an annual rate of interest of 18.3 percent. The second lender would have to state that the payments he receives of $60 a month over 30 months amount to a total finance charge of $300 at an annual rate of interest of 15.5 percent. Thus the buyer has the information to make an intelligent choice.

The bill, therefore, would apply the same conditions to those who sell the use of money as we require from those who sell goods. Just as we except the butcher to list the price per pound for the meat he sells, the gasoline dealer to disclose the price per gallon he charges for gasoline, and food stores to post the price for milk per quart, so the lender or credit extender should post his price.

"TRUTH" NEEDED

There are a number of sound reasons why the truth-in-lending bill should be made law.

First, it would protect the consumer's right to know the truth about credit rates and charges so that he can compare alternatives and make intelligent choices among various credit plans.

President Johnson aptly summed it up in his 1964 consumer message in which he endorsed the truth-in-lending bill. The President said: "The cost of such credit must be made as clear and unambiguous as possible, eliminating all possibility of abuse. The antiquated legal doctrine, 'let the buyer beware,' should be superseded by the doctrine, 'let the seller make full disclosure.' "

It will help to put a stop to the activities of those who prey upon the poor and profit from their unfortunate circumstances. It will not only help to win the war on poverty, but the war against the loan shark and the fast-buck artist. Truth in lending will tip the scale of justice a little way back toward the consumers and give them a better chance in the complex marketplace of today.

Second, truth in lending will protect the ethical lender and businessman from losing business to unscrupulous competitors. An honest businessman may nevertheless be forced to adopt unethical credit practices by his unethical competitors. If we require every lender to compute and state the true interest rate in a uniform manner, however, we will break the endless chain of misleading claims and shabby deceptions. Businessmen would be secure from the fear that a higher cost competitor will lure away his customers with deceptive credit statistics.

Third, it will invigorate competition and thus encourage more efficiency with, in the end, an added benefit to consumers in the form of cheaper credit. Consumer credit is a big business. In the short- and intermediate-term field alone, which means mainly installment debt, the American consumer is paying at least $11 billion a year in interest. This is more than all the sales of the entire natural gas industry. This step to increase competition in the growing field of consumer credit, in which there exists now almost no price competition, can save the American people millions or even billions of dollars a year.

Fourth, truth in lending will help to stabilize the economy. The interest rate, that is, the cost of credit, functions as a built-in economic stabilizer. When inflation or overexpansion threatens, a rise in the interest rate can discourage investment and help to keep the economy on an even keel. Or when recession or underinvestment becomes a threat, a lowering of interest rates can encourage investment. But where the interest rates are concealed, this mechanism cannot work. Most consumers do not learn of changes in consumer interest rates. Truth in lending will correct this by requiring disclosure of interest rates so that changes in them could then have their proper effect of stimulating or discouraging purchases and thus help to stabilize the economy.

WHY NOT TRUTH AND COMPETITION?

Why indeed do we not have such a law on the books already? Who would object to truth and competition in consumer credit? Despite the work of many groups and Congressmen for the truth-in-lending bill since Senator DOUGLAS first introduced it in 1960, and despite President Kennedy's and President Johnson's endorsement, powerful groups have prevented its enactment.

Truth in lending has run up against exactly the same arguments used against earlier reform legislation to protect the consumer, such as the original Food and Drug Act of 1907, the truth in securities legislation of the 1930's, the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, the Fur Labeling Act of 1951, the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act of 1958, and the Automobile Information Disclosure Act of 1958. In every case the business groups involved said that the consumer had no particular right to know the facts or that full disclosure to the public would cause the industry to collapse.

Even aside from these clear legislative precedents, consumers clearly have the right to know and to compare the costs of credit. It is only in the field of consumer credit that he is denied this information. The price of credit traditionally has been expressed as a true annual rate on the unpaid balance. The terms for loans on houses, interest rates on savings accounts in commercial banks, and short-term interest rates to businesses to finance payrolls and purchases are all expressed in terms of true annual rates. It is only the consumer of short-term credit—mainly the installment buyer and the person who takes out a small loan—who is denied this information. Of course, the consumer has a right to know the cost of credit.

If knowing the truth about credit will cause the industry to collapse, that is certainly a severe indictment of present practices. But none of these reform measures referred to above, despite dire predictions from opponents, ruined the industries involved. The stock market did not collapse because investors were told the truth about the stocks offered for sale. Truth in securities became the salvation of reputable stockbrokers. Truth in lending will strengthen the ethical credit industry.

What the issue comes down to is whether we want truth and competition to operate effectively in the marketplace, and whether we think the consumer has a right to the basic information he needs to make an intelligent decision when purchasing credit.

Those who believe the buyer has a right to know the truth about credit charges will want to express their support for this legislation to their Members of the Congress.

"Let us keep our commitments to the American consumer and pass a law which will give him an even break in today's complex marketplace. Let us reaffirm our faith in the free enterprise system and the beneficial effects of honest competition. Let us restore to the field of consumer credit the elementary prerequisites of fair dealing. Let us pass the truth-in-lending bill."—Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, July 12, 1965.

INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL–CIO

Walter P. Reuther, president; Jacob Clayman, administrative director; Jack T. Conway, executive director; Nicholas Zonarich, organizational director.

VICE PRESIDENTS

George Burdon, Walter Burke, Charles Cogen, John Crull, Joseph Curran, Karl Feller, Max Freenberg, John F. Griner, A. F. Grospiron, A. F. Hartung, Ralph Helstein, Paul Jennings, Walter L. Mitchell, Paul L. Phillips, William Pollock, S. Frank Raftery, A. Philip Randolph, W. Vernie Reed, Frank Rosenblum, P. L. Siemiller, Louis Stulberg, Jerry Wurf.

Amendments to the Railway Labor Act Are Necessary

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 706 would end some gross injustices in the present handling of employee grievances in the railroad industry—injustices that have caused widespread resentment among the employees.

The National Railroad Adjustment Board was established by Congress in 1934, under the Railway Labor Act, to arbitrate "minor disputes"—unadjusted employee grievances—in this industry, but for the past 15 years the NRAB has failed miserably to function as it should.

The NRAB is divided into four divisions. The first division handles all claims cases of the "operating" employees. Three other divisions handle cases involving the "nonoperating" employees. As an example of the delaying tactics and inaction of the NRAB, there are at the present time over 4,000 cases pending before the first division of the Board. If there were no further cases sent to the first division as of this date, and using as a yardstick the production rate of the division for the past 3 years, it would take 32 years to clear the present docket.

Railroad employees now wait as long as 10 to 11 years to get a decision on their claims pending, by which time many of them are either retired or deceased. Railroad employees are certainly entitled to more equitable treatment than is now being afforded them.

One of the main reasons for this huge backlog of cases is the refusal of management to accept awards or precedent in subsequent similar cases unless they tend to deny a given claim. The other basic cause for the slowdown and resultant backlog is the refusal of the carrier members of the Board to decide a case without a referee, unless the labor members will agree to a denial or dismissal of the claim. Preparing briefs and oral argument before a referee takes many days and even weeks in many cases, hence the reason for the carrier members refusing to decide cases without a referee. The railroad brotherhoods have tried for years to reach an understanding with the executives of the Nation's railroads which would have taken care of this matter; however, their efforts have been futile.

The result is to deny the employees many thousands of dollars due them for as long as 10 to 11 years, while the carrier has the use of this money without interest or penalty of any kind. Decisions relating to basic principles in the working agreements with the carriers are also withheld by delaying decisions of claims of contract violations.

H.R. 706 is the solution to this problem. It provides that upon request from an organization or a carrier the other must agree to the establishment of a "special board" on that particular property to dispose of pending cases. In dealing with the economic factor, the fact is that the cost of disposing of cases before a "special board" would be much less for the carrier, the organization, and the Federal Government.

There is at present provision in the Railway Labor Act for the establishment of "special boards of adjustment" on individual railroads to dispose of dockets or cases upon agreement by both parties. Of course, those railroads that are responsible for the huge backlog of cases will not agree to "special boards." A number of railroad carriers will at the present time agree to such "special boards." There is no backlog of cases on these railroads, neither do they have a backlog pending at the National Railroad Adjustment Board.

H.R. 706 is equitable to both the employees and the carriers. It makes possible the settlement of claims in a reasonable time, without waiting from 8 to 11 years for the same settlement. Justice delayed is justice denied.

Second, the Railway Labor Act now provides that "all awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board are final and binding except insofar as they shall contain a money award." The serious adverse effect of this provision on the employees is that all awards which deny a worker's claim for settlement of a grievance are final and binding, while those awards which sustain his claim when money is involved are not final and binding on the employer. Some railroad managements in recent years have adopted a policy of refusing to pay awards made by the Adjustment Board when money is involved. The only recourse open to the employee, even though his claim has been upheld by the Board, is to file a law suit in Federal district court and have his case tried all over again. This procedure may go clear to the Supreme Court of the United States. This is a gross inequity to the employees.

Railroad employees have suffered a great financial loss through the injustice of railroad management's refusing to pay claims which the National Railroad Adjustment Board has sustained, thereby finding it necessary to go through all the courts to the U.S. Supreme Court in order to try to collect a claim which has already been decided in their favor.

H.R. 706 will erase this gross injustice. H.R. 706 simply provides that all awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board will be final and binding (including those containing money) on both parties. It provides judicial review to either party if they can prove fraud, corruption, or that the Board went beyond its jurisdiction in the handling of the case. These are the tests traditionally applicable to awards of arbitration tribunals established pursuant to section 9 of the Railway Labor Act. This bill has had full and complete hearings before the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. After amendment, it was reported to the full committee without dissent and the full committee has now reported the bill out favorably without dissent. There was no minority report filed on the bill. The committee reported that:

> Under the circumstances, the committee feels that a change in the existing procedures of the Board is not only warranted but is essential. Of the alternatives considered by the committee, the approach set out in the reported bill seemed to the committee the most feasible method of resolving the existing impasse.

The bill is strongly supported by the 22 organizations represented by Railway Labor Executives' Association and by the AFL–CIO.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote for this bill.

Why Congressmen Love Their Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, an article appeared in the magazine Think entitled, "Why Congressmen Love Their Mail." In this article, the author, Leonard Baker, a former Washington reporter for Newsday, puts his finger—in some cases in a very humorous manner—on the importance and the problems created by congressional mail.

I believe the article is of interest to my colleagues, and it follows:

WHY CONGRESSMEN LOVE THEIR MAIL

(By Leonard Baker)

(U.S. Congressmen receive some 50 million pieces of mail a year. They range from offbeat requests and touching thank-you notes to crackpot complaints and abusive criticism. Answering them is a never-ending chore; but still, Congressmen like to get letters. They are vital links to the people who vote.)

A New York Congressman recently had the unpleasant job of writing to a constituent—an aged man desperately in need of an increase in his Social Security benefits—that his benefits could not be increased. The Congressman explained his efforts to help the elderly man, why the law did not permit the increase, and then the Congressman closed his letter with his personal apology. The constituent sent a reply that ended with these two sentences: "Don't worry. You done your damndest, and that's all you can do." The Congressman confesses to keeping that letter nearby. He enjoys reading it every so often, because, he says, "It gives me a boost."

Not all letters to members of Congress are so helpful. Perhaps 50 million pieces of mail will flow into the 100 senatorial and 435 Representatives' offices this year. A Senator from a large State, such as New York, New Jersey, or California, receives a thousand letters a day. A Member of the House receives between 100 and 200 a day. Some are thank-you notes. Others are requests for help. Most are demands that the member either support or oppose a particular piece of pending legislation.

Whatever the letter is, it is a vital part of political life. To the sender, the letter is a link with the vast maze that is the legislative process and the great bureaucracy of a paternalistic Government. To the receiver, the letter is a link with his constituent—the voter who determines whether he will return to Capitol Hill after the next election.

ABSURD REQUESTS

This is true even though some letters are unrealistic. Some years ago, former Senator Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, received a letter from a group asking if he could stop at the White House "on your way to the Capitol one morning" and ask President Eisenhower if he would speak at the group's annual dinner. When former Vice President Richard M. Nixon was making his trip to Russia, a House Member received a letter from a constituent asking the Member to have Nixon bring the constituent a spoon from Moscow. Several years ago, a Texas Congressman received a letter written by a farmer who had a retired veteran living on his farm. The Congressman was asked to help the veteran, who had "seen military duty as a member of the U.S. Cavalry * * * in obtaining some form of subsistence" so the veteran could live "in the dignity which should be the ex-soldier's way."

The "veteran" was a mule.

Sometimes the letters are just strange. A letter that came to one congressional office contained a bug—dead, fortunately—and a note, saying: "What is it and how can I get rid of it?" A check with the Department of Agriculture identified the bug, and the Department recommended the best bug killer. The bug had been marauding the letterwriter's roses.

But whether the letter is unrealistic, abusive, emotional, or strange, it is answered. That is the first rule of operating any congressional office. "The worst sin in the world I suppose," said a Republican elected to Congress 10 times, "is not to answer their letters." After this rule, there are several subsidiary guidelines to follow.

The first is never take a position in a letter on pending legislation. As one Member—elected to the House 11 times—explained: "Never in your correspondence before a bill has had its hearings and debate take a position either for or against the bill. Because lo and behold, in comes a guy and he takes the whole inside out of the bill and it is completely something else. Then you have to switch your position, but your constituents will never understand why."

Another guideline handed down from senior to freshmen Members is: "Remember that you are now big news in your home district and don't ever write anything to a constituent that you wouldn't be willing to see on page 1 of the local newspapers. If you can remember that, it will keep you out of trouble."

These two guidelines often result in this kind of letter: "Dear Mr. Smith: Thank you very much for your letter regarding the pending legislation on bearskin import quotas. I will keep your thoughts in mind when the bill comes before the House for debate and vote. Sincerely yours." Substitute medicare or voting rights or any other major issue for "bearskin import quotas" and you have a copy of one of the 50,000 to 75,000 letters leaving Capitol Hill for constituents' mailboxes each day.

A bland reply, yes; but safe, very much so.

There is still a third guideline—give the "crackpot" mail a chance. Each Member of Congress daily receives mail from outraged voters. By a rough rule of thumb, a letter moves from the "outraged" to the crackpot category when it includes at least three swear words, and one adjective describing the Member as "dumb" or "stupid," and an avowal never again to vote for the Member.

THE PERSONAL TOUCH

Members handle this kind of mail in varying ways. Some write placating letters explaining why they did what they did. A few Members try the personal approach. They may telephone their angry constitutents and try to talk it out. One House Member has a secretary call the letter writers. "That takes the burn out," according to the Congressman. A few days later, the Congressman himself calls.

There are still some crackpot letters that just cannot be answered in a rational manner. "They are the extremes," said a Senator. "Nobody can take care of them. I say the 12 disciples couldn't answer them * * *." Such letters are rarely acknowledged except when a Member gives vent to his own anger. There is a story of one Senator who answered such letters: "Dear Mr. So-and-So: I have received your intemperate letter of such and such a date. Sincerely yours."

Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, has phrased what may be the classic response to such mail. When a constituent from Kettering, Ohio, accused him of favoring socialized medicine because he supported medicare, the Senator replied: "I am sending you a letter received this morning, evidently from some crackpot who used your name." When a woman in Cincinnati wrote him a particularly nasty letter, Senator YOUNG replied: "Lady, reading your abusive, insulting, and untruthful letter causes me to feel happy I am not your husband."

But Members of Congress love their mail; if it slacks off, the Congressmen quickly become concerned. There is a feeling on Capitol Hill that any constituent interest, even a negative one, is better than disinterest. In 1962 a Congressman announced that a defense plant in his district was losing a major Pentagon contract and that perhaps 10,000 men would become unemployed. After breaking the news on a radio broadcast, the Member waited for what he expected would be an avalanche of mail from angry voters accusing him of not looking after his district. A week later, the Congressman, somewhat stunned and very worried, reported: "Not one letter."

Also, the mail has some substantial benefits for the Member. The number of letters on a specific issue gives him some indication of the matter his constituents consider important, and a guide to the issues that will be hottest in the next campaign. There is still another value. Sometimes a constituent writes a good letter, one that suggests a new approach to national problems, or, by its logic, can influence the Member to change his stand on pending legislation. Representative JOHN W. WYDLER, a second-term Member from New York, expressed it this way: "Sometimes you'll get a letter that will really strike you. You'll look up and say, 'This guy has a point.' "

The Congressman's mail also provides him with a mailing list of persons who have shown they are interested in Washington events and the Congressman's role in those events. To the persons on that list go the member's newsletters, copies of his speeches and other propaganda. The more highly-organized offices on Capitol Hill keep a card file with the names of every person writing to the Congressman, the subjects, the times and the dispositions. The file is kept both alphabetically and geographically. If the Congressman goes to a certain area in his district, he first reviews the cards of letter writers from that area. Then, if he meets any of them, the Congressman recalls their particular letters—as good a way of impressing voters as yet devised.

A REAL LINK

For the constituents, too, the mail has value. As more and more the Federal Government enters into all our lives, the average citizen feels less and less a part of the decisionmaking process. There are several ways he can counteract this. He can "march on Washington," participate in a university "teach-in-," contribute funds to one of the many committees dedicated to saving America from the latest evil. But the easiest thing he can do, the process available to each American—even those too young to vote—is simply to write a letter to his Congressman.

"It's a real link with their Government," said a young House Member. He frequently sends out newsletters or questionnaires to gage his constituents' attitudes on national issues. "Nothing does more good than one of these mailings," he said. "It really tells the people you are here and generates a tremendous response." His constituents, he said, do not just answer the questionnaires with a yes or no, but "they write long paragraphs telling me how they feel and why."

Another value for the constituent is that the Congressman often is the key to the bureaucratic doors that bar the American from the Federal agencies. A citizen has trouble obtaining the veteran's pension he believes he should have? A soldier needs an emergency furlough to visit a critically ill member of his family? A family needs special legislation so an elderly grandmother can be brought to this country? Write the Congressman. He is Mr. Fix-It. Whether you voted for him or against him, contributed to his campaign or his opponent's, the Congressman will help.

According to 1 estimate, the various executive branch agencies record more than 200,000 queries a year from Capitol Hill. Because many such queries go unreported, that figure is undoubtedly an understatement. Some of these queries have nothing to do with a constituent; the Member may need a fact for a speech he is writing, or he may require some legal advice for a bill he is introducing. But the vast majority of such queries involves a plea by a constituent for help in solving his problem with the Federal agencies. As a rough estimate, each working day a Member's office may have at least one new constituent problem to take up with the executive branch, and each problem requires several letters and phone calls between the Congressman's office and the executive agencies.

The Federal agencies—which depend on Congress for their operating funds—cooperate. Most agencies have congressional liaison offices to handle queries. And every 2 years when a new Congress comes to town, the agencies have seminars on Capitol Hill to explain to the new Members what can and cannot be done. All agencies will expedite a matter, unsnarl a ball of redtape, and give courteous treatment to a congressional request. But the Pentagon, for example, will be a little more expeditous and courteous for a Member of Congress who is on an Armed Services Committee, as will the Post Office Department for a member of a Post Office and Civil Service Committee, as will most agencies for more experienced, more powerful legislators.

TOO MUCH TO HANDLE

While some legislators privately grumble at the errand running they must do, most accept it as a welcome part of their job. After all, if they can help you, there is your vote, your wife's vote, her brother's vote, your uncle's vote, and the vote of the grocery man on the corner who listens admiringly to your story of how Representative Smith was so helpful to you and never asked anything in return.

But as important as the mail is to the Member of Congress, its volume is too much for him to handle personally. A Senator, for example, cannot even sign the 1,000 letters that may be processed daily by his office. Most senatorial offices use an automatic device—a machine that drives a pen to produce an exact replica of the Senator's signature. Its very exactness is the only reason it can be detected from the real thing; mechanical signatures are identical while personal signatures never are. Another favorite device is the automatic typewriter. If a large number of letters is received on a single subject, a standard reply is prepared and recorded on a cylinder. The cylinder is inserted into the automatic typewriter in much the same way that scores were inserted into the oldtime player pianos. A staff member just types the name and address, and the salutations; the machine automatically types the letter.

Although a Member cannot handle his mail personally, he can govern the efficiency and the courtesy with which his staff handles it. Most Members require their staffs to produce tallies of the mail, either daily or weekly, showing the number of letters on each subject, those for and against each legislative proposal, the number of requests for assistance and how they were handled. Members usually read a certain amout of the mail, following the announced practice of the late President Kennedy, who, it was said, read every 50th letter the White House received. Also, if a staff member is having trouble with a Federal agency in gaining help for a constituent, the Member takes over the case personally. The voice on the telephone to Representative Joe Smith is much more effective to the bureaucrat than the voice of Representative Smith's secretary.

A Member often personalizes his mail. When his secretary and the automatic machines have combined to write a rather cold letter to a constituent named, say Robert Jones, the Congressman brings back the warmth by taking pen in hand, crossing out the typed "Dear Mr. Jones" salutation and substituting a handwritten "Dear Bob."

But if the mail leaving Capitol Hill is organized, the mail coming in can be even more so. President Kennedy once pointed out that "important and powerful and well-organized interest groups" develop large mail campaigns "which tend to give an impression" of greater sentiment on the specific matter than actually exists.

How much impact does this kind of mail have on a Member's vote?

Former Representative Frank E. Smith, of Mississippi, tells the story of the House Member who always relied on a count of his mail to determine his vote on controversial issues. How would this Member, he was once asked, vote if the letters split 50–50? The Member answered: "In that case I would use my own judgment." Most Members do not rely on their mail to that extent, but it apparently does have an influence. "You don't get a letter, and then vote the way the letter tells you," said a Member. "But your mail is one of the things that does influence your vote." Another Member agreed: "On any controversial issue, a Congressman knows whether his mail is for it or against it."

THE POSTCARD DRIVE

The simplest mail campaign today is the postcard drive. In 1964 Members of Congress were flooded with cards demanding they sign the "Becker discharge petition." The petition, sponsored by former Representative Frank J. Becker, Republican, of New York, would have forced the House to consider a constitutional amendment permitting religious devotional exercises in public schools. One Member on the House side received 5,000 such postcards from constituents. On the Senate side, Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, introduced the same type of constitutional amendment, offering as one of his reasons that "I have received a great deal of mail in support of a constitutional amendment." There was no secret as to the origin of the postcards. Religious groups passed out the preprinted cards at breakfast, lunches, and other gatherings and requested their members to sign them and mail them to their Congressmen.

IF MONEY IS INVOLVED

In 1962, when the Kennedy administration tried to establish a withholding tax on dividend and interest income, savings and loan associations wrote to their depositors suggesting they protest the move in letters to their Congressmen. Many of the statements by the associations persuaded the depositors that the tax was a new one. The tax was an old one, actually, but the proposed means of collecting it was new. Again the letters deluged Capitol Hill. Some Senators claimed to have received more than 30,000 letters objecting to the withholding provision.

These two examples and what happened to the legislation illustrate something traditionally true about mail campaigns. If the issue involves money, the campaign has a much better chance of succeeding than if it involves a more basic issue as did the Becker petition. In the case of the withholding tax on the dividend and interest income, the measure was not approved by Congress although the administration claimed it would mean an additional $600 million in taxes collected—a $600 million already owed but not paid. To the Member, it seemed just a little bit too risky to buck such an outpouring of mail on a matter equal to less than 1 percent of the Federal budget.

The Becker discharge petition, however, involved a fundamental constitutional issue—the separation of church and state. At first, it appeared the Members would again bow to public pressure as evidenced by their mail. In this case, realizing the depth of the issue, they waited awhile, hoping the pressure would lapse. "I'll sign the damned petition," said one Member last year to a newsman as he fingered the latest batch of postcards, "if something doesn't happen soon." Things did happen in the next few weeks, however. Hearings by the House Judiciary Committee produced considerable opposition to the proposal.

And in the congressional offices, the secretaries looked at the stacks of postcards growing higher and higher. Some bright-eyed administrative assistants noticed that the same people signed as many as three or four postcards. The more energetic Congressmen personally met with some persons who had signed the cards, and came away convinced that the signers were completely unaware of the basic issues or the fuss they had aroused. In short, the campaign had hit a little too hard. It aroused opposition, suspicion, and humor—enough to overcome the campaign itself. The proposal never came to a vote.

Sometimes, of course, organizations try to disguise their mail campaign as a spontaneous outburst of constituent emotion. But it is easily recognized as part of an organized drive. "You get 10 letters from 10 different places in the district," said a Member, "but you can see they are almost identical. It's one letter really, with just one message, and all 10 get one answer." Another Member picked up a letter from his desk, and said, "You can see this letter was not typed but was obviously printed by offset, with just my name and the signer's name added."

During the medicare fight, one Congressman acknowledged being impressed by the letters he received from the doctors in his district urging him to vote against medicare. The letters were sincere, courteous, brief, unemotional, and some even complimented the Representative. Then the Member came across another document. This one was from the American Medical Association to doctors urging them to write their Congressmen. It advised the doctors to make their letters "sincere * * * courteous—a compliment is appreciated * * * brief * * * straightforward," and also suggested the doctors "avoid emotion." The Congressman's final reaction: "Aw, come on, doc."

There have been numerous other times when Members ignored their mail in casting their votes. One of the most outstanding examples happened back in 1941. It was August and the draft extension was on its way to being defeated because the Members of the House were getting a little too much heat from back home. It was then that Sam Rayburn moved through the House, invoking his prestige as Speaker, and told the Members to vote for the draft even though it might mean their defeat at the polls. The final vote, coming just 4 months before Pearl Harbor, was 203 to 202 in favor of the draft extension.

WHEN THE MAIL SAID LITTLE

Sometimes Members enjoy voting against their mail, or at least appearing to vote against it. Such an act suggests they are courageous statesmen rather than mere politicians. A clever legislative leader can play on that emotion, as EVERETT M. DIRKSEN did during the Senate debate several years back on the United Nations bond issue. DIRKSEN, with all the passion at his command, waved his hand and appealed to the Chamber for a favorable vote on the issue, telling his fellow Senators: "It does not make any difference what the mail from back home says to us."

Actually, the mail from back home was saying very little. The bond issue was hot in Washington but had lit few fires with the public. With those 15 words, however, DIRKSEN had created, on that issue, a moral standard to differentiate between the brave and the meek. The bond issue passed.

Unemployment Insurance and the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article by Miss Elizabeth Wickenden, technical consultant on public social policy of the National Social Welfare Assembly, Inc., with reference to the important subject of unemployment insurance coverage:

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND THE WAR ON POVERTY

(By Elizabeth Wickenden)

In the present war on poverty, as in other forms of combat, it is perhaps inevitable that, in the public mind, assistance to current casualties should initially overshadow the long-run strategies of building a stable and organized social order in which such casualties can no longer occur. Many people find it easier to grasp the need for particular forms of immediate aid to deprived individuals than to consider the need for basic reform in the institutional structures which affect us all.

Unemployment insurance, as the principal mechanism for giving the worker assured income to partially replace that which he loses through involuntary unemployment, is clearly such an institutional structure and hence a major weapon in the strategy of fighting poverty. Nevertheless, it is not surprising that its central role in any effective war on poverty has not yet received the same degree of pinpointed public attention as the crash program of innovation measures popularly known as the poverty program, authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act to help the present victims of poverty.

One of the major purposes of the poverty program is to center the attention of all elements in our affluent society on the presence in its midst of over 30 million persons who are not sharing that affluence. This is bound to create a more critical and constructive interest in the basic institutional lags and weaknesses out of which that poverty springs. Thus, the poverty program, as it becomes fully operational, is almost certain to bring about increased attention to the values of the unemployment insurance mechanism and the need to bring it up to date to meet current problems. This article is devoted to an analysis of this process and the challenge it presents.

ASSETS OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM

What are the particular assets of the unemployment insurance system as a major weapon in the war on poverty? There are four closely interrelated and central attributes whose values will surely be brought into sharper focus as the programs of the Economic Opportunity Act center increasing attention on the needs of the poverty-stricken in our society.

First, unemployment insurance is a program of cash payments.—Our economy, like other market-oriented industrial economies, is basically money oriented. Poverty, for virtually all individuals in the United States, must be measured in the first instance as a gap between their money income and that which is considered a tolerable level of individual or family income in relationship to the total actual or potential productivity of the Nation. Obviously, the poverty level in the United States, where average per capita income currently amounts to about $3,000 a year, is a quite different one from that in an underdeveloped country where per capita income runs below $100 a year.

Poverty is also different in modern America from what it was in the days when most people lived directly off the land, many of them in the relative isolation of the frontier. In those days individual enterprise and energetic self-reliance might well make the difference between a groaning board and constricting poverty. Today the individual must earn his livelihood from a job (and increasingly that job requires a large capital investment from a source over which he lacks control), or sell some product or service in the market, or live from the income of savings, or receive cash income from a governmental or other program of transfer payments—like social insurance.

There are many forms of nonmonetary benefit and service, especially those related to education and vocational training, that can enhance an individual's earning capacity, others that can help him make more effective use of his income, and others that either supplement his cash income or meet very particular needs not susceptible of answer in the market economy. In the final analysis, however, most people will measure their removal from poverty in terms of their cash income.

Not only is money income the measure of removal from poverty for most people, but it is also the measure of their dignity and freedom in a modern society. The framers of the Social Security Act understood very well this value of the cash payment for they had clearly before them the indignities of the grocery order, the rent payment, the community woodshed and the poorhouse. As these horrors have receded from memory, the proposers and makers of policy have sometimes been less aggressive in their advocacy of the unrestricted cash payment and some of their qualifications of the principle have good practical justification. But for the poor themselves, the most obvious answer to poverty is more cash in their pockets. Unemployment insurance is not the answer to the cash needs of all, but in the circumstances for which it is logical—interruption of wages due to unemployment—its cash payment aspect is a major asset.

Second, the purpose of unemployment insurance is to prevent poverty, not to alleviate poverty after it has occurred. While most people will gladly concede in theory the primacy of measures designed to prevent poverty, most of the popular criticisms directed against the unemployment insurance system ignore this distinction. The alleviation of poverty is a welfare job with benefits based on and related to the fact and existence of poverty, more commonly designated as "need." But unemployment insurance is designed to prevent poverty by assuring to the unemployed worked a predictable and objectively determined income which is related to his previous earnings but unrelated to his other assets or his need and granted as a matter of insured right. It is this attribute that gives unemployment insurance dignity in the eyes of the beneficiary. The fact that the benefit payment is often too low under many of the State laws to serve in preventing poverty is a different question, discussed later. But the basic role of unemployment insurance is a preventive one.

Two kinds of criticism, operating on quite different levels of sophistication, are frequently made with respect to this preventive aspect of unemployment insurance. The first is epitomized by the recurrent newspaper story of the unemployed movie star arriving in his limousine to pick up his unemployment check. Here a naive or deliberate confusion is cultivated between unemployment insurance, in which entitlement is based on prior work history and availability for work, and public assistance where entitlement is based on actual need. Both programs suffer from this common confusion of their purposes. A more sophisticated version of the same confusion goes something like this: "Assuming a limited amount of money available to help the unemployed, any payments made by unemployment insurance to the nonpoor, in effect, make it impossible to give adequate aid to the poverty-stricken unemployed."

The first fallacy in this line of reasoning is the assumption that either the number of the unemployed or the amount available for their support is fixed. Obviously well adapted economic, educational, and service policies should be capable of reducing the extent of unemployment to manageable proportions. But even assuming present levels of unemployment, payments made to the unemployed play such a role in maintaining the consumption side of the market equilibrium as to justify them as an element of production costs. In any case the cost of making payments related not to need but to joblessness is not so great as to justify distorting a preventive institution into one based on need. If one starts with the assumption that prevention of poverty is a primary social goal, no benefit conditioned on the fact of poverty can serve that goal.

Again many of the criticisms directed toward unemployment insurance are based not on its basic concept of entitlement but on its inadequate implementation in terms of extent of coverage, benefit levels, and conditions of entitlement. Obviously, the answer to these problems is not a different system but a better adapted use of the existing system.

Third, a closely related value of unemployment insurance is the factor of legally enforceable objective criteria for entitlement based on a previous work history.—If one accepts the premise that in the modern world individuals are largely dependent on social instrumentalities for their income, it follows that the only effective answer to a sense of helplessness on the part of individuals lies in legally enforceable rights and entitlements. This aspects of the war on poverty has been recognized by the Office of Economic Opportunity in the strong encouragement it is giving to the financing of legal services to the poor and the emphasis placed in discussions of those services on representation of individuals before the governmental bodies controlling public benefits. It becomes especially important with respect to those benefits, like public assistance and unemployment insurance, where adverse public opinion in particular circumstances may influence the decisions and policies of administering agencies.

It is sometimes difficult for employees of governmental agencies, conscious of their efforts to protect the interests of their program beneficiaries against every sort of pressure and criticism, to recognize the extent to which the right of appeal against their decisions and representation by a lawyer or other outside advocate protects the health of the program for which they are responsible. The effective utilization of the right of appeal would also seem to require the review and consideration of State agency practices related to legal representation and assistance for unemployment insurance claimants and the difficulties they sometimes encounter during the appeals process. Not only the observance of the objective rule of law guaranteeing appeal rights, but the maintenance of a fair balance between the administrative and beneficiary relationships is the essence of legal processes to protect the rights of the latter.

A legal right, however, must also be rooted in a well-accepted social value and here again the entitlement factor in unemployment insurance has a basic strength in its relationship to a work history. For work is still the most generally accepted basis for income in our society, despite the interesting speculations of groups like the Ad Hoc Committee on the Triple Revolution that automation with its attendant abundance may ultimately make this an obsolescent relationship. Certainly for the present there is no question but that income from productive labor is the most acceptable basis both to the individual and to the molders of public policy. In this sense unemployment insurance may be regarded as a kind of deferred return on labor already performed as well as a token of good faith with respect to the willingness of the worker to return to productive labor as soon as a job is available to him. Since his ability to perform such labor is conditioned on the productive apparatus of the country, the cost of carrying him over this period of involuntary unemployment is considered an appropriate charge against the cost of production itself, and his entitlement to benefits is still firmly based on his status as a member of the work force in good standing.

There are many precedents for legal entitlements surrounding an individual in his capacity as a worker and unemployment insurance derives great strength from its association with them. Here again the shortcomings of unemployment insurances in this respect are not intrinsic to the concept. They result from failures to make the adaptive modifications required to meet changing conditions.

Fourth, and basic to all other unemployment insurance values, is its ongoing institutional stability.—For not only does the mechanism of social insurance protection against the risk of unemployment assure predictable income to the individual, it also plays a major role in the total institutional structure on which the health of our society increasingly depends. Neither production nor consumption can any longer be regarded as functions based exclusively on independent individual initiative and effort. Production requires heavy investment in highly complex organizational structures which in turn rely on a market situation largely supported by the availability of expendable income.

An employer cannot control his market conditions any more than a worker can control his job. Both are equally dependent on an elaborate complex of delicately balanced interactive institutionally mechanisms in which the market economy is only one of many factors. In this situation the health of the market economy is as dependent on overall institutional mechanisms as is the employer for a return on his investment and the worker for a return on his labor. In simple fact, all are equally dependent on their common instrumentality, government—not to supplant their own functions but to create the institutional relationships within which all can function and thrive.

Obviously, within such a complex interaction of institutional relationships the role of government must itself be institutionalized, i.e., based on a rule of law and operational mechanisms which function with predictable continuity. It is conceivable, of course, that government might deal with the fact of individual poverty due to joblessness in a purely ad hoc manner with some official reaching into a common fund for the relief of destitution according to his own best judgment of the moment.

But in the anarchy of such an arrangement more than the dignity and security of the worker would suffer. All aspects of economic functioning would be thrown into disarray and the rule of law which is the essence of stable government would be totally undermined. In other words, the prospect is so unthinkable in the modern world as to make the point really unarguable: institutional continuity is a major asset in the role of unemployment insurance in an effective war on poverty.

ADAPTATIONS FOR THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM

But institutional continuity does not mean institutional rigidity, and this turns attention to the other half of this analysis: the changes that are needed to make the unemployment insurance program a really effective instrument for fighting poverty. For institutions are like people; constant growth and adaptation are not only indispensable for effective functioning, they are the very price of survival itself. So when one comes to look at the shortcomings of unemployment insurance as a weapon against poverty, one must consider first the failure of our policymakers to keep it up to date.

In the 30 years since the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935, our gross national product has grown from $72.5 to $634.6 billion in 1964; our total civilian labor force has grown from 52.8 to 74.2 million and the distribution of that force, both in terms of occupation and geographical location, has drastically altered; changes in the relative contribution of machinery and labor to production have started a process of revolutionary change which is bound to accelerate; the educational and skill components of required labor within that production pattern are equally altered; the age and sex distribution of the work force has likewise undergone a major change; the average weekly gross earnings of a production worker in manufacturing has risen from $23.64 in 1939 to $103.38 in 1964; and the scope of both domestic and world markets has constantly widened. These are just some of the factors that have revolutionized the economic and, more specifically, the job market situation in which unemployment insurance is expected to play its appropriate role.

What has been done in that 30-year period to bring about commensurate adaptations in unemployment insurance? The answer is very simple: At the Federal level, at least, virtually nothing. While its companion social insurance program of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance (OASDI) has been repeatedly enlarged, strengthened, and adapted to changing needs—through wider coverage, higher benefits, and new forms of protection—the Federal-State unemployment insurance system has stood virtually still except as individual States have moved ahead of the country as a whole. Fortunately, there are now signs of real hope for imminent change in the fact that the administration has put forward major remedial proposals, now under consideration by the Congress.

What would be the effect of these proposed changes in terms of the war on poverty? Without discussing the individual provisions in detail their impact applies to five broad related areas: coverage, benefit levels, benefit duration, benefits while retraining, and the role of the Federal Government in unemployment insurance.

COVERAGE

The criticism is made frequently that the unemployment insurance system fails to protect those who earn the least, who are the most vulnerable to unemployment and hence most quickly thrown into poverty if they lose their jobs. Obviously, this is not an attribute of the system itself but of our failure to move it out of the selective coverage with which it, like OASDI, began its existence into one of more universal applicability. Assuming, as this article does, that employment opportunities almost universally derive from a total institutional complex which is subject to social and economic factors that cannot be controlled either by the individual employer or the worker, protection against the risk of individual unemployment within that complex should be universally shared.

The current proposals move in that direction by extending coverage to 5 million additional workers, mainly those in small firms, in nonprofit organizations, and on large farms, and by modifying the requirements for effective coverage. The fact that many of the workers in these groups are peculiarly vulnerable to destitution is important to the war on poverty but less so, in the view of this observer, than the fact that it is a movement toward universal coverage. For only when all workers are covered will the preventive wall against poverty due to temporary joblessness be complete.

BENEFIT LEVELS

Poverty, to the jobless worker, must be measured by two yardsticks: the absolute levels of his current income and the degree to which he has suffered a reduction from his normal standard of living. By neither standard is our current unemployment insurance system adequately meeting its proper role as a preventive of poverty. The war on poverty has used a rough average of $3,000 a year for a family of four as the pivotal measure below which poverty may be assumed.

Reduced to a weekly figure this would require an income of something over $57 for the elimination or prevention of poverty. But even with all the wide variations among the State benefit schedules the average weekly benefit payment in 1964 was only $35.96. There are, moreover, only seven States (at this writing) which permit unemployment insurance payments—under even the most favorable circumstances—to reach this out-of-poverty level under current maximum limitations.

For the worker who bases his standard of living on the assumption of a continuing earning power, the other measure of poverty is equally important. In turn, our very economy is based on this same worker's willingness to make long-term expenditure commitments in terms of such essentials as the mortgage on his house or rental levels established by lease, his time payments on an automobile and all the other expensive investments of modern living, his health and other insurance payments, his educational obligations to his children, and his taxes. When he loses his job, not only his personal economy but his role in the national economy is thrown into disarray unless his replacement income bears a reasonable relationship to his earnings.

Yet here unemployment insurance payments are not only hopelessly inadequate, averaging only 35 percent in terms of wage replacement, but are actually 6-percent lower than they were in 1939. Under the provisions of the proposed legislation all States would be required to raise the weekly benefits amount to 50 percent of the individual's weekly wage up to the State maximum, and the maximum would be set initially at 50 percent of the statewide weekly wage, thus rectifying the situation to that extent. This is a long overdue step in the right direction.

DURATION

In this hasty overview it is clearly impossible to discuss the full implications of existing duration limitations on the effectiveness of unemployment insurance as a preventive of poverty. Perhaps the most significant fact to note in this area is the changing character of unemployment itself. In the unemployment insurance system envisioned by the framers of the Social Security Act in 1934, it was apparently assumed that most unemployment would result from seasonal factors in production or temporary dislocations in the market.

The role of the worker in this picture was assumed to be relatively static; after the seasonal or market dislocations had passed, the worker would return to his former or similar job. But in today's changing economic pattern the causes of unemployment have changed in ways that create a far greater risk for particular workers of long-term unemployment or major changes of occupation, skill, or location that require considerable time for readjustment. Thus, in practical fact, the exhaustion of claimants' benefit rights under existing duration restrictions of the State laws has become a major factor in creating poverty and dependency. Even though the actual number of individuals exhausting their benefit rights before securing employment has gone down in recent years, they still constitute nearly one-quarter of all beneficiaries. Obviously, these people have no choice but to turn to public assistance or relatives if jobs cannot be found.

The legislative proposals aim to improve this situation in three ways: (1) by requiring the States to provide benefits for at least 26 weeks to eligible claimants who meet the requirement of 20 weeks of prior employment; (2) by giving additional financial help to States whose own funds are depleted due to heavy unemployment; and (3) by the provision of a permanent program of Federal Unemployment Adjustment Benefits (FUAB) for the long-term unemployed worker with a strong prior attachment to the labor force.

RETRAINING

Closely related to the problem of duration, as discussed above, is the question of whether the unemployed worker can hope to find a job without acquiring a new or different skill. Under the original unemployment insurance concept a primary condition of entitlement was considered to be "availability for suitable work," by which was meant that the worker must be continually available in case a job similar to the one he had formerly held opened up. But for a worker displaced by automation, changing skill requirements, or major shifts in employment distribution such continous "availability" may prove an actual handicap to reemployment if it prevents him from acquiring a new skill through training or from moving to a new location to seek employment. The FUAB program would make a progressive step toward solving this problem by conditioning these extended benefits on retraining where appropriate and by the provision requiring States to pay regular benefits to unemployed workers while taking training approved by the State agency.

A STRONGER FEDERAL ROLE

Perhaps the most significant contribution of the current proposals to make the unemployment insurance system a more effective weapon in preventing poverty is the recognition that unemployment is a national problem requiring nationwide standards of remedy. Even though the Social Security Act left the actual administration of unemployment insurance to the States, it recognized the need for a nationwide system by the ingenious tax offset system which virtually assured universal State participation (which in fact did occur), and imposed certain minimum standards to achieve the elements of a common program.

Again, failure to update those standards to meet changing conditions has left the States in the situation where any initiative by a particular State to raise standards above the Federal requirement is resisted by employers who fear for their competitive situation in relationship to those employers in less enterprising States. Obviously, in a Federal system where many States must function within a single national market, the Federal Government is the only jurisdiction which can assure simultaneous updating of provisions among all the States, thus providing a reasonable standard of adequacy without competitive disadvantage to any one State.

From the point of view of the worker, the benefits of such action are obvious, but it is hard to understand why employers have not all been equally alert to see its advantages for them. Not only will this act simultaneously protect their own work force and their own competitive position, but it is the surest way to maintain the market on which their prosperity ultimately depends.

LIMITATIONS ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM

In conclusion something should be said about the limitations of the unemployment insurance system in the war on poverty. Not all or even a majority of the people who are presently poor can expect to have their poverty eliminated either by finding a job or receiving the kind of substitute income provided by unemployment insurance. It is even possible that the expanding productivity of each worker may still further reduce the work force by extending the period of youthful preparation, speeding the retirement of the elderly, and encouraging other forms of activity for persons whose major usefulness and fulfillment may lie outside the wage economy. There are other ways of assuring adequate income to these groups, and the effectiveness of unemployment insurance would not be enhanced by trying to stretch its provisions to meet their needs.

Moreover, unemployment insurance can never substitute for a full-employment economy. By its very concept of entitlement, its role must always presuppose the ultimate and, in fact, prior existence of a job. Thus the creation of jobs—whether in the private sector motivated by profit, the public sector providing authorized services, or the possible extension of public works jobs specifically designed to make good use of available workers—must always take priority as a goal. But within its own supportive limits unemployment insurance should be recognized for what it is—a major arm of the country's poverty-fighting establishment, needing only the kind of updating of its weaponry that has been so generously supported in other kinds of warfare.

SOME "FIRSTS" IN THE HISTORY OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IN THE UNITED STATES

1916: The first proposal for a State unemployment insurance law in the United States was made in 1916 when a bill, modeled largely after the British Act of 1911, was introduced in the Massachusetts legislature.

1931: In a special legislative session, Wisconsin enacted the first unemployment insurance law in this country. The Wisconsin Unemployment Reserves and Compensation Act, approved on January 28, 1932, culminated 10 years of legislative discussion in the State.

1935: Following approval of the Social Security Act on August 14, which established the Federal-State system of unemployment insurance in the United States, Congress enacted the unemployment compensation law for the District of Columbia on August 28. This was the first "State law" to include coverage of one or more at any time, and to provide benefit allowances for dependents.

1935: The first State unemployment insurance laws were approved by the Social Security Board: District of Columbia on November 15 and Wisconsin on November 27.

1936: On August 17, Wisconsin paid the first unemployment benefit check to be issued in this country from a State unemployment insurance fund.

1940: On September 23, New Jersey became the first State to enact a provision for preserving a servicemen's benefit rights earned before induction for use after military service.

1942: On April 29, Rhode Island became the first State to enact a temporary disability insurance law, to be administered in coordination with the unemployment insurance program.

1944: Michigan was the first State to add a provision for dependents' allowances to its State unemployment insurance law.

1945: Maryland was the first State to eliminate the waiting period.

1946: Total benefit payments exceed $1 billion for the first time.

1949: On February 28, Kansas became the first State to enact legislation providing for a flexible maximum weekly benefit amount.

1953: Nevada was the first State to increase maximum taxable wages above $3,000.

1954: The Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of August 5, included the first permanent provision for Federal assistance to States with low reserve funds.

1954: September 1, marked the first major extension of coverage under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act—to firms employing four or more employees in 20 weeks, effective after January 1, 1956.

1958: On June 6, Pennsylvania became the first State to sign an agreement with the U.S. Secretary of Labor electing to participate fully in the temporary unemployment compensation program. However, on April 16, Connecticut, prior to the inception of the Federal-State TUC program, but while it was under active discussion, was the first State to initiate its own program of paying additional benefits, equal to 50 percent of regular benefits, to claimants who exhausted their regular unemployment insurance benefits.

1964: On May 2, Hawaii became the first State requiring employer contributions on a flexible taxable wage base. Beginning in 1965, an employer was required to pay contributions in a calendar year based of remuneration paid for employment to each individual not to exceed 90 percent of the "State average annual wage." In 1963, one house of the Idaho Legislature passed a measure providing for a flexible taxable wage base.

Compulsion—The Issue in 14(b) Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a timely and significant editorial on the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, written by John M. Johnston, appeared in a recent issue of the Chicago Daily News. Mr. Johnston brings out certain aspects of this question that once again merit attention.

His editorial follows:

COMPULSION—THE ISSUE IN 14(b) FIGHT

(By John M. Johnston)

A delegation of 100 Illinois businessmen is going to Washington next week to lobby against repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. According to the announcement by the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, they intend to explain to Congressmen "how a closed shop and other critical labor issues could affect their business."

Such a mission seems to be as misguided as its publicity is deceptive. The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits a closed shop. What is involved in 14(b) is the union shop. Not even that is at stake in Illinois, where the political strength of the labor unions is ample to block the passage of a right-to-work law.

The big objection to the mission, however, is that it falsely makes the issue merely one of who would be hurt and who helped. (The 14(b) clause permits States to outlaw contracts requiring union membership as a condition of employment.)

The real issue is far deeper. President Johnson had his try at beclouding it by asserting that his purpose in asking repeal was to make the labor laws uniform, to "bring the 19 States with right-to-work laws into line with the 31 which do not have them." But mere uniformity could be achieved just as well by amending Taft-Hartley to forbid the union shop.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz says the issue is really the liberty of contract, the right of an employer and union to make an agreement by which all employees must join the union. It would be an evil principle, however, which held that the right of contract destroyed all the rights of minorities.

Wirtz' position would sanction agreements in which employers agreed to hire no women, or Negroes, or Presbyterians.

The struggle over the union shop, while of no practical significance in Illinois, really goes to the heart of the preservation of democracy. I question whether there is a single supporter of 14(b) repeal who does not know in his heart that he is morally wrong in pursuing an oppressive course for his own advantage.

The Johnson administration to its discredit, is paying off a debt for the support of the labor unions. The unions are unashamedly reaching for more power. Who can doubt that, if they could, the union chiefs would conscript every worker and bind him to pay dues and obey commands?

It is unfortunate that businessmen should give the impression that they, too, are equally narrowly concerned with their own interest.

Democracy presupposes that people are capable of doing things for the general good, of foregoing private advantage in favor of fairness, of justice, of decency between man and man.

No amount of palaver can disguise the fact that the union leaders want a union shop in order to reap dues for their political and propaganda endeavors, to bring unwilling workers under their discipline, to increase what is euphemistically called "bargaining power," meaning the ability to put an employer out of business till he meets their terms.

H.R. 12410

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the cold war GI bill will provide an adjustment program necessary to meet the changing needs of our times. Like its predecessors, it reflects our deep-seated gratitude to the men and women who have faithfully served in our Armed Forces during what is termed the cold war. The label "cold war" is in a sense a misnomer since every individual entering the service, regardless of the year or particular world situation can incur risks of a special nature. Furthermore, he may be required to interrupt his education or career, often for an extended period. During this time he receives relatively low pay, certainly not enough to enable him to save for the future education or training essential to a successful career. As a result, some readjustment benefit plan is necessary to help the veteran obtain the education or skills vital in this age of technology. This bill is designed to accomplish just this objective.

It should be remembered that this legislation is of economic value not only to the veteran, but also to his community and Nation. Our society is bound to be enriched by the strengthening of the capabilities of those who will be called upon to lead our Nation in the important years ahead. They will be treated in a manner comparable to that accorded their fathers, brothers, and uncles, who were the beneficiaries of previous GI bills.

In terms of return on investment, there is none better. Experience has shown that the past GI programs have more than repaid their cost in tax revenue received as a result of the increased income of the veterans. I am confident the result of this bill will be likewise.

While much has been said about the educational benefits provided by this legislation, its other provisions are also significant. The home-loan benefits, non-service-connected disability rights and veterans preference provisions are particularly noteworthy. These considerations have been reflected in prior programs which over the years, have proven effective and justifiable.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming bipartisan support which is accorded to this measure deserves more than passing mention. It is not often that legislation of this import can pass without a single dissenting vote. Such backing is a tribute to our veterans and reflects the attitude of a grateful people.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baldwin, John F., *Calif*	
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*	1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*	
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5019 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	1705 Longworth House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg*	914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*	
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Fogarty, John E., *R.I*	1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*	301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn*	119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George, *Idaho*	
Hansen, John R., *Iowa*	800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	4517 Wetherill Dr., Westmoreland Hills, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y*	The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*	
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	

Appendix

National Recognition for Citizens of Montana—Tribute to Joe Carroll and Catherine Nutterville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am indeed pleased that so many past and present residents of my State are receiving recognition.

The new Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Jack Hood Vaughn, is a former Montanan. Jack Mahan, of Helena, is the new Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and is also former national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Senator MANSFIELD this month selected Joseph S. "Stan" Kimmitt, a former resident of Great Falls, as administrative assistant to the majority leader. Mr. Kimmitt retired last month as a colonel from the Army. He served 5 years as Senate liaison officer for the Secretary of the Army.

Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall named Dr. Joseph P. Linduska, formerly of Butte, as Associate Director of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife.

Dr. Fred Honkala, dean of the graduate school at the University of Montana, was appointed by Secretary Udall to a vacancy on the General Technical Advisory Committee of the U.S. Office of Coal Research.

Director Sargent Shriver, Jr., of the Office of Economic Opportunity, named George McCarthy, formerly of Butte, as Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs.

The Washington Post recently featured two Montanans who are in active roles in this area. "Man From Montana is D.C. School Find," read the headline on Columnist George Lardner, Jr., story about Joe Carroll, assistant superintendent of the District of Columbia Public School System. Twice Mr. Carroll's age but also working in education is Dr. Catherine Nutterville, a VISTA volunteer who spent more than 50 years teaching in Montana.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 1966]

TEACHER, 78, CARRIES BANNER FOR VISTA

(By Anthony Keith)

A veteran educator who taught the poor in a rural schoolhouse more than 50 years before the war on poverty was declared is one of Washington's cadre of 17 Volunteers in Service to American (VISTA), the poverty program's "domestic Peace Corps."

Catherine Nutterville, now 78, is still a teacher, but her aims and techniques are keyed to the new effort. Like most of the other—college age—VISTA volunteers here, she works through the United Planning Organization, the city's poverty agency.

Miss Nutterville, who has been working at UPO's neighborhood legal services headquarters since early November, is completing plans to teach impoverished youngsters "in terms that will reach them" what their legal rights are. Using such devices as mimeographed pamphlets and informal drama she hopes to convince them to "see themselves as dignified human beings" in a classroom that's new to her—one of UPO's neighborhood development centers.

One of Miss Nutterville's proposals is to sponsor a student essay contest on the rights and responsibilities of people who rent or buy houses. She points out that "while these children are competing they will be carrying the word home, for the generation that didn't learn."

Education was different in the one-room schoolhouse in Fort McGinnis, Mont., to which she rode on horseback in the early years of the century.

"I was working with 23 rural children aged 6 to 18," Miss Nutterville recalls. "My oldest boy was older than I was myself. We played and worked together; it was a very simple world.

"These people were poor," she adds, "but they weren't poverty stricken" and they didn't face social discrimination as many Washington youngsters have. "Now I come into these complexities of color and poverty. The world is different."

Convincing whites and Negroes alike she is not "a little old lady in a glass case" is one problem, she says, and she wants to be "in on the testing" of her theories at a neighborhood development center.

"I had fussed because I didn't have any field work" during 6-week VISTA training at the University of Syracuse, she recalls. Complaints won her an assignment to teach three functionally illiterate adults in their homes, one of whom read to fourth-grade level after 13 visits, she said.

Miss Nutterville joined VISTA last July because "it was impossible to do otherwise." Helping the poor was family doctrine, she said, and the depression years in Butte "were a very subtle type of schooling." She came out of semiretirement in Great Falls, Mont., after a teaching career that spanned more than 50 years at elementary and high schools and colleges. Along the way, in 1942, she obtained a doctorate in education from Columbia University.

VISTA's wage scale made life "a little rough" the first months here, said Miss Nutterville, who lives alone in a modest downtown apartment. (Volunteers get a monthly living allowance—about $140 here—and lump payment of $600 when they complete a year's service.)

But if she can convince Washington youngsters "that they're dignified human beings * * * that they're not dropouts * * *. If I can get that across I think it will be worth the year I put in."

MAN FROM MONTANA IS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL "FIND"

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

WOLF CREEK, MONT.—Seems an unlikely beginning for a big-city-school official.

But the mountain air must have done Joe Carroll good.

He didn't just teach at Wolf Creek's high school—in Cascade, Mont., 35 miles away. He drove the schoolbus, too. In his spare time, he coached.

"There weren't many services," he says, "but you did a lot of things with the students."

Carroll's title is now assistant superintendent in charge of budget, research, and legislation for Washington's public school system.

The city was lucky to get him. For new ideas from school officials, the 39-year-old Carroll is the man to watch.

School Superintendent Carl Hansen is still the boss. And as Carroll told a panel program here recently, the two don't always agree. But, he stressed, Hansen's always willing to listen.

And every once in a while, Carroll makes a sale.

He started work 2 years ago. Since then school officials have stopped apologizing for their budget requests and started fighting for them. Most of the cuts were being made at the District Building with all the discrimination of a bologna slicer, a study by Carroll charged.

The complaint drew denials. But officials at the District Building no longer cut budget requests without thinking twice. In fact, they've grown quite sensitive about the cuts they do make.

The schools, of course, are still short 1,001 things and not just in dollar signs. Carroll's the first to admit that the suggestions he pushes are ideas rather than answers for the problems of Washington's schools. But he believes that answers can be found and short of the millennium, too.

"This is the decade of the big cities ahead of us," Carroll feels. "Somewhere we're going to be able to break the bind, make people in the city feel like individuals."

After Wolf Creek, where individuals have no trouble feeling that way, Carroll shifted to Harvard where he spent 2 years finishing up his work for a master's degree and getting a doctorate in education.

From there he went to the Newton, Mass., schools, a highly touted system of some 17,000 students ("full of new ideas and experiments"), where he worked in the business office for 5 years. Before coming to Washington, he spent another 3 years as a management consultant for a Chicago firm—but he got tired of the traveling involved.

On his third trip here, an assignment for the Fairfax schools, he heard the budget job was open, called Hansen and got it.

"He did tell me it'd be frustrating," Carroll recalls. "And he also told me that if I had trouble working in a biracial situation, this wouldn't be the place for me."

The Carrolls bought a home in integrated Neighbors, Inc. territory, entered their two children at Shepherd Elementary. The oldest, Walker, had trouble with his reading in first grade, but, Carroll says, the class had 39 youngsters, "too many for a teacher to handle adequately." All in all, though, he's satisfied with the school and its teachers.

"I don't feel the kids are losing," he says, "but one of the reasons is that we're able to shore them up at home.

"If you took the same classroom load, but with more children who have problems and no special help at home, the teacher would have to be a second cousin to Christ to handle it."

If the city's schools are to get anywhere close to the educational paradise of "individualized treatment" for every student, Carroll adds, "we've got to get on the bicycle and move. Our problem isn't integration; it's disintegration."

The mammoth dream budget presented by Hansen to a House Education and Labor subcommittee this month—$212.4 million a year in operating costs plus a $265.7 million construction program—indicates what's involved.

"The number one answer," as Carroll sees it, "is making the school system highly competitive. Salaries are a factor in this, but I'd put it second or third. What teachers want most is a situation where they can work with a feeling of accomplishment, a chance to try out their own ideas. If a teacher is given a difficult assignment, it should be a sign that he or she is good enough to handle it."

Carroll would also like to see decentralization of the school system under community superintendents reporting to the central administration. Some may suspect this would only foster de facto segregation, but that would depend to a large degree on how the boundaries are drawn. Others may feel it would foster autonomous little principalities, but that, Carroll feels, could be prevented by tight management controls.

"Bigness," he says, "isn't necessarily goodness."

That's a lesson that educators from Wolf Creek, Mont., have no trouble remembering.

Sewart AFB Closing Leaves Builders Holding the Bag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to mount that Secretary McNamara's announced proposal to close Sewart Air Force Base in Rutherford County, Tenn., was hastily conceived and ill advised.

It has now been disclosed that just 2 months prior to the announcement of the proposed closure by Secretary McNamara an Air Force official told builders in the area around Sewart that 475 homes would be needed for Sewart airmen.

The Nashville Banner recently published an article in this connection, detailing the experience of one builder, Mr. J. W. Brandon of Smyrna, Tenn.

Under unanimous consent I insert this letter in the Record, believing it to be of broad general interest to my colleagues and to the Nation.

The article from the Nashville Banner follows:

SEWART CLOSING LEAVES BUILDERS HOLDING BAG

(By Frank Van Der Linden)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's sudden order closing Sewart Air Force Base at Smyrna by 1970 has left local builders holding the bag with about $300,000 worth of unsold homes, Representative Joe L. Evins was informed today.

Evins gave a House Armed Services subcommittee a letter from J. W. Brandon of the Smyrna Hardware and Lumber Co. charging that the Air Force pleaded for construction of 475 new homes for Sewart airmen last October.

That was just 2 months before McNamara decided to scrap the $44.6 million troop carrier facility, which he had previously certified as permanent.

Brandon told the Smithville Congressman that "on or about October 2, 1965, Brig. Gen. Ernest C. Hardin called about six of us builders together to acquaint us with the proposed buildup of Sewart Air Force Base * * * he and his staff requested that we provide as many new dwellings as possible, requesting a total of 475 units of all types.

"As a result of this meeting, we pulled the stops out and by the time Secretary McNamara made his closing announcement, we had either under construction or almost completed 20 new homes, representing some $300,000 worth.

"It goes without saying that the announcement practically stopped the sales of new homes. We are selling a few simply because there is no other place for the servicemen to live; but with little folks like ourselves, operating on limited capital, it is difficult to understand why our Defense Department would operate in this manner.

"In addition, we understand that at the briefings of new men entering Sewart Air Force Base, they are being told not to buy new homes under any circumstances. This seems unfair to us after General Hardin's request to provide as many homes as possible."

Brandon said McNamara showed very poor judgment by reversing his pledges of last April—that Sewart would be permanent—and by scrapping an important troop carrier base when every indication points to an escalation of war in southeast Asia.

Evins has high hopes that the House subcommittee will recommend that the Sewart order be rescinded.

The First Statue Dedicated to the Memory of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as we approach the anniversary of the birth of Illinois common man for the ages. I think it appropriate to enter into the record an interesting article which appeared in the February edition of the Illinois Bar Journal concerning the first known statue of this common man whose words and deeds have made such a lasting impression upon mankind that he belongs not to one nation or generation but to all nations and all generations, Abraham Lincoln.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One hundred years ago this year the first statue dedicated to the memory of Abraham Lincoln was unveiled in San Francisco.

The statue was produced by Pietro Mazzara, who is believed to be of Italian ancestry. He resided in San Francisco for several years according to news items carried in San Francisco papers. He died in September 1883, in Paris, at the age of 60.

Mazzara apparently was moved to sculpt the statue within days after Lincoln's death. His model was ready for exhibition within 3 months of Lincoln's assassination and was shown in the autumn of 1865 at the Mechanics' Fair in San Francisco.

Shortly thereafter, a group of citizens headed by William Chapman Ralston, president of the State Bank of California, purchased the statue from Mazzara and placed it on a pedestal in front of a new grammar school named after Lincoln. The statue was dedicated April 14, 1866.

The Lincoln Grammar School, a four-story brick structure, was one of the finest buildings in San Francisco at that time. It was located at Market and Fifth Street. The school was opened on June 29, 1865.

A third grader at the school by the name of George W. R. King was given the honor of unveiling the statue. He told his school master that he had shaken hands with Lincoln on April 11, 1865, while passing through Washington.

The statue is unique in two respects: (1) Conventional statue garb was discarded for contemporary dress, and (2) Lincoln is shown dressed in the pink of fashion.

F. Lauriston Bullard, the author of the book, "Lincoln in Marble and Bronze," states that the "pose is theatrical—that of a self-conscious man, which Lincoln was not—but the uplifted face is that of a man proud of a great deed." His right hand holds a scroll, smybolizing the Emancipation Proclamation, and his left hand is uplifted in a gesture of grandeur.

Another Lincoln authority, Lucias L. Solomans, stated in a speech in 1936 that "the (right) hand rested upon the curly head of a manumitted slave boy." Photos of the statue do not make this clear.

The statue, made of plaster, stood in front of the Lincoln Grammar School until 1889 when a replica made of French bronze was substituted for it. Then in 1906 the great earthquake that hit San Francisco destroyed the statue.

It is interesting to note that the inscription on the statue contained a mistake in stating Lincoln was elected President in March 1861 and reelected in March 1865. He was inaugurated at those times. The inscription reads:

"Abraham Lincoln, born February 12, 1809, elected President of the United States March 1861, reelected March 1865, died April 1865."

ILLINOIS BAR JOURNAL.

Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert in the Congressional Record my remarks, I include therein an item which appeared in the Andrews, S.C., High School paper written by Miss Susan Terry of Andrews, S.C., entitled "Democracy: What It Means to Me."

Miss Terry's grandfather came to this country from Edinburgh, Scotland, 40 years ago and has distinguished himself as a sculptor. He supervised the carving of most of the figures on the east front of the U.S. Capitol.

I am delighted to know that our young people are beginning to take more interest in their Government.

I trust that every Member will have an opportunity to read the article written by Miss Terry:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Susan Terry, member of the senior class, Andrews High School, Andrews, S.C.)

Democracy? What about it? What is democracy?

Democracy is our government, our work, our enjoyment, our own personal religion; it is our way of life in this United States of America.

Today, a man picks up his newspaper and reads a group of liberals are burning their draft cards, marching in Alabama, or protesting the war in Vietnam. As he reads on, he notices the newspaper's remarks on these and other world affairs. All the remarks are not complimentary. He wonders how these people, these liberals these demonstrators can do these things. Why can the paper print such material? He knows this is America, the land of democracy, which permits freedom of the press and the right of the people to oppose their government. Even though these people oppose violently, they do it because they have the right of opposition.

Last night, on his way home from work, the man heard people on the streets orating on such subjects as our Government, religion, the stock market, the Peace Corps. What right do these people have to do this he wonders. Then he realizes that freedom of speech is also part of our democracy.

Sunday the man and his family attend the church of their choice because of democracy's freedom of religion.

The man sits on the jury in court the next week. Five men stand before the judge. Two of the men are the sons of a wealthy, well-known businessman. One is a Negro who already has a criminal record. The other two men are nationalized Americans. One is an exiled Cuban; the other was an honest man till he fell in with the others. The five men are given the same sentence because in America men are equal regardless of their birth, wealth, race or religion.

The man goes home and thinks over the events of the past few day. He wonders about his freedom to follow the cause of his choice, his freedom to be a part of the business world, and his right to have an equal share in government. Is this, too, still a part of democracy? Which part? Yes, these freedoms are all involved in democracy, but they are of different types.

Economic democracy is his freedom and right to pursue the career of his choice and to better himself in it.

Social democracy is his right to have equal rights regardless of his race, birth, wealth, religion or sex.

Political democracy is his right to have an equal share in government.

"Democracy is a way of life that is my abilities derived from my background and how I use them," the man has decided.

How can we strive to keep democracy? We can by being good citizens taking an active part in government, by getting the right education so that we can understand and do our duties to our country to help better our lives, by fighting daily against communism, fascism, and other types of dictatorship to helping those in need. The poverty-stricken hungry or ill person is always tempted by these other ways of life.

I am just one person, a student at an American high school, but together we, the citizens of this country, are a vast army that can, by trying, keep democracy in our country alive.

Progressive Investor-Owned Power Company Makes Significant Report to West Virginia Delegation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Members of the West Virginia Delegation in the Congress were privileged today to have been guests of the Monongahela Power Co., at the annual luncheon that progressive firm hosts for the purpose of reporting on notable developments in its important service area.

Today's significant event in which I shared guest status with my distinguished colleague, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, and Representatives HARLEY O. STAGGERS, KEN HECHLER, JOHN M. SLACK, JR., and JAMES KEE, was the "Upward Appalachia" luncheon in the annual series.

There are numerous reasons for the title, "Upward Appalachia," as the theme of the luncheon. Things are, indeed, looking up in Appalachia, a note on the program pointed out, listing as an example the Monongahela Power Co's, upward progress in the construction of its $110 million Fort Martin Power Station on the Monongahela River near Morgantown, W. Va. When this huge station is finished, it will more than double Monongahela Power Co.'s use of West Virginia coal.

Monongahela Power President Don Kammert, emphasized that the industrial outlook in West Virginia is most promising, with many firms indicating more than a cursory interest in possible new plant locations in the Mountain State. He pointed out that in addition to the State's basic natural resource industries—coal, oil, gas, quarrying, and lumber—there is increasing diversification, and this is a significant development. And, Mr. Kammert further emphasized, West Virginia's highway development and projections are proving to be magnetic to commerce and industry, while outside industries also are noting the Mountain State's progress in tourism and tourist accommodations—with further substantial improvements in this field coming "in the very near future."

The Monongahela Power Co., through its energetic president and fellow officers and staff members, presented to the West Virginia delegation a splendid report on activities of the company and its service area which relate to the economic growth of West Virginia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed with these remarks, in the Appendix of the RECORD, the report to which I referred.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT OF MONONGAHELA POWER CO. ACTIVITIES WHICH RELATE TO THE ECONOMIC GROWTH OF WEST VIRGINIA

$2,200,000 RATE REDUCTION

Effective January 1, 1966, Monongahela Power reduced rates for practically all of its customers. These reductions amount to $2,200,000 on an annual basis and represent the largest reduction in the history of our company. The reductions apply to customers in all categories and exclude only those few who now are paying fixed minimum bills.

These reductions have been made possible by increased efficiency of operation, increased volume of sales and recent reductions in Federal income taxes. We are hopeful that the new rates will stimulate greater use of electricity and make our area more attractive to industry.

We are proud of our record of rate reductions which are in keeping with our policy of always striving to provide electric service at the lowest possible price. This is our sixth reduction in the past 8 years. In 27 of the past 40 years we have effected reductions. One result is to be seen in the average cost per kilowatt-hour. In 1926 the average household was paying 7.7 cents per kilowatt-hour. Today it is down to around 2½ cents.

OUR CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Monongahela Power will spend more than $35 million for construction of generation, transmission, distribution and general service facilities during 1966. That is about $9.5 million more than we spent during 1965, the difference being accelerated expenditures at Fort Martin generating station where construction will reach a peak this summer. Aside from Fort Martin we still will spend around $10 million this year for regular construction and for additions to our major transmission system.

It may also be of interest that Allegheny Power System companies, of which we are one of three—all in the Appalachian region—will spend a total of $74,500,000 during 1966.

Barring unforeseen delays, the first unit at Fort Martin will be placed in operation in May, 1967, and the second unit no later than spring, 1969. The rapidly developing market for power supply has caused us to step up our target dates for both units. Our forecasts now indicate that we will have need for additional power supply by 1970.

The extra-high-voltage transmission system that will link Fort Martin and the Allegheny Power System companies into a broad network of 500,000-volt lines is underway and it, too, should be completed by 1967. We will start construction of towers on the 72-mile segment from Fort Martin to Virginia Electric & Power's new plant at Mount Storm as soon as the weather breaks.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Figures which have just been compiled by Monongahela's area development department on industrial development during 1965 are particularly encouraging. More than $32 million was spent on new industrial facilities within our service area, practically all of it in West Virginia. A total of 29 completely new industries came into the area, while 42 of our existing industries expanded operations. Those combined expansions represent 1,666 new jobs, with a potential additional employment as high as 3,341.

Our own industrial development staff processed 332 inquiries during the year and after those were screened there remained 122 prospects, many of whom are still being furnished with information about the area.

The upswing in industrial development in West Virginia can very definitely be credited to the fine teamwork that exists in the State, involving all agencies of development—Federal, State, and local agencies, industry, and the communities themselves. We're in a better position than ever before to grow, and the completion of our new highway system should do much to stimulate that growth.

THE GREAT BLACKOUT

None of Allegheny Power System's integrated facilities were affected by the outage on November 9, 1965, which blacked out New York City and most of New England for several hours. As a result of that blackout, however, we have undertaken to review our facilities, operating practices and planning philosophy to help us avoid such an occurrence on our system. Unfortunately, the New England incident has resulted in considerable unjustified criticism of interconnected systems, when actually interconnections represent a most important contribution to the stability of power supply. Also, as the use of electricity grows by leaps and bounds, those interconnections represent one of the major factors in keeping power supply cheap as well as plentiful. Just within our own system it means that we can use the more efficient and economical generating units of the three companies and deliver power supply anywhere in the system to meet varying peaks in the five-State area. That same situation holds for our interconnections with the other transmission systems around us.

The Only True Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the continuing concern over civil rights clearly indicates that regardless of the number of Federal laws proposed and enacted, the real solution for such problem lies in local initiative and decision. This is one of the significant points made by Dr. John A. Hannah, Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in a speech at the annual meeting of the Cincinnati Human Relations Commission on January 27, in which he reviewed the civil rights issue since the Commission was established in 1957. He commented not only on the current situation but made recommendations as to the efforts which must continue if we are to eliminate discriminatory practices throughout our country.

While there is still much to be accomplished to insure equal opportunity among our citizens, Dr. Hannah's remarks about the progress which has been made are encouraging.

I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to Dr. Hannah's objective appraisal of the problems before his Commission and under unanimous consent I include his speech in the RECORD:

THE ONLY TRUE GLORY

(Address by John A. Hannah, Chairman U.S. Commission on Civil Rights at the annual meeting of the Cincinnati Human Relations Commission, January 27, 1966)

The opportunity to participate in this annual meeting of the Cincinnati Human Relations Commission is appreciated. As we learn more and more about the complex problem of civil rights in America, it is interesting to note how the various communities approach a solution of their specific difficulties. No two take exactly the same approach, and this is as it should be; for no two communities are exactly alike, and what works well in one will not necessarily work in another.

Cincinnati is especially interesting to the outside observer in view of its history, its geographical location with ties to both the North and the South, the composition of its population, its rich cultural heritage, and its industrial importance. Other cities, like your own in some respects, may well be able to learn from your experience here, and it is to be hoped that as the flow of information improves, you may be able to learn from experiences elsewhere.

This very diversity argues strongly for the contention that no overall panacea for our social ills can be divined in Washington, enacted into law, and imposed uniformly on the whole country. If my 9 years as Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights have taught me anything, it is that the final solutions will have to be worked out locally, and that whether they will be worked out depends on the willingness of local leaders to work together in a spirit of cooperation, mutual trust, and shared responsibility.

This is not to suggest that the Federal Government has no part to play, that all can be left to local initiative and decision. The evidence is all to the contrary. It is self-evident that there are levels of responsibility, with Federal, State, and local governments being called upon to act in their own areas of influence.

But the responsibility does not end with the agencies of government; it runs to many kinds of organizations and to the individual citizen, too. If our theory of democratic government is to retain its validity and virility, then every American must participate in the solution of what is surely the most pressing and most demanding domestic problem of our times. It is my conviction that no domestic problem confronting our country today is more complex, more frustrating at times, more important, and more demanding of solution than the problem of civil rights.

The participation of every American in the decisions that must be made being essential, it is heartening to observe so many private citizens lending their talents as volunteers to the efforts to find fair, equitable, and honorable ways out of our great difficulties. Once the majority of Americans become involved in intelligent discussion, we can depend upon them to make the right decisions.

What, specifically, are we talking about when we discuss civil rights?

Civil rights are, by definition, the rights of citizens—all citizens. Furthermore, and more important, they are the rights extended to all citizens equally.

For our purposes today, let us define civil rights to be the rights of all Americans to:

1. Equal opportunity to be educated to the full extent of their human talents;
2. Equal opportunity to fully use their potential contribution to our society through equal opportunity for employment and comparable compensation for that contribution;
3. Equal opportunity to live in decent housing and in wholesome neighborhoods; and
4. Equal opportunity to participate fully as citizens through a fully free and encouraged opportunity to vote in all elections.

If all Americans enjoyed equal opportunity in these four particulars, then the more serious problems of civil rights would soon be solved.

It is well to remember that the founders of our system of government did not delude themselves that they had developed a perfect system. They were wise men who made the art of social organization their principal concern, but they were also humble men who understood that changing conditions would demand changes in the social structure. Hence they deliberately framed a system for our government that would be flexible and adaptable to new situations as they developed. There is nothing wrong with the basic system they devised—the fault lies with those who have failed to sense changing conditions through the decades and failed to make the changes that were so evidently needed.

The Founding Fathers wrestled at the Constitutional Convention with the problem of human slavery and worked out an acceptable compromise of divergent views. They provided that the importation of slaves into our country was to be prohibited after a date not far in the future, calculating that with the supply shut off the institution of slavery would wither away as more and more free Americans became available to perform the work then assigned to slaves. As events were to prove, they miscalculated. Slavery did not wither away, but instead continued to be a point of bitter contention until it was wiped out in the aftermath of the bloody Civil War.

At the end of that war, those in the victorious North recognized that something had to be done if the millions of newly freed slaves were to be assimilated into society, and for a few years there was intensive activity intended to insure the vote to these new Americans, and to give them the equal protection of the law. Then interest dwindled, and for too many decades the American people shut their eyes to a situation plainly demanding adjustment and redress.

It was not until the Supreme Court ruled in the school segregation cases in 1954 that interest in civil rights, so long dormant, was rekindled.

You may remember that those decisions immediately precipitated dispute over what the actual facts were in the whole area of denial of civil rights because of race, or color, or religion, or national origin.

Some insisted that the old separate-but-equal doctrine provided equality of educational opportunity; others denied it. Some claimed that jobs were equally available to all; others said that was not true. Some asserted that there were equal housing opportunities available to all Americans; others claimed the contrary. Some insisted that there was unfair discrimination in the administration of justice; others denied it. Some said that in too many places, citizens were being denied the right to vote because of color or race; others claimed that was untrue.

In this atmosphere of contention, the Commission on Civil Rights was created by the Congress in 1957 on the recommendation of President Eisenhower in an attempt to substitute light for heat. It was created as an independent bipartisan agency, and President Eisenhower appointed three members from the North and three from the South.

The very charter of the Commission suggests the state of confusion about the facts prevalent at the time. It was given the responsibility to investigate complaints that citizens were being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, or national origin. It was given the responsibility to appraise public policies relating to the equal protection of the laws in such areas as education, housing, employment, the administration of justice, and the use of public facilities and transportation. Finally, it was to report the facts of violations and abuse, if any were found, and to make suggestions for their correction to the President and the Congress.

Please note that the Commission on Civil Rights was given authority only to investigate, report, and recommend, not to take any action on its own.

At that time, many doubted that any Federal agency with authority only to investigate, report, and recommend, but not to act or to enforce, could make much impact on the troubled civil rights situation.

Today, less than 9 years later, there is no longer any serious dispute about the facts. There is plenty of argument about what should be done to correct violations and abuses, but little or none about the facts. The credit for this constructive change in atmosphere I claim with all modesty for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

In developing the information on which decisions could be strongly based, the Commission has held 15 major hearings in cities in all parts of the country.

The Commission plans to hold its next important hearing in Cleveland. Testimony will be taken in all areas of civil rights concern, but much emphasis will be on education. Cleveland is chosen as the site of this important hearing because it is a large northern city with a large Negro population and problems typical of those in northern urban areas. More importantly, Cleveland has demonstrated that it has good community leadership and a strong disposition to tackle its difficulties in an atmosphere of cooperation and good will. We are very hopeful that from this hearing there will come suggestions that will be helpful to other large cities in both the North and South.

Every year since the Commission was established in 1957, it has published a report summarizing information developed in the course of the year, and making specific recommendations to the President and the Congress. The recommendations have been based in part on testimony taken at hearings, in part on information developed through the Commission's staff through investigation and research, and in part on information supplied by volunteer advisory committees to the Commision now functioning in all 50 States and the District of Columbia.

In addition, the Commission has published a number of special reports offering an honest appraisal of the programs of certain Federal agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture; the Department of Defense; the Department of Justice; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and others.

The Commission has made 25 major recommendations for changes in Federal law or Federal policy since it was established in 1957, and 19 of those recommendations have been adopted in whole or in major part. In addition, there have been innumerable changes in the regulations and procedures of Federal agencies.

Sometimes, in the midst of demonstrations and bitter controversy, we tend to lose sight of the undoubted fact that the taking of testimony, patient investigation, and sensible recommendations for action have and can have, profound effect. I commend that approach to you here in Cincinnati.

You might be interested in just one brief case history of the evolution of a Commission recommendation because it shows how powerful an idea can be when it is based on unassailable fact and appeals to the American sense of justice.

In 1959, three of the six members of the Commission on Civil Rights took the position that since all Americans pay taxes to the Federal Government, none should be excluded because of race, color, religion, or national origin when Federal funds are granted in support of specific projects. That led to the recommendation that Federal agencies withhold funds from any institution of higher learning which refused to admit, on racial grounds, any student otherwise qualified for admission. At the time, the Federal Government was granting through universities and colleges hundreds of millions of dollars each year in support or research, student loan programs, etc. Much of this was going to public universities which were denying admission to Negroes solely on racial grounds. At that time, three of our fellow Commissioners disagreed with us, as did a lot of newspapers and other commentators.

A year later, however, in 1960, the entire Commission endorsed a similar recommendation. In 1962, the Commission recommended to the President that he, by executive order, advise all agencies of the Federal Government that Federal funds be withheld where their expenditure would support activities in violation of Federal law—constitutional, statutory, or Supreme Court interpretation. The Commission was roundly criticized for this recommendation, not only in the South but in the North as well. President Kennedy indicated in a news conference that he would not follow the Commission's recommendation on the grounds that such executive action would be presumptuous on his part and that he would not ask Congress for the authority which he felt was not his already.

However, in 1964, only 2 years later, Congress followed the recommendation and provided in title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that all Federal funds be expended in a non-discriminatory manner only.

So, in 5 years, a recommendation originally applying only to colleges and universities, and later expanded to cover all Federal funds, was written into law to apply to all agencies of the Federal Government and all other institutions and agencies receiving Federal financial support.

Why this drastic change?

I like to think it was because the majority of Americans had come to agree that if a citizen is required to pay taxes or serve his country in the military or elsewhere, no matter what his color or race or religion, then he is entitled to share all benefits when tax money is expended.

That something will be done when Americans know the facts is one of the most heartening aspects of the difficult civil rights situation. The great majority believe in fair play, and once they become persuaded that the deck is stacked against one group of their fellow citizens, they support action to assure them an even break. The history of recent years bears that out, and justifies the hope for continual progress—slower than some would like, but continuing progress all the same.

Risking the danger that always attends historical assessment at close range, it can be suggested that in the years since 1957 the Federal Government has reexamined and restated the rules under which we are going to operate in the area of civil rights; it has reasserted the traditional American belief in the equality of men; it has set in motion powerful machinery to bring about the practical realization of our idealistic concepts; and it has acted to insure that its own practices and procedures do not impede, but stimulate, progress toward those goals.

In these turbulent years the Federal Government has played a role it had long avoided but could not honorably escape. When we talk about civil rights, we talk about the rights of citizens—all citizens—and we look to the Constitution, the Supreme Court, the Congress, and the Chief Executive to define and protect the rights to which all of us are entitled as American citizens.

Now the Federal Government has redefined those rights. Furthermore, it has made it abundantly clear that the Civil Rights Acts and related laws are going to be enforced. It has served ample notice that when Federal funds are expended, they are going to be expended without discrimination among citizens. Race, color, creed, or nationality are not to count against any citizen's eligibility to share in the benefit of Federal programs.

To be sure, a great deal more needs to be done, and will be done. It may be too soon to say, but certainly not too soon to ask, whether we have not reached a memorable point in this great social readjustment. It is not too soon to ask whether we have not reached the point at which the Federal Government, having pointed the way, begins to shift the burden of responsibility to others. Is it not now the responsibility of State and local government, and private agencies and organizations as well—social associations, labor unions, business and industry, schools and churches—to bring their policies and practices into line?

This relates to what was said earlier to the effect that the final solutions of civil rights depend to such a large extent on local initiative and determination. There is no comfort in this thought: A great deal of drudgery will be involved, and infinite patience, courage, good sense, and good will will be demanded of us. All of us know that it is a lot easier to make policy than to devise a workable system for putting it into effect.

With due respect to the role of the Federal Government, all of us should look forward to the time when Washington agencies are less prominent on the civil rights scene, and State and local agencies and organizations come to the fore. Such a development would indicate that the American people had accepted and endorsed the principle of equality of citizenship, and turned their efforts and attention to the task of making that philosophical concept a working, living reality in their home communities.

Looking forward to that day—and it will surely come—let us attempt to put our difficulties into some kind of perspective.

First of all, we should attempt to throw off some of our guilt feelings, which might well distort our judgment, and understand that the situation today is not entirely one of our own creation. Each generation has inherited the problem from the one before. What is distressingly clear is that each successive generation has inherited a larger accumulation of difficulties because of lack of corrective action in earlier years. It is only in our time that the accumulated deficit resulting from years of failure to take corrective action has reached the critical stage—the point of the explosions that have marred the national scene in recent years. It is our lot that the necessity—or the opportunity—to set things aright has fallen to us of this time.

Then we must realize that we are attempting to make a tremendous social readjustment, not in isolation, but at a time of social and political revolution in many parts of the world. As a prominent banker pointed out recently, political power is in the hands of the millions in the underdeveloped nations today. Hunger now has access to political power. Poverty with political power lifts its voice, articulate and without apology. So it is in the world, so it is in America, and what we do is being done in the powerful spotlight of world attention.

Then we should keep in mind—and this has special pertinence for you in Cincinnati—many of the final answers to the nagging questions with which we are beset will be hammered out in the cities. The majority of Americans live in the cities; wealth and economic power are centered in the cities; jobs and opportunities are most plentiful in the cities; the peculiar conditions of urban life exacerbate the difficulties of housing, health, and education which are the major components of the total problem.

More and more, the aspirations of those who are demanding their full civil rights are being defined in political, social, and economic, but mostly economic terms. Jobs and opportunity for advancement are the prizes most eagerly sought, particularly in the Northern States, and it is in the cities that they are sought most insistently.

We must recognize that Negroes make up the largest single minority group of American citizens, and hence their justified demands deserve priority of attention.

Ladies and gentlemen, it will do us no good to ignore those demands, or to blindly trust that the complex problems they pose will somehow solve themselves. Negroes already constitute a majority in the District of Columbia, and in 1960 they made up more than 20 percent of the population of the central cities of 11 metropolitan areas having a million or more residents. By 1980, if the arithmetical projections of current population trends are borne out, Negroes will be in the majority in Detroit, Cleveland, Baltimore, Chicago, and St. Louis. These are the realities with which we must deal, and deal soon.

Our concern for the Negro must be more intense and possibly more immediate for the simple reason that he labors under handicaps more severe, more humiliating, and more destructive of will and motivation than the rest of us. We need to persuade him that education offers him the best way out of his present economic and social condition.

This opportunity other Americans, be they fourth generation or newly arrived from foreign lands, have been quick to exploit. Immigrants to these shores have either already known or quickly learned, that education could open the doors to opportunity. Perhaps it was too late for the parents, but not for their children.

The Irishman, the Hungarian, the German, the Italian, the Swede, the Armenian, the Greek, bore no physical characteristic that made him different from others in this country and hence a fixed target for discrimination. Furthermore, they did not bear the stigma of slave descent.

All of us in this room, unless there be full-blooded American Indians among us, are the descendants of immigrants. But who can tell about the majority of us, by looking at us, from what country our progenitors came? Furthermore, who cares?

But all Americans do not enjoy this immunity from categorization. The Negro is forever marked by the color of his skin as one apart. He cannot lose himself in the homogeneity in which the rest of us can take refuge. He is forever marked as being of another race, fellow American though he be.

We must keep in mind, too, that progress is being made, and made rapidly. Theodore H. White has written that "the success of the Negro in many of the great American cities is one of the breathtaking stories of human progress."

Negro life expectancy has risen from 35 years at the turn of the century to 65 years today; individual income for Negroes rose 54 percent between 1950 and 1960; for families, it went up 73 percent. In 1945, only 4 percent of Negro families made more than $6,000 a year; in 1961, the proportion had increased to 20 percent.

Census data in 1960 showed that whereas only one-third of Negro males in the South were employed as production workers, craftsmen, clerical or sales workers, in the North nearly one-half were so classified. For this gain we can thank enlightened business and labor leadership.

These data are cited, not to suggest that the Negroes have no basis for complaint, but to demostrate that substantial progress has been made, and that more can be made given sufficient good will and determination. We have not been handed a puzzle without an answer, but one that can be solved with patience and effort.

Our concern cannot be for the Negro alone. It must extend to the white man in the slums as well as to the members of all the minority groups that are sometimes discriminated against—Latin Americans, American Indians, and others. It must extend to the youngster on the cutover subsistence farms, the unemployed miner in Appalachia, the migrant farm workers and the tenant farmer on the Southern plantation, as well as to those even more disadvantaged in the ghettos of our big cities. All these must be the objects of our concern, else we shall be guilty of the discrimination we all deplore.

I would be unfaithful to my trust as a universtiy president if I failed to point out that much of the growth in income most of us have enjoyed in recent years has been the result of a better educated work force using more and better equipment. For me, education is the most promising instrument with which we have to work, but that is another story too long to be related here.

It appears to me that we have two major problems, one short range, one long range. In the immediate future we must find ways to help those who find it difficult, if not impossible, to find useful, productive employment for reason of lack of education. President Johnson and the Congress have already launched a number of programs to improve the lot of this large group, and make them useful, productive members of society.

The long-range programs must do something for the youngsters, and those yet to be born, and here education is the key factor. We may as well face the fact that we must live through a long period of tension and difficulty and that it will not end until a whole new generation has grown to maturity, a generation grown up under conditions encouraging the development of all youth of all colors and all races and all economic conditions, with all having access to the same opportunities for growth, and education, and employment, and recognition as all other of their fellow Americans. This is the great challenge that faces our society in 1966. How do we make these opportunities available equally to all—and encourage all to use them?

As a final comment designed to help put our difficulties in prespective, we should remind ourselves, as all Americans should remind themselves, that freedom and self-discipline are forever intertwined, that rights and responsibilities are the two faces of the same precious coin.

In this connection, I like a comment made recently by David Rockefeller when he said:

"No society can guarantee every man the fulfillment of his individual quest. What it can do is to spur his willingness to learn, reward his daring to venture, hold forth promise for his striving and his ability, and make room for his personal capacity to create. It can also instill and reinforce the sense of responsibility which is necessary not only for good citizenship, but also for good individual fulfillment."

Finally, it is interesting to note that the agency created by you here in Cincinnati to wrestle with these tremendous social problems has taken the name of "human relations commission." Many others, a remarkable number, have done the same.

Perhaps we have been making a mistake by lumping all of these complex matters of racial, religious, social, economic, and political relationships together under the term "civil rights." Perhaps we should be talking about human rights instead. The phrase "civil rights" has a cold, legalistic tone about it, and may mislead us into the delusion that law can and will right all wrongs.

But when we speak of "human rights," we bring the matter down to the level of each of us, and we begin to think, as we should, of others as human beings like ourselves, human beings with the same ambitions, hopes, fears, and aspirations that we all entertain—human beings entitled to the same respect and dignity others enjoy.

The task of education—and religion, too—the task for all of us in 1966 is to persuade people that color and race make no difference.

The British Ambassador to the United States, Sir Patrick Henry Dean, brought home this point forcefully last year in a speech at Williamsburg, Va. Sir Patrick pointed out to his American audience that the founders of this country sought to create a truly humane society in which the individual man is seen to be the center of our political universe.

"In such a society," he went on to say, "the individual man must be the master and not the slave of his ideological and national environment, and the only true glory can come from his being able to choose in freedom, and satisfy in dignity, his own personal, spiritual, and material aspirations."

Are we of this day, two centuries later, willing to settle for a society less humane than our forefathers sought to create for us? Are we of this day too crass, too materialistic, too selfish to accord to our fellow-citizens less than we demand for ourselves?

I do not think so. That is why I believe that this new year, and the years to come, will see you in Cincinnati and your fellow-citizens in hundreds of other cities, lead the way, steadily, and confidently, toward the time when all Americans will enjoy all of their civil rights equally, and their human rights as well.

Breakthrough to Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two poems written by my friend, David Gimbel of Brooklyn, N.Y., who has done so much in behalf of retarded children:

BREAKTHROUGH TO DIGNITY

(By David Gimbel)

Across the length of this great land,
There are countless children who need a friend,
For they dwell in a world untouched by time,
By generations of people who have drawn a line.

And so in the country, village or city,
When folks pass them by they say, "What a pity!",
While they go on their way and soon will forget
The child that they saw but never had met.

Yet retarded children, in their own gentle way,
Are like other children in their affectionate way.

They seek only love, for on this they all thrive,
Because this is the food that keeps them alive.

They watch other children as they play and they run,
But they're not accepted to join in the fun.
And so, like a wall that seems without end,
They are all closed in without even a friend.

Yet we hope that the clouds will soon disappear
And that the rays of the sun will begin to appear,
Then the breakthrough to dignity from these centuries of strife
Will bring all of these children a new way of life.

THY CHILDREN, THY CHILDREN

(By David Gimbel)

O Eternal Father of the universe, in the shadows of our existence we pray to thee for guidance.

For we are the parents of retarded children who must live every day with the dawn of fear and with the sunset of distress. In their community of bewilderment they so tenderly reach out but most of these angel children only find so much emptiness.

O dear God we beseech thee to awaken those who seem deaf to our pleas and who are so blind to reality, How many more words will yet have to be spoken, how many more tears shall we shed, how many decades must we still wait?

O dear Lord how many times the welcome mat has been pulled from under the very feet of these angel children. As a result like driftwood they were left to pile up on a lonely beach the debris of humanity. Although some of us manage to smile, our hearts always seem to cry within us. For laughter is the echo of happiness, but tears are merely the silence of yesterday.

Guide us dear God from the stormy seas that has engulfed our lives and into a safe port of understanding and hope. Tis there we will find the warmth of friendship and the open gate of acceptance for our children in the circle of brotherhood.

O dear God make our days brighter and our hearts will be lighter. Make our hopes everlasting for thy love of humanity is like a gentle caress that is filled with the beauty of loveliness.

Forsake not thy little ones, Oh Lord who dwell at thy feet. Amen.

The Abolishment of Pornography and Antitheistic Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Woman's Club of El Campo, Tex., I call to the attention of the Congress a resolution recently adopted by that organization concerning the abolishment of pornography and antitheistic materials.

The resolution follows:

THE WOMAN'S CLUB,
El Campo, Tex., January 25, 1966.

THE ABOLISHMENT OF PORNOGRAPHY AND ANTITHEISTIC MATERIALS

Whereas the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has stated that American morals are besieged today by an unprincipled force in the spread of obscene literature through the means of films, photographs, comic books, magazines, books, phonograph records, and pornographic materials; and

Whereas this practice is robbing our country of decency and serves as a seedbed for delinquency and sex deviation among juveniles and depravity among all ages; and

Whereas unspeakable vile and antitheistic materials are being sent unsolicited through the U.S. mails into homes and are sold openly elsewhere: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Woman's Club of El Campo, Tex., strongly urge its members and other citizens to use every available means to combat obscenity, pornography, and antitheism; and be it further

Resolved, That we write our President, Senators, and Representatives to ask their assistance to bring this before the U.S. Congress to solicit their aid in preventing such material being brought before the public.

MRS. JAMES RANKIN,
President.
MRS. GEORGE WILSON,
Chairman.
MRS. FLOYD CHRISTIAN,
MRS. PAUL LAMPLEY,

Community Antenna Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks my office has received literally hundreds of letters and telegrams from residents of my State who are subscribers to Community Antenna Television. These people are deeply concerned about reports that the Federal Communications Commission is planning to impose restrictions upon the CATV industry which will impair the service which they presently receive. After some study of the problem, I can only conclude that their fears are not unjustified.

It is not my purpose to maintain that the FCC is without authority to regulate CATV. Nor is it my contention that no regulation is needed. However, the authority of the FCC to regulate and actual regulation are not the same thing. Moreover, judging from the substance of staff recommendations at the FCC and the basic assumptions underlying these recommendations, I seriously question the correctness of what I anticipate the regulations will be.

I do not intend at this time to delve too deeply into the technical aspects of the problem. I will, however, cite the possible effects that regulation will have upon CATV subscribers in my district, specifically in Laconia, N.H., which presently has the sole CATV system in my district. It is my impression that the situation in Laconia is not dissimilar to other situations throughout the country.

Laconia is a small city in central New Hampshire. It has no local television station of its own. As a matter of fact, the only TV broadcaster in New Hampshire is located in Manchester about 45 miles from Laconia. By present FCC standards, Laconia is located within the grade B contour of three Maine broadcasters who represent all three major networks. A grade B contour is one in which the broadcaster delivers an acceptable signal to 70 percent of the locations 50 percent of the time. The plain and simple fact is, however, that for those who live within the city of Laconia, normal off-the-air reception is inadequate and unreliable. Therefore, many people desirous of better reception have made the financial outlay to subscribe to Community Antenna Service. The very fact that people subscribe to the system is evidence of the inadequacy of off-the-air reception.

The Community Antenna Service also furnishes, by way of microwave relay, a major New York independent station. This service is particularly attractive since this station carries the New York Yankees baseball games.

If the FCC staff recommendations are incorporated into regulations much of the service now provided will be severely curtailed. For example, the nonduplication requirement of the recommendations would require the CATV to black out any show which is being carried by any other stations in a grade B contour. The practical effect would be to require the viewer to watch the weak signals transmitted by the Maine broadcasters, or watch nothing at all. Such a regulation would be totally unrealistic. It would effectively deprive a large segment of the subscribers of decent television reception.

The FCC has indicated that one of the reasons it wants to restrict CATV is to encourage the development of local television stations. There is undeniably merit in this purpose. However, to the best of my knowledge, no one has ever evinced an interest in establishing a local station in or near Laconia.

A further justification for restricting CATV has been its "economic impact." This can be and often is a valid justification. The underlying assumption involved is that CATV has a negative effect on local advertising. But when the community involved lies on the outer fringe of a station's B contour, this justification is less persuasive. A Maine television station is not the logical medium for Laconia, N.H., advertising. I would , therefore, seriously doubt that CATV in Laconia has adversely affected the advertising revenues of the Maine broadcasters.

I have not attempted to discuss all the effects that unwise and unduly restrictive regulation would have upon CATV. I have attempted to briefly outline the most harmful effect that such regulation would have upon one community. Undoubtedly, there are countless other communities in the same position. I want to make it perfectly clear that my primary concern is for those subscribers who without CATV would not receive adequate television service. I will vigorously oppose any regulation which will impair this service.

The Independence of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the small businessmen of the Nation are dismayed at recurrent rumors that the Small Business Administration is to be transferred to the Department of Commerce. In the face of these rumors many expressions of alarm and opposition to such a proposal have been received by the House Small Business Committee.

Typical of these is a letter from Mr. Ernest H. Osgood, president of the Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., a great organization well known for its dedicated advocacy of small business.

In his letter, Mr. Osgood very ably sets out strong reasoning why the SBA should not be absorbed into the Department of Commerce but should remain independent.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the letter from Mr. Osgood in the RECORD. The letter follows:

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF
NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
Boston, Mass., February 3, 1966.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVINS: Many members of the Smaller Business Association of New England have heard disturbing rumors during the past few days that plans are now being discussed in Washington to strip the Small Business Administration of its independence and place it within the Department of Commerce.

Our association strongly believes such a move would seriously weaken the effective role the SBA has performed since 1953. There is no organization for small business in the country that has been more closely associated with the SBA than ours. SBANE worked closely wth the House and Senate Small Business Committees in the years preceding the Small Business Act of 1953 and many of its proposals were incorporated in this legislation. During the past years we have continued to give close attention and constant official liaison to the SBA and know of the extensive assistance this agency has given the small business community of the Nation since it became an independent agency.

For years before the SBA was created, agencies for small business existed within the Department of Commerce but their capabilities were never realized in a department long preoccupied with large business affairs. SBANE is alarmed that small business problems will again be relegated to second place within a department more attuned to big business.

Since 1953 Congress has recognized, through the SBA, the difference between big and smal business and has served well its obligation to assist the small business community. SBANE respectfuly urges that you use the influence of your office in opposition to any plans that would dilute the aims and programs of the Small Business Administration.

Sincerely,
ERNEST H. OSGOOD, Jr., *President.*

Plain Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, out of the many thousands of words written about Vietnam the plainest words—in the opinion of Columnist David Lawrence—came from President Johnson on his arrival in Hawaii. For, says Lawrence, "he summed up the American case in a plain-spoken way."

Lawrence said that President Johnson's statement "against retreat and surrender are a timely warning to the enemy that the United States is resolute and determined to carry on the war until an honorable settlement is made. The principle of safeguarding small nations against aggression is vital to America's safety in a world menaced by Communist imperialism."

Reading this, I felt that others will also want to see the appraisal made by this writer who was on the scene at Geneva when the fate of Indochina was the issue, and with this in mind I would like to submit his column for the RECORD.

TODAY IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS: WHY WE'RE IN VIET—JOHNSON EXPLAINS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—"What's the Vietnam war all about?" Many a person who doesn't follow in detail the ups and downs of a war 10,000 miles away asks that question and begins to wonder how it is related to the safety of the United States.

Out of the many thousands of words written about the war, perhaps the simplest explanation of the whole problem was given by President Johnson on his arrival in Hawaii last Sunday. For he summed up the American case in a plain-spoken way. The speech appeared in condensed form in most cities, but the actual text of a few paragraphs is worth reading and rereading. The President said:

"It is a question of the gravest importance to all other nations, large or small, whose people seek to walk in peace and independence. For were the Communist aggressors to win in Vietnam, they would know they can accomplish through so-called wars of national liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea—or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and Malaya—or the threat of aggression in Turkey—or in a free election anywhere in the world. * * *

"There are special pleaders who counsel retreat in Vietnam. They belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope. We cannot accept their logic that tyranny 10,000 miles away is not tyranny to concern us—or that subjugation by an armed minority in Asia is different from subjugation by an armed minority in Europe.

"Were we to follow their course, how many nations might fall before the aggressor? Where would our treaties be respected, our word of honored, our commitment believed?

"In the forties and fifties, we took our stand in Europe to protect the freedom of those threatened by aggression. If we had not then acted, what kind of Europe might there be today? * * *

"If we allow the Communists to win in Vietnam, it will become easier and more appetizing for them to take over other countries in other parts of the world. We will have to fight again some place else—at what cost no one knows. That is why it is vitally important to every American family that we stop the Communists in South Vietnam."

Unfortunately, an appeasement policy which may not attract much attention at the time can turn out later to be the forerunner of a big war. In 1938 many people hailed as the beginning of an era of peace a conference at Munich between British Prime Minister Chamberlain and Adolf Hitler, the head of the Nazi Government in Germany. But Hitler misconstrued its meaning as weakness and a year later started World War II. He assumed that the British would not fight to defend the Continent of Europe and that the United States would never enter the war at all.

Unquestionably, the Red Chinese and the Soviets are watching the development inside the United States of a pacifist and isolationist movement which argues that the Vietnam war is of no consequence to the United States, that troops should be brought home and that Asia should be left to its own devices.

The dangers in this kind of argument would hardly be apparent to those who have not followed closely the pages of history. This correspondent was at Geneva in 1954 when the fate of Indo-China was the issue. It was as evident then as it is today that the Communists were trying to take over in southeast Asia, and the United States refused to sign the final document because it appeared to be a surrender to the Communists. Immediately thereafter, steps were taken by the United States to draw up a Southeast Asia Treaty Organization comparable to NATO in an attempt to assure peace. The Communists were not dismayed and gradually began to overrun Vietnam as a start toward the conquest of all of southeast Asia.

President Johnson's statements this week against retreat and surrender are a timely warning to the enemy that the United States is resolute and determined to carry on the war until an honorable settlement is made. The principle of safeguarding small nations against aggression is vital to America's safety in a world menaced by Communist imperialism.

Clifford R. Shaw Award Presented to Elliott Donnelley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr Speaker a very distinguished citizen, Elliott Donnelley, of Chicago, was honored on Sunday, January 30, 1966, by the Chicago Federation of Community Committees.

Mr. Donnelley, vice chairman of R. R. Donnelley & Co., located in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois and one of the largest printing firms in the country, was presented the Clifford R. Shaw Memorial Award in recognition of outstanding contributions in human relations, youth welfare, and delinquency prevention.

Attended by 500 persons at Luigi's Restaurant, 2550 West North Avenue, the award was presented in behalf of the federation by Anthony Sorrentino, delinquency prevention supervisor for the division of community services of the Illinois Youth Commission.

In making the presentation Mr. Sorrentino remarked:

I greatly appreciate the privilege and honor accorded me by the Chicago Federation of Community Committees to present its special award, the Clifford R. Shaw Memorial Award—bearing the name of a distinguished social scientist and humanitarian—for presentation to an eminent industrialist, philanthropist and humanitarian, our good friend Elliott Donnelley.

I know that Clifford R. Shaw, the sociologist, founder and director of the Chicago area project, would have been pleased and proud to know that this first award bearing his name is being presented to the man we are honoring this evening. For the man we are honoring is an extraordinary man.

Our honored guest has an illustrious record in the field of human relations and youth welfare. Last year, for example, he was given special recognition and an award by the United Negroes Fund for his outstanding contribution in promoting the education and welfare of our Negro citizens.

Mr. Donnelley is especially noted in our city as the founder, organizer, and major supporter of the Chicago youth centers, one of the most valuable resources for thousands of disadvantaged, culturally deprived children. Under his able leadership, and boundless generosity, the Chicago youth centers have grown during the past decade from a few boys' clubs to over six major institutions. In addition the centers carry on special community services and work with street gangs, performing vitally needed programs for youth welfare and delinquency control.

Another unique project started by Elliott Donnelley about 6 years ago was the establishment of the job-finding investigating committee. Financed almost singlehandedly by him, with staff services by the Illinois Youth Commission, this project was the very first in the city of Chicago to focus attention on the need for special services for our unemployed youth, and particularly for those who had been in trouble with the law. This project paved the way for other special projects in the field of youth employment which were later supported by foundations and by city and State government and more recently by the war on poverty by the Federal Government.

Those of us who are identified with the Chicago Federation of Community Committees and the Chicago area project which work with and through the division of community services of the Illinois Youth Commission, are especially grateful for Mr. Donnelley's interest and financial support to our community projects for the treatment of delinquents and the prevention of delinquency. Under Mr. Donnelley's leadership a plan was initiated last year to give financial assistance to self-help community committees and to assist them in the further development of their programs, and hopefully to prepare them for participation in the Community Fund of Chicago.

These are just a few highlights of Mr. Donnelley's activities and contributions. In addition he is a generous supporter of numerous other charitable, welfare, and educational programs, too numerous to mention.

In conclusion, I should like to mention just a few of Mr. Donnelley's affiliations. He is a former mayor of Lake Forest. At the present time he is vice chairman of the board of R. R. Donnelley & Co. In 1961 he was appointed by Gov. Otto Kerner to the advisory board of the division of community services of the Illinois Youth Commission. A fishing enthusiast and world traveler, he is virtually a railroad engineer with an avid interest in all things pertaining to trains from model trains to locomotives on the narrow gage to the sleek, modern diesels.

Above all, our honored guest is a man who is endowed with great commonsense, who has deep insight in identifying a problem and great capacity for making intelligent decisions and plans for an attack on the problem. In short, he is a down-to-earth man of action and a great humanitarian in the best sense of the word.

Neighborhood volunteers and professional workers in youth welfare were also honored. Walter S. Klimek, Illinois Youth Commission member, also presented awards to 31 volunteers who support the work of community committees affiliated with the Chicago area project.

Dr. James E. McKeown, chairman of the Sociology Department of De Paul University, also presented awards of merit to four professional youth workers for unusual dedication to their work. The four are: Mrs. Lural Evans, an attendance officer for the Chicago Board of Education; John F. McGuire, probation officer for the Family Court of Cook County; Donald E. Thomas, of the Chicago Police Department Youth Bureau; and Edward Miller, a parole officer for the *Illinois* Youth Commission.

During the meeting, the Honorable John Troike, chairman of the Illinois Youth Commission, spoke on the value of volunteers in delinquency prevention.

The main speaker was Arthur H. Kruse, executive director of the Community Fund of Chicago, who stressed first that we need to join leadership and money of the total community with the leadership and money of the local neighborhood. Second, we need to join together the motivations and inspirations of volunteers and professional people. Third, we should strive to mobilize and coordinate all resources in the community.

Currently, with our Government's emphasis on the war on poverty and in the prevention of juvenile delinquency, this approach by the Chicago area project and the Illinois Youth Commission, is especially worthy of our attention. It was Clifford R. Shaw who first stressed the indispensability of involving the local residents in any attempts to deal with community problems, and especially the problem of delinquency. Shaw was truly a pioneer in this field and it is heartening to see our Government and many private agencies now employing these self-help ideas.

Since the Chicago area project is so little known, yet so significant, a brief account of the story of this enterprise by Anthony Sorrentino is herewith included for the RECORD.

Medicare and Your Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, because of the many inquiries my office has received from constituents who expect to participate in the medicare program but want to know what they will need in the way of supplementary private insurance or financial assistance in the event of sickness, I have developed a fact sheet which I hope will be of some help to them.

The Social Security Administration, of course, has made complete material on the program available but has approached the task with information as to the coverage medicare will provide. The fact sheet developed in my office shows exactly what the program does not cover.

This information, which has been checked for accuracy by the Social Security Administration, should be helpful to those persons who want to provide, through private insurance, for those expenses *not covered by medicare.* Many people, I find do not realize that medicare will not pay all the bills.

My concern about the eventual cost of this program and the philosophy behind it is a matter of record, but my purpose in setting forth the limitations of medicare is not to find fault with it but to make sure my constituents know exactly what it will provide. With this knowledge, they should be better prepared to participate in the program.

Because of the great interest that has been shown in this approach to the problem, I am pleased to insert the fact sheet at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of any Member who might find it useful:

THE LIMITATIONS OF MEDICARE

This fact sheet has been prepared to acquaint you with the limitations of the Government's new medical care program for people 65 and over and, hopefully, to assist you in the selection of private health insurance to supplement the Government plan. Actually, there are two Government insurance programs, both starting next July 1. One helps you pay your hospital bills, the other helps you pay your doctors' bills. In either case will the Government program cover all of your expenses. Listed below, for your use as a participant in the program, is a brief description of the limitations.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE

(Eligibility is automatic if you are 65 or over and now get social security or railroad retirement benefits. If you are not getting these benefits—whatever the reason—you are probably eligible. If so you must fill out a routine application to establish coverage. There are no monthly premiums.)

Hospital bills: Limited to 90 days each illness. You must pay the first $40 in each spell of illness. After 60 days in any one spell, you must pay $10 a day for the additional 30 days of hospital care to which you are limited.

Outpatient diagnostic services: Limited to 20 days. You must pay first $20 in costs and 20 percent of remaining cost during the 20-day period.

Posthospital nursing home care: You must have been in the hospital at least 3 days before you qualify for this convalescent care in a nursing home or specially designated extended-care section of a hospital. After 20 days of this care, you must pay $5 a day for each of the remaining 80 days provided in a single spell of illness.

Home health care: Does not pay for doctors' bills. Program will pay for 100 visits to your home (by nurses, etc.) in any 365-day period following your hospitalization.

MEDICAL INSURANCE

(You must enroll and pay $3 a month for this plan, which will help you pay your doctors' bills. The Government also pays another $3 a month for you. If you were 65 by last year, you must enroll on or before March 31, if you want to be covered under this plan when it starts in July 1966. Those who are 65 or over and are getting social security, civil service or railroad retirement benefits will, upon enrolling, have the $3 deducted each month from benefit checks. Those not getting monthly benefits will be told later how and where to pay.)

Doctors' bills: You must pay the first $50 of medical expenses, including doctors' bills and other medical services (see "other medical services" below), in any calendar year and 20 percent of the remaining "reasonable" charges in that year.

Home health visits: You are entitled to up to 100 home health visits per year (in addition to the home health visits under hospital insurance) subject, of course, to a plan having been approved by the attending doctor for the same.

Other medical services: Other medical services, such as X-rays, surgical dressings, splints, casts, etc., are also covered.

SERVICES NOT COVERED AT ALL

You must pay for routine physical checkups, eyeglasses, hearing aids, dental expenses (except in certain surgical cases), private duty nurses, custodial care in a nursing home, and such personal services as a telephone and television in your room. Doctors' bills are not covered unless you sign up for the medical insurance plan.

DRUGS

Under hospital insurance, drugs are covered only when furnished in a hospital or extended care facility.

Under medical insurance, drugs are covered only when actually administered by a physician; not when self-administered, even if at a doctor's direction.

WHAT IF YOU HAVE OTHER HEALTH INSURANCE?

Although medicare doesn't cover all your hospital and medical expenses, it does offer some benefits (home health care, and nursing home convalescent care, for example) not normally covered by private health insurance policies. In fact, many insurance companies have indicated that to the covered individual, medicare is a bargain and have advised people over 65 to sign up for the medical insurance feature before the March 31 deadline. There are indications that many companies are now in the process of changing their policies so that after July they can offer to persons over 65 covered by medicare new policies to cover those things for which medicare does not pay. There is nothing in the act to prohibit private coverage and it is suggested that you consult your insurance agent concerning additional coverage.

Remember, though, that medicare doesn't start until July 1, 1966, so if you sign up for it, don't cancel any health insurance you now have, at least until then. If you have any questions about how your present insurance will be affected by medicare, get in touch with your insurance agent.

SHOULD YOU SIGN UP FOR MEDICARE'S DOCTOR BILL INSURANCE?

That decision is entirely your own. Coverage is not automatic. However, as your Representative in Congress, I would urge you to sign up without delay. If you sign up by March 31, you will protect your rights to all medicare benefits, and you can also carry one of the new supplementary private insurance policies if you wish. However, if you miss the March 31 deadline, you won't have another chance to sign up until the end of 1967, when the premiums will be higher.

In order to sign up for medical insurance one need not visit the local office in person but may do so by mail. All inquiries should be addressed to your district office of the Social Security Administration.

About Raised Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the recent raising of the interest rates by the Federal Reserve Board has caused quite a furor. Those of us from the Midwest feel especially unhappy about these developments.

The farm economy of our area has never progressed under a tight money policy. Because we must borrow funds for most of our farm operations, the raise in interest rates is costing the farmers of the Seventh Iowa District considerably more than previously. This is neither wise nor fair.

One of the editors of our district, F. S. Nelson of Shenandoah, commented on this is his paper the Weekly Times. His recent article along with a news story quoting two of my colleagues, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, and Congressman WILLIAM BARRETT, fairly well expresses my personal feeling on this matter.

[From the Red Oak (Iowa) Weekly Times, Jan. 12, 1966]

ABOUT RAISED INTEREST RATES

(EDITOR'S NOTE: the noted financial columnist J. A. Livingston recently tried to explain why the Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates. His widely read column, usually very succinct and profound, caused a furor across the Nation, President Johnson openly opposed McChesney Martin, Federal Reserve chairman, in the move. The following letter by veteran Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, sums up the administration views on the matter quite clearly, and we publish it for your enlightenment. F.S.N.)

To the EDITOR:

Columnist J. A. Livingston has now given us the Christmas bedtime version of the continuing and constantly shifting story of "Why the Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates."

Mr. Livingston assures his readers that the action was all part of a Christmas Eve urge by the Federal Reserve Board to benefit the little savers of the Nation. Yes, Mr. Livingston, there is still a Santa Claus.

But for the average consumer who does not subscribe to the Santa Claus theory of economics, Mr. Livingston's column has a cold, hard ring. For they are the ones who will be reaching down deep to pay an added $25 billion in interest charges in 1966, up 25 percent from the interest rate bill of $100 billion in 1965.

Mr. Livingston's theory is based on the fact that there are millions of savings accounts in various financial institutions. Therefore, according to the Livingston theory, millions benefit when interest rates are increased. The columnist attempts to imply that among these savers are millions of low-income Americans.

What Mr. Livingston leaves out of this Santa Claus image of the Federal Reserve Board's action is astounding.

First, Mr. Livingston ignores the income distribution figures. The fact is that more than half of the population has annual income of less than $4,600. Surely the columnist does not suggest that this group has amassed huge fortunes in savings accounts.

About one-fourth of the Nation's families and single individuals have no liquid assets—that is, no savings. On the other hand, virtually all of this group must borrow to survive. Higher interest rates take more dollars out of the already inadequate incomes of this segment of the population.

Another 28 percent have liquid assets or savings of under $500 and another 12 percent, liquid assets of between $500 and $999. In other words, 64 percent of the Nation's families and single individuals have savings of less than $1,000.

But the big question is how much debt is on the backs of this group of nonsavers and small savers which make up the great majority of the population. The interest on this debt is staggering and does not begin to be offset by the minimal interest gained on small savings accounts.

Millions of Americans have home mortgages ranging between $10,000 and $20,000. Millions of the same Americans also owe $1,000 to $1,500 on an automobile. Millions of small businessmen and farmers are deeply in debt for capital. All of this group must pay the 25-percent increase in interest imposed by the Federal Reserve Board. It is nothing less than a tax on this group.

I hope Mr. Livingston is not suggesting that the small saver who may draw interest on a $300 or $400 savings account is benefited when he must pay 25 percent more for interest on a $20,000 home. For example, a 1-percent increase in interest rates adds $4,734 in interest costs to a $20,000 loan over a 30-year schedule of maturity. This is roughly equivalent to the annual income for more than half the population.

Mr. Livingston's upside-down economics notwithstanding, the truth is that interest income goes primarily to a handful of high-income groups, large corporations, and financial institutions. It takes money from the pockets of the average- and low-income citizen.

Mr. Livingston cannot escape the fact that it takes money to make money with money.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. House of Representatives.

Two veteran congressional leaders today charged that the increase in interest rates on FHA mortgages was the direct result of the Federal Reserve Board's defiant action in increasing the discount rate on December 6.

"Now William McChesney Martin has succeeded in jeopardizing President Johnson's housing programs to the detriment of millions of American homeowners," Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, and Representative WILLIAM BARRETT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said in a joint statement released following the announcement of the FHA interest rate increase. Mr. PATMAN is chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and Mr. BARRETT is chairman of that committee's Subcommittee on Housing.

The two Congressmen described the FHA action as "highly regrettable."

"This one-fourth of 1 percent increase in the FHA rate will add millions of dollars to the cost of homes purchased in 1966," they said. "For example, a home buyer who purchases a $20,000 house will pay $1,122 in additional interest charges over the life of a 30-year loan."

Mr. PATMAN and Mr. BARRETT said that although the FHA increase was held to one-fourth of 1 percent, there is "grave danger that this rate hike will lead to even larger increases in the cost of conventional home mortgages." This has been the traditional pattern in previous interest rate increases, they noted.

"Much of the effect of the 1965 Housing and Urban Development Act will undoubtedly be wiped out by increased interest costs," they said. "These increases will hamstring and slow the building industry throughout the country, placing decent housing out of the reach of many Americans."

The two Congressmen said that the increase of the interest rate on housing added another "substantial reason" for forcing the Federal Reserve Board to rescind its December order raising interest rates.

"The Congress cannot sit idly by while the housing and other vital programs are threatened by a one-vote majority of the Federal Reserve Board," they said.

The Congressmen said that interest already represents too high a proportion of the total cost of housing. With the new increase in FHA rates, they noted, homeowners will pay a total of $20,881 in interest on a 30-year, $20,000 mortgage—more than the cost of the home itself.

"These are costs that should be brought down and not raised," they said.

City's War on Poverty Runs Well but Has Its Troubles in Job Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a reporter, Margaret Josten, of the Cincinnati Enquirer, has written a seven-part series on the antipoverty program in Cincinnati. Today, I include the last part of her series to illustrate the kind of reporting that helps inform the public about the various antipoverty programs at work in our communities under the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

CITY'S WAR ON POVERTY RUNS WELL, BUT HAS ITS TROUBLES IN JOB FIELD

(By Margaret Josten)

While the antipoverty war at the Federal level is beset by a never-ending stream of financial and political troubles, Cincinnati's effort seems to be running on fairly well-oiled wheels.

Theodore M. Berry, former Cincinnati vice mayor, now a top official in the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, is gratified, in fact, to see his home city doing its job with what he calls "a minimum of the kind of tension and conflict general in other communities."

He rates Cincinnati's effort as better than average, adding, "I think it ranks very well in the upper 10th of the class."

Cincinnati does have some problems, however. And while they may not be of importance in the big picture, some do get to the very key to the success of the antipoverty war. They have to do with jobs and job training.

A dispute has developed here in recent weeks between the Community Action Commission, local arm of the war, and the Ohio Bureau of Unemployment Compensation, charged by law with setting up job-training programs under the Manpower Development Training Act.

John E. Hansan, CAC executive director, charges that the BUC has failed to show aggressive action in getting such programs into operation.

Lewis H. Evans, BUC area manager, answers that he cannot set up job-training classes until he determines whether jobs will be available for the graduates.

"We can do not greater injustice to an individual than to put him into training and then have no job for him," adds Mr. Evans.

Mr. Hansan's argument is that MDTA requirements in connection with occupational demand can be adhered to "liberally or rigidly." He thinks Mr. Evans is being too rigid.

Another argument which goes 'round and 'round in Cincinnati has to do with union membership for Negroes, who, by their very position on the economic ladder, are most involved in the war against poverty.

Civil rights groups charge that the building trades unions give only token membership to Negroes. The unions say otherwise. Efforts to straighten out the matter locally have had little effect.

This argument goes on nationally, too.

Top OEO officials avoid taking one side or another. One does say, however, that a large union (presumably in the building trades) is getting ready to set up an apprenticeship program which would alleviate much of the trouble.

A number of job-training programs are underway in Cincinnati. The board of education, the Citizens Committee on Youth, and the BUC are prominent among the sponsors.

Mr. Evans reports that an average of 400 persons a month have been in training under the Manpower Development Training Act during 1965. This does not include on-the-job programs in which 113 persons are training in 17 categories at private local firms.

Occupations for which people train under MDTA range from automobile repairing to welding, from tool and die making to cooking.

A major problem in the local antipoverty effort lies in that area known as Over the Rhine, where, although help is sorely needed, there is as yet no program funded by OEO.

Over the Rhine, which Mr. Hansan calls one of the most difficult neighborhoods in Cincinnati, is a heterogeneous mixture of young and old, white and Negro, old established families and migrants. The topography is so fragmented it really is not a single neighborhood.

Mr. Hansan explains that the area has a proliferation of social agencies and religious institutions, each with its own way of doing things, but none with the staff or budget to do the big job.

In addition, he says, southern Appalachian migrants, of whom there are many in Over the Rhine, are neither joiners nor belongers. This makes any kind of neighborhood attack on poverty difficult, he adds.

But Mr. Hansan is optimistic. He hopes that "sometime before spring" enough leadership will have been pulled together from among the residents and the institutions to make some definite antipoverty plans.

The word from Washington is such, however, that the financial outlook for new programs is bad.

Several national programs will need to be cut back. And the community action division of the OEO, now headed by Mr. Berry, is not going to be free with its money in the future.

The war in Vietnam has top priority.

Youngsters Favoring U.S. Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride I learned of the action of students of the Big Spring High School, Big Spring, Tex., who have formed the Big Spring Youth for Freedom in Vietnam and who have obtained 533 signatures on a petition supporting U.S. policy in Vietnam. The petition reads:

> We, the undersigned, as patriotic students of Big Spring Senior High School, in the interest of promoting a better understanding of the prevailing opinion of American youth, and recognizing the right to dissent, nevertheless realizing that any aggression, whether it be fascist, Nazi, or Communist, must be arrested, do hereby proclaim that we support the present U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I compliment these young people on this most impressive statement, and join them in the sentiments they express. It causes a welling pride that students in my area have taken an initiative in this matter, at a time when we hear of the protesters and draft card burners in other parts of the Nation.

The following is an article from the Big Spring, Tex., Herald, which describes this effort on the part of these students.

YOUNGSTERS FAVORING U.S. VIETNAM POLICY

(By Tom Barry)

The effects of the war in Vietnam can be felt thousands of miles away—by politicians, the electorate, demonstrators pro and con—and in Big Spring, where vibrations have reached into Big Spring High School.

Reaction to the war and its implications recently came from three Big Spring High junior classmen, David Thomas, Larry Arnhart, and Dale Pless. They were discussing, these 16-year-olds, Vietnam over the noon meal at the school cafeteria. More particularly, they were discussing draft card burners, beatniks, and the image given by a loudmouthed minority to the majority of teenagers. These boys felt something should be done.

PETITION PLAN

Others were listening to the discussion. Ten in all decided that the thing to do was to get 500 students to sign petitions saying they, even though nonvoting teenagers, support the present policy of the U.S. in Vietnam. When signed, the petitions will be sent to Members of Congress.

Forms were printed, permission of school authorities was granted to pass them out and post them on the bulletin board, and by Friday more than the original goal of 500 signatures of students had been obtained.

Also, the group gave itself a name—Big Spring Youth for Freedom in Vietnam.

Five hundred students represent more than one-third of the entire student body of the high school, according to the youthful chairman of the organization, David Thomas.

"We expect more, and will not close our signature drive until Tuesday," he said. "We have had surprisingly little opposition to the drive," he continued. "We've had more trouble with students signing two or more petitions each than with those who refuse to sign."

David said only three students have refused to sign the petition because they favor getting the U.S. out of Vietnam; and a few more refused to sign because they think the war ought to be accelerated.

Four purposes unite the 10 members of the organization to disavow the draft card burners; to show the adult world how they feel; to encourage representatives in Government; and to support the present policy in Vietnam. Some of the members of the group, like young Thomas, are strongly conservative in their political views; others are on the left side of the fence; and there are some who are middle-of-the-roaders.

After the petitions are signed, they will be divided into three groups of about equal numbers and mailed to Senator JOHN TOWER, OMAR BURLESON, representing the 17th district, and GEORGE MAHON, representing the 19th district.

"We hope we have a better chance of the petitions having more weight by sending them to the three individuals rather than to President Johnson," Thomas said, "after all, in a few years we'll be the ones fighting in Vietnam if the war goes on, and it is an election year, even though we can't vote yet."

About 12 teachers are helping the group in one way or another, Thomas said, putting petitions up in classrooms and passing them around in government classes.

Will the petitions do any good?

"Well," Thomas said, "let's say our hopes are moderate."

"We thought we should do something," Thomas said. "We are hardly the type to demonstrate in the streets, and we know that petitions don't normally get a lot of results, but we wanted to speak our piece."

The vigor with which the 10 members of the organization are presenting their case for the majority of teenagers (already several teachers have announced open support of the campaign, according to Thomas) indicates that something beyond ignoring the normally quiet, "average" teenager should result.

Excise Taxes To Eliminate Junkyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, prior to his confirmation as Director of the Bureau of Mines last week, Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., noted that very promising progress is being made on the Bureau's research project for the use of automobile scrap in modern steelmaking. In view of the numerous steps that are in the making to contend with the auto junkyard problem, I feel that every Member of Congress should familiarize himself with all facets of the subject.

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 provides that the establishment and use and maintenance of junkyards in areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system should be controlled in order to protect the public investment in such highways, to promote the safety and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve natural beauty. Among the provisions are Federal participation in junkyard removal, landscaping and screening, as well as a reduction in federal highway funds to states which fail to provide effective controls.

Also during the last session of Congress, I proposed that 1 percent of the auto excise tax be used by the Federal Government to dispose of auto junkyards, with as much as half of the income to be put into research to determine whether the junked cars have further economic use. Numerous recommendations have come from the general public as well as from interested businesses in response to this suggestion, and meanwhile considerable development toward economic disposal of scrapped cars has taken place. I have received correspondence from representatives of the scrap industry who are convinced that research thus far clearly indicates that the time is near when through proper crushing and incineration old cars can be dismantled and the steel salvaged profitably. Meanwhile Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has invited universities, nonprofit organizations, business firms, and individual citizens to submit constructive recommendations and proposals to the Bureau of Mines for expanded research on disposal of scrap autos and other solid mineral wastes.

The Bureau's own scrap-auto research is described as follows:

> Bureau research on the scrap-auto problem is directed toward overcoming presently known economic and technological barriers—such as changes in steel making and automobile manufacturing practices—that have caused once-sizable markets for these discarded cars to shrink. Out of the Bureau's research have come two promising metallurgical processes, both of which are scheduled for early testing in large-scale demonstration plants.
>
> One process involves the conversion of all the iron and steel in auto body scrap to a high-grade iron ore for which there is a ready market. With this process the scrap can be used as a reductant for low-grade, nonmagnetic taconite that is abundant in the United States. This is done by carefully controlled roasting of the scrap and the taconite in a rotating kiln, which converts both the iron in the taconite and the iron and steel in the scrap to magnetic iron oxide. After roasting, any unconverted scrap is screened for recycling, and the iron oxides are concentrated by magnetic separation into a high-grade form of iron oxide. All nonferrous materials in the scrap, as well as the gangue in the taconite, are rejected in the process. By changing the roasting conditions, the process can be made to operate without taconite. In this variation iron in the scrap is obtained as an oxide, which can be separated magnetically from nonferrous contaminating elements in the scrap.
>
> In the other process being developed by the Bureau, cylindrical shaped bales made from cannibalized automobiles, less engines and transmissions, will be run through a rotary kiln at a temperature high enough to burn the combustible materials and melt the nonferrous metal parts. The kiln gases will be cleaned to prevent air pollution. Resulting clean scrap, upon discharge from the kiln, will be compacted to any desired density for steelmaking charges. After the technique for burning and separating nonferrous metals from baled automobile hulls is developed in a pilot plant, a larger demonstration plant including a modern electric steelmaking furnace with necessary accessories will be built for demonstrating the economic feasibility of the thermal treatment technique. The objective is to show that many types of steel can be produced from thermally treated automobile scrap only, and that almost any type of steel can be economically produced from thermally treated scrap and directly reduced iron ore.

Mr. Speaker, as these efforts continue, the number of junked cars to blight suburbs and countryside rises annually. More than 5 million were dumped onto the heaps last year. The president of General Motors predicted on January 17 that the average annual demand for cars and trucks in the United States could exceed 11 million by 1970, thus blazing the way for bigger and bigger junkyards.

While the unsightly cars are piled higher, adjacent land tracts—whether they are business, residential, or farm areas—suffer correspondingly. Regardless of how attractive your own plot of ground may be, its beauty is quickly marred if a neighbor is unconcerned about the trash in his yard. In our particular region of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Electric Co., has long practiced beautifying to the fullest possible extent the properties on which its facilities are located, including the rights-of-way for power lines. Trees are planted and carefully nurtured, and the company takes pride in helping to keep our State beautiful.

Responsible mining companies needed no laws to insist upon reclamation of stripped properties. For years they have been turning earth from which coal has been extracted through surface operations into attractive forest, farm, and recreational areas.

These operations by the utilities and coal companies have been carried out at their own expense, without cost to Federal or State government. By the same token, it would seem reasonable for auto manufacturers and consumers to provide the means for proper disposal of cars that are no longer usable, and the use of a portion of the excise tax would appear to be the least injurious or objectionable means of absorbing the cost.

The Bureau of Mines projects are commendable and should receive high priority, but once a satisfactory method of economic disposal of auto bodies is developed, the Federal Government should retire from this activity and permit commercial growth of the industry. I am hopeful that such plans will be achieved prior to July 1, 1970, in order that it will not be necessary for Federal and State governments to finance removal and screening of auto junkyards, as provided in the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

Newspaper Columnist Joe Crump has observed:

> Making junked automobiles commercially profitable is a sure way to remove them from the scene.

With a portion of the excise tax available in support of the junked car disposal program, there is all the more reason to assume that research can and will make it a profitable undertaking.

While some development engineers are confident that small disposal plants—even portable facilities—can dispose of junked cars economically, the concensus would appear to favor—at least in the early stages—large centers to which the steel shells would be hauled from points within a wide periphery. In the latter event, I would hope that automobile transportation firms will be ready to assume a role in the operation without delay. Stackback and piggyback railroad cars as well as the two-deck auto-carrying trucks that move from assembly centers with new vehicles snuggled closely together should quickly be converted for hauling remnants from scattered junkyards to points where giant incinerators have been established.

We are obviously making headway in our battle to eliminate the ghastly auto junkyard. Let us give it a boost by applying 1 percent of the excise tax to this crusade.

A Citizen's Views on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I know that we all receive a great deal of mail these days on Vietnam. This, to me, indicates a great concern and uneasiness throughout the land. My own mail reflects the obvious differences in opinion and comes from people in all walks of life. The expression and understanding of the writers varies greatly but recently I received a letter from a constituent which so cogently states some of the underlying questions in people's minds, that, with the permission of the House, I would insert it in the RECORD. We have all heard from many sources the arguments for and against our policy in Vietnam; and while I do not agree with all the writer's views, his letter is, I believe, an eloquent effort by a citizen to reason things out for himself.

SIERRA VISTA, ARIZ.,
February 1, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I, as an American citizen and veteran, deplore the ambiguous, indecisive, vicious policies of the administration in regard to Vietnam.

If our objective is to merely stem Communist aggression, why are we unable to enlist wider allied support?

If we wish to be the power in Asia, won't it be necessary to "acquire territories and bases?"

If we are striving for a military victory, why did we engage in a bombing pause or throw ourselves on the mercy of the United Nations?

If we desire peace through the United Nations, why are we bombing North Vietnam?

If the problem is so complex, why do the alternatives of policy, to bomb or not to bomb, sound so simple?

We stand in violation of the Geneva accords and the United Nations' Charter, yet we claim to be prepared to wage a 6-year war to the tune of half a million American men.

Along with an ineffective buildup of strength and a relatively ineffective bombing of North Vietnam, we are to assume that Red China and the Soviet Union will stay out of the conflict in the field.

To disagree with our current policy is not to endorse the righteousness of either the Vietcong or North Vietnam. It is rather to realize that the time for sending living, productive citizens to die for an ambiguous and strange point of honor has passed us by.

And this conflict does hinge on a strange point of honor. Senator JOHN STENNIS has said it was a mistake to enter this conflict, but now that we are committed we cannot back down or withdraw. The commit your policy and your sons to a stubborn position such as this is strange indeed. History will label it not only strange but vicious.

I suspect that since the war is a reality (undeclared and unconstitutionally executed) your mail is divided 10 to 1 in favor of our policy. However, sir, if on the eve of our now vast commitment it had been put to a vote, I wonder if our President would have enjoyed such odds.

Finally, I resent this administration's muzzling of debate. Let me remind you, sir, a conference with 21 congressional leaders is not debate, any more than a public statement announcing the resumption of bombing is debate after this bombing has already occurred.

When you read the opinions of your constituents into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would feel far less helpless if you could express mine in the halls of what was once a vital forum for debating and forming policy—the Congress of the United States of America.

Sincerely yours,
TIMOTHY W. GARGIULO.

The New GI Bill of Rights

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly urged, supported and voted for the new GI bill of rights—H.R. 12410.

This bill authorizes a program of education and training for veterans of military service discharged after January 31, 1955.

The serviceman has met his responsibilities to the Nation. It is the Nation's responsibility to prepare the serviceman returning from service to take his place in civilian life.

I only regret that the benefits of this bill do not come up to those of the Korean war bill. I supported such increased benefits. The administration opposed them and made clear that any attempt to raise benefits would end chances for Presidential approval of the legislation.

ANALYSIS

Education: Provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. College-level and below-college-level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided. Part-time training is permitted. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month of training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months. Persons serving on active duty for training do not accrue eligibility. The education and training allowances provided are as follows:

Type of program	No dependents	1 dependent	2 or more dependents
Institutional:			
Full time	$100	$125	$150
Three-quarter time	75	95	115
Half time	50	65	75
Cooperative	80	100	120

Fees and tuition are paid for less than half-time training. Education must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge or 8 years from the effective date of the act, whichever is later. Training is provided for active-duty members of the Armed Forces who have served at least 2 years, a portion of which occurred after January 31, 1955. These active-duty members may receive payments for fees and tuition. Administrative provisions of the GI bill for veterans of the Korean conflict and the war orphans' training program are applicable to this proposed program. Schools will be approved by State approval agencies of the various States, and these agencies will be responsible for extending supervision to approved schools.

Guaranteed and direct home loans: Benefits of both the guaranteed and the direct home loan programs are extended to veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The guarantee of a loan by a private lender in the amount of $7,500 is extended to this group and, in areas established as direct loan areas where guaranteed financing has not generally been available, a maximum direct loan of $17,500 is authorized. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to regulate interest rates, consistent with the ceiling established for Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. A fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses under this program, by requiring the veteran to pay 0.05 percent of his loan at closing.

Non-service-connected medical care: At the present time, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, are eligible for medical care in Veterans' Administration facilities only for service-connected disabilities. This group is made eligible under the provisions of this bill for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as war veterans. Eligibility for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities is based on availability of a bed and the signing of a statement of inability to pay for treatment elsewhere, as is required of veterans of earlier conflicts.

Preference in Federal employment: Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to the group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans. This benefit is not extended to those on active duty for training.

Presumption of service connection of chronic and tropical diseases: This presumption of service connection of numerous chronic and tropical diseases, as listed in section 301, title 38, United States Code, now applicable to war veterans, is extended to those veterans with service after January 31, 1955.

Burial flags: The bill will permit the Veterans' Administration to furnish a flag for draping the casket of deceased veterans of service after January 31, 1955, as is now provided war veterans.

Job counseling and job placement assistance: Places veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as veterans of earlier conflicts for assistance through the Department of Labor in job placement and counseling.

Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief: Amends the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act by increasing protection for individuals who are renting homes when called to service from $80 monthly rental to $150 monthly rental.

Recommendations of the Governor's Conference on Natural Beauty and Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the text of a letter to me dated January 31, 1966, from the Honorable Roger D. Branigin, Governor of the State of Indiana, setting forth the recommendations of the recent Governor's Conference on Natural Beauty and Natural Resources.

Governor Branigin's letter follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
Indianapolis, January 31, 1966.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We had a very enthusiastic response to the Governor's Conference on Natural Beauty and Natural Resources, and now must see that every recommendation from the participants is carefully studied and implemented if possible.

The following recommendations have been brought to my attention by Mr. John E. Mitchell, chairman of the conference and director, department of natural resources. I am referring them to the congressional delegation for further consideration and implementation.

I trust you will find these recommendations both interesting and helpful.

That the Federal grant-in-aids program for the construction of municipal sewage treatment plants be expanded materially in order to insure a construction rate which will provide facilities for the adequate treatment of all the State's municipal sewage within 7 to 10 years. This means at least trebling the currently authorized Federal programs.

That the State of Indiana provide construction grants for municipal sewage treatment plants as a supplement to Federal grants and in an amount sufficient to raise the total grants on each project to 50 percent of the total cost.

That a Federal law be enacted which permits rapid tax writeoff by industry of the investment in industrial waste treatment facilities.

That storage for low-flow augmentation be included in all reservoir developments in Indiana whenever it is practicable or economically feasible. That as a similar contribution to streamflow maintenance, greater consideration be given by local constituents in small watershed programs—to the preservation and restoration of headwater marshes, swamps, and other wetlands which can be useful for water retention and wildlife habitat.

Federal appropriations should be increased under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to assist rural areas in financing water and sewage works. (Presently there is not enough money to meet the demand.)

Sincerely yours,
ROGER D. BRANIGIN,
Governor, State of Indiana.

Redwood National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I joined the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] in proposing the creation of a Redwood National Park in California. Without my knowing or anticipating it, the Michigan Democratic State Central Committee on January 9, 1966, had unanimously adopted a resolution also calling for a Redwood National Park.

You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, my pleasure in welcoming this resolution which coincides so closely with my own views. Under unanimous consent I submit the resolution adopted by the Michigan Democratic State Central Committee calling for the creation of a Redwood National Park to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

RESOLUTION FOR A REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Whereas the California Redwood forests are some of the Nation's most outstanding scenic resources, and the demand of the people of the entire Nation for such irreplaceable areas of spectacular natural beauty is ever increasing; and

Whereas of the over 2 million acres of virgin redwood forest that once forested the northern coast of California there is only one remaining major block of land suitable for a National Park; and

Whereas the area of the proposed park is being logged right now, and the time is almost past when it will be possible to save this area from damage by logging and freeways, and the flood and storm damage which result when the watershed is destroyed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan go on record in support of the establishment of a 90,000-acre Redwood National Park on the northern coast of California in the Prairie-Creek—Redwood-Creek groves and Gold Bluffs wild beach area, as recommended by the National Park Service; and be it further

Resolved, That the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan request President Johnson and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall to make every effort to arrange a moratorium on logging in the proposed park area until Congress has acted on the proposal now before it; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators MCNAMARA and HART and to the Democratic Congressmen from Michigan.

Appointment of Jack Hood Vaughn To Head the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to visit the other body yesterday and to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn, to be the Director of the Peace Corps.

While my primary purpose in testifying was to urge the committee to approve Mr. Vaughn's nomination, I also discussed the role of the Peace Corps in our oversea assistance efforts.

Because of the great respect I have for Mr. Vaughn and the importance I attach to the position to which he has been nominated, I thought my testimony would be of interest to our colleagues and offer it herewith for insertion into the RECORD.

TESTIMONY OF HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, RELATIVE TO THE NOMINATION OF JACK H. VAUGHN, AS DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS, FEBRUARY 9, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful and delighted at the opportunity you have afforded me to testify in behalf of the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn for Director of the Peace Corps. I warmly endorse his nomination.

While I know it is usual to speak primarily of a nominee's qualifications at these hearings, I should like to concentrate first on the importance of the position, for I think it has been underrated both in Congress and by the public.

The Peace Corps too often still today is viewed as a mere idealistic outlet to absorb the energies of the starry-eyed do-gooders of our society. While under the brilliant leadership of Sargent Shriver it has earned universal praise from the complete spectrum of our society—from its most conservative to its most liberal elements—its weight and importance is still not generally recognized. One has but to ponder that one of the President's highest aids, Bill Moyers, aspired to this post as the "Everest" of his ambitions, to come to second thoughts about its significance.

In my view, the Peace Corps demonstrates an approach to success in our endeavors with the developing countries, where all other approaches have to a greater or lesser degree failed. I think I will meet little argument that the future of the world and of our role in the world lies largely with these developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The Peace Corps has proved the validity of working from the bottom up rather than from the top down in these countries. It has demonstrated the success potential of community development techniques of having our people live with the people they are assisting in the slums that surround all of the major cities of these countries and in the countryside in the rural peasant villages. It has demonstrated the importance and practicality of stimulated self-help—and the economy of such programs. It has shown that work in primitive societies does not necessarily require top technical background—that the average citizen of this country can play a meaningful role in the development of a country where infant mortality is over 50 percent and the people don't know the significance of feces disposal, water impurities, or sound diet. It has proved the feasibility and efficacy of intensive language and cultural preparation of our foreign cadres, of having them live within the communities they serve rather than in isolated American ghettos, of having them receive compensation comparable to their host counterparts and play roles not as superior advisers but as coequals.

The future expansion of our foreign assistance endeavors should be along lines demonstrated successful by the Peace Corps—and no more appropriate person could be found than Jack Hood Vaughn to preside over this extension.

Indeed, by standards of experience, knowledge, ability, personality, character, and temperament, no equal could be conjured.

Jack Vaughn is a close personal friend and became so when he was my boss at the Peace Corps. He was Regional Director for Latin America and I, Director of Programs for the west coast of South America under him, virtually from the start of the Peace Corps.

I, therefore, am able to speak of him from a vantage point of an associate as well as a friend, and as a person intimately familiar with the Peace Corps operation he is to head, for I was the second staff member brought on board by Mr. Shriver to formulate the concept of a Peace Corps early in 1961. I can also speak of him from a personal familiarity with his knowledge of Latin America and the respect Latins hold for him.

What an unusual combination of experience. Jack Vaughn has served in virtually all of our overseas agencies—the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America and before that as Ambassador to Panama; our foreign aid agency as mission director in Senegal; he started his Government career in the early days of USIA in Bolivia and Costa Rica; and, of course, he served as a Regional Director of the Peace Corps itself.

The geographic diversity of his foreign experience has been broad, bringing him in direct contact with two of the three continents of the world with which the Peace Corps deals—Africa and Latin America—and with incomparable breadth and depth where the greatest Peace Corps concentration of activity lies, in Latin America.

Jack Vaughn's rise to responsibility has been meteoric and hard won. He came up the hard way, by his bootstraps. It's a real American success story worthy of Horatio Alger—how a golden gloves fighter from Columbus, Mont., going under the inauspicious pseudonym of "Johnny Hood" made good. He graduated from the University of Michigan in 1943 and volunteered for the Marine Corps where his talents earned him promotion from private to captain in just 3 years. He got a master's degree from Michigan when he got out and taught there and at the University of Pennsylvania. In 1949 he offered his services to USIA and from there had the spectacular span of Government service and rise of personal success previously recounted.

In the Peace Corps, Jack Vaughn built the Latin American program from insignificance to the dominant program. He was a man who was universally respected in a highly competitive organization and whose advice and counsel were sought by all. As a boss, he encouraged his associates to innovate and inspired from them an indescribable devotion which led to uncanny productivity. This human quality no doubt played an important part in his continuing series of successes and his warm following among his associates and the foreign peoples with whom he worked. He was immensely popular and respected both as Ambassador to Panama and previously as ICA mission chief in Senegal as well as at his other posts. The universal acclaim he received from all Latin capitals during his recent trip as Assistant Secretary of State is well known and recognized as a major contribution to our Latin American relations.

It gives me great pleasure to give this nomination my unqualified praise and to urge upon you and the committee the confirmation of a most unusually well qualified man for this job of great national and international importance.

Mission Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, although Hanoi and Peiping have thus far given only negative responses to peace overtures, we are continuing the search for a door which will one day lead to peace. We can be encouraged that efforts toward peace are being taken by the United Nations, by the Pope, by various governments, as well as by private diplomatic explorations.

And we can all be encouraged by the bold and positive move which our President took in going to Hawaii.

In an editorial dealing with the mission to Hawaii, the New York Journal-American commented that it will be of great advantage for President Johnson to meet personally with the two ranking South Vietnames delegates, and it adds:

> Indeed, the meeting will be of equal advantage for the Vietnamese. Direct, blunt talks between the leaders of the two Governments can only result in closer understanding of each other's problems and an improved cooperation in pursuing the war.

The newspaper concludes that "once again President Johnson has made a bold and positive move with regard to the explosive Far East situation, and the Nation should solidly support him in his effort."

I think many of my colleagues may want to read the editorial in its entirety, and with this in mind, I submit it for the RECORD.

> MISSION TO HAWAII
>
> President Johnson's sudden trip to Hawaii to confer with top American and South Vietnamese officials on the Vietnam war is further evidence of the mounting gravity of that conflict and of the administration's preoccupation with ending it.
>
> Significantly, it marks L.B.J.'s first departure from the continental United States since becoming President.
>
> Hawaii is a logical place for so top-level a conference. As well as being the closest the President should go to Vietnam, as far as his personal safety is concerned, Hawaii is also the command center of all American military operations in and off Vietnam.
>
> Gen. William C. Westmoreland, American commander in Vietnam, reports to the Hawaii headquarters of Adm. Ulysses S. Grant Sharpe, commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific. In turn, Admiral Sharpe reports to the Pentagon, which then reports to President Johnson. Thus the President is, in effect, temporarily shortening this lengthy chain of command by his visit.
>
> It will also be of great advantage for President Johnson to meet personally with the two ranking South Vietnamese delegates, Premier Nguyen Cao Ky and Chief of State Nguyen Van Thieu.
>
> Indeed, the meeting will be of equal advantage for the Vietnamese. Direct, blunt talks between the leaders of the two Governments can only result in closer understanding of each other's problems and in improved cooperation in pursuing the war.
>
> Once again President Johnson has made a bold and positive move with regard to the explosive Far East situation, and the Nation should solidly support him in his effort.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko—Hero of Two Worlds

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, Americans and Poles alike celebrate the anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Polish soldier and statesman. His unswerving dedication to the great cause of national independence for both the United States and Poland earned him the title of "hero of two worlds."

Thaddeus Kosciuszko was a man of action, of great courage, and of an undying belief in the right of every nation to be free. When the American Revolution erupted, he hastened to this continent to fight for American independence. To the cause he brought great skill as an engineer and great personal valor, and in 1783 a grateful United States of America extended to him the privilege of American citizenship and the deepest thanks of the American Congress.

His task in America done, Kosciuszko returned to his beloved Poland to join in the struggle to prevent the third and final partition by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The Polish patriots, led by General Kosciuszko, defeated the Russians at Raclawice and ably defended the beautiful city of Warsaw but were at last overcome by the superior numbers of the enemy. In the battle of Maciejowice on October 10, 1794, the gallant Poles were defeated and their leader was taken prisoner by the Russians. Released 2 years later, General Kosciuszko dedicated the rest of his life to efforts to obtain Polish independence.

Mr. Speaker, the torch of freedom has been passed to our generation of Americans and Poles. We gain inspiration from the great hero Thaddeus Kosciuszko and on this day reconsecrate our lives to the great cause of freedom to which he gave his best.

New England's Economic Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the economic headaches we in New England have suffered almost since the end of World War II are a familiar story to most Americans. While the country in general progressed and moved forward to new records of prosperity each year, New England for a long time lagged behind. We were in a virtual depression while the rest of the Nation enjoyed an unprecedented boom.

We lost the bulk of our textile industry. Because of economic stagnation, we lost our young people who migrated to the areas of greater opportunity. We lost industry, manpower, and economic resources.

But as dramatically as the nightmare began, so apparently has it ended.

New England has bounced back. Today it is an economic success story of major proportions.

Those of us who are privileged to serve the six great States that comprise the New England region are justly proud of the progress, the imagination, the initiative, and courage that are so much a part of New England traditions and which have been demonstrated again so well in recent years.

This week the pages of the U.S. News & World Report magazine contained an excellent story about our economic comeback. The article deals specifically with the causes behind both our economic decline and our unprecedented rejuvenation. Credit is given where it is due—primarily to the businessmen and industrialists, to the economists and planners who could see through the despair of one generation to the bright opportunities of another; who could remember the resourcefulness and optimism of a bygone day when New England, and our great city of Boston, was truly the Hub of the Universe.

The adaptation of existing resources to modern problems, the initiation of important new industries keyed to the unique skills and capabilities of the New England region lie behind our success story.

I feel the aforementioned magazine article deserves to be read by all Americans and certainly by the Members of this body. In my opinion it contains some valuable seeds of wisdom for those of us whose job it is to ponder the scope and efficacy of government with respect to regional economic problems. I therefore have asked unanimous consent to reprint the article in full at this point in the RECORD, and respectfully commend it to the attention of my distinguished colleagues.

The article follows:

NEW ENGLAND'S BIG COMEBACK: LATEST SUCCESS STORY

BOSTON.—New England today is enjoying a boom unprecedented in history—and one which is steadily gaining momentum.

The upswing is broadly based. It extends to nearly every major industry and to almost every community of the six-State area.

Employment in New England in 1965 moved past the 4 million mark—the highest on record. Gains were reported not only in the region's factories, but also in a number of service industries of growing importance to its economy. Among these are insurance, financial, and business services, medical service, education, and recreation.

Construction, which trailed the rest of the country's industries last year, reached new levels. Spending for plant and equipment rose 15 percent in the region in 1965, and a similar increase is forecast for this year.

Throughout New England, unemployment is low and labor scarce. It is not just skilled labor and technical employees that are needed. Many employers would be overjoyed to find unskilled workers who could be trained. Help-wanted advertisements in the major newspapers are at an alltime high. Some areas are running short of housing for recently hired workers and their families.

UP FROM ADVERSITY

The current boom is something new and welcome in New England. Since the end of World War II, the region's economic growth had consistently lagged well behind that of the Nation as a whole. Regional comparisons usually had shown New England bringing up the rear in nearly every measure of economic progress.

Many of New England's woes were traceable to the loss of a big segment of an important industry—textiles. Scores of major firms picked up stakes and moved to the South to take advantage of lower wages, land costs, and taxes, and to be closer to raw materials and major customers.

Left behind were factories of Civil War vintage, blighted cities and pockets of massive unemployment.

Other long-established industries—shoes, shipbuilding, fishing, and paper—either declined or showed slow growth.

The States, particularly Maine and Vermont, suffered heavy losses of workers as residents moved out to find new jobs. Says one Vermont official of that period: "Our biggest export was our young folks."

New England came to be viewed by the rest of the country as worn out, ultraconservative, lacking vitality, and removed from the mainstream of postwar prosperity. As one Connecticut official remembers it, "People came to think of New England as having nothing to offer but stone fences, lobster pots, wooden bridges, and Yale University."

THE SPREAD OF SUCCESS

A unique feature of New England's newfound prosperity is that the northern tier of States—New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont—is sharing in the uptrend. Even in good times, these States usually had lagged behind southern New England. Connecticut for many years has been better off than the rest of the region and unhappy over being tarred with the same brush.

Now the fastest-growing State in New England is New Hampshire. Unemployment there is the lowest in the Nation. In 1965, unemployment averaged 2.9 percent of the State's labor force, compared with a national figure of 4.6 percent. Industrial construction in New Hampshire in 1965 was up 400 percent from the 1964 figure.

BEHIND THE BOOM: BRAINPOWER

What has happened to change the picture in New England so suddenly?

Many of the region's top economic experts admit they are stumped for an answer. One explains it this way: "It is all very vague, you cannot measure it by statistics. But New England today has a competitive advantage over other areas. This advantage boils down to this—brainpower."

Long a leader in the field of education, New England lately has been getting a big payoff from this investment. The brainpower advantage is traceable, mainly, to the big three of its prestige universities—Harvard, Yale and, especially, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

MIT is a university completely built around science and technology. Because of its pioneering work in electronics, it was selected as the site of the Government's World War II research laboratory that perfected radar. This was a huge effort, comparable to the Manhattan project, which developed the atom bomb. Top scientific and engineering personalities were drawn to MIT from all over the United States.

Another wartime laboratory at MIT did early work on guidance systems and fire-control techniques. Today, the university is heavily engaged in guidance systems for missiles such as Polaris and for the Apollo moon vehicle.

When Soviet Russia exploded a nuclear bomb in 1949, the Federal Government called on MIT to develop an intercontinental defense system. A new laboratory was built on Route 128, a highway that encircles all of Boston but the waterfront. In the process of developing the new system, major advances were made in computer technology. Among universities, MIT is the largest computer research center in the world.

OFFSPRING OF MIT

To supply the new laboratory with needed parts and materials, a number of small firms began to spring up along Route 128. Many top scientists and engineers left the laboratory to form their own firms, to exploit their knowledge in a new and expanding technology.

With MIT spawning new ideas, with topnotch scientists and engineers, and new companies, the Boston area became a leader in the field of electronics and research-oriented industry based on new technology.

Once a country road, Route 128 today is bordered by new plants. A recent survey showed 574 firms along the highway, employing nearly 55,000 people. Included were almost 100 manufacturing firms, 66 research companies, and 56 engaged in both research and manufacturing. Since 1962, there has been a 45-percent increase in the number of firms along the golden semicircle, as it is now called.

Graduates of MIT, who once left New England to take jobs in more prosperous areas, now seem to prefer to settle in or near Boston and to work in one of the many laboratories or electronics firms. Says an MIT official:

"As top scientists moved into this area, more and more younger men wanted to come and rub elbows with them. They were attracted, too, by the cultural advantage of the New England area. Culture is an 'in' thing with these highly educated people. We have more Ph. D.'s per acre around here than any other place in the country."

Recently, MIT set up four new research centers—space sciences, life sciences, earth sciences and materials science and engineering. Coming is one in communications.

There is no evidence that the birth of new firms is slackening. It appears more likely to increase. University officials say that revolutionary changes may be ahead in the field of biology. Some new fields being studied by MIT's laboratories include oceanography and medical instrumentation.

Other major New England universities also are beginning to expand research activities.

SEARCH FOR PLANT SITES

The mushrooming growth of electronics and related research firms is by no means confined to Route 128 or the Greater Boston area. Successful firms seeking sites for new plants are pushing out into southern New Hampshire and, to a lesser extent, Maine and Vermont. Connecticut and Rhode Island, as well, are gaining new industries.

The growing interest in siting plants in northern New England is due, in part, to a desire to get away from big-city congestion and problems. Vermont, for example, stresses its "moral climate" in newspaper ads. Says one: "Vermont has no really big cities with snarled transportation, strife, crime, bureaucratic waste, poor housing, air pollution and all the other seemingly hopeless problems of large metropolitan areas today."

INDUSTRY FIT TO AREA

The growth of research-oriented industry fits in perfectly with New England's needs. The region does pose handicaps for mass-production industries. It is poorly situated with respect to the center of U.S. population. It has high transportation and electric-power costs, and is lacking in most raw materials.

Because of these deficiencies, New England is specializing more in low-bulk, high-value products. "Even in electronics," comments one observer, "when something is developed suitable for mass production, it is usually produced elsewhere. Then the research people come up with something new. We have to keep running all the time."

Throughout the region, there has been a steady shift to new products and procedures based on research. A study in 1955 showed about one third of factory employment depended on products not in existence a decade earlier. A similar study today, experts say, would show this figure to be about one half of total manufacturing employment.

New Englanders believe that their combination of brainpower and a skilled, adaptable labor force will enable the region to keep abreast of new developments. They also see the growth of research-based industry as giving New England a stability it never had before.

NEW ROLE FOR OLDER INDUSTRIES

Some long-established industries also have played a role in New England's upswing.

One of the most important of these is transportation equipment. United Aircraft, centered in Connecticut, is the region's biggest private employer. Its payroll is approaching 70,000 and has been increasing at a rate of 1,000 a month as the firm seeks to keep up with orders for jet engines, helicopters and other aircraft components.

Another big employer, General Dynamics' Electric Boat division at Groton, Conn., has built much of the U.S. nuclear-submarine fleet. It has been stepping up production, hiring more workers. A large number commute from Rhode Island.

The machine-tool industry, long important to the area's economy, is showing new strength. Employment in this industry tends to rise and fall in line with capital spending by firms across the country. With plant-and-equipment spending at high levels, and further gains projected, the industry is expected to continue to lend its weight to the boom.

TEXTILES: NO LONGER A DRAG

Even the textile industry, which for many years acted as a drag on New England's economy, added slightly to its payrolls in 1965. During the postwar period, employment in the industry had fallen from 275,000 to about 100,000, but now it appears to have stabilized at that level. Most of the cotton-textile industry already has been lost, and remaining firms produce mostly woolen yarns and fabrics—a more expensive product.

The leather and shoe industry has been adding workers. Much of it has shifted out of older Massachusetts towns with high wage rates to newer plants in Maine and New Hampshire. The area continues to produce one third of the leather footwear made in United States.

Shipbuilding, which had been in the doldrums for years is showing new life—partly as the result of growing defense needs. There also has been heavy new investment in the paper industry, important to Maine.

New England's biggest growth, however, has not been in manufacturing, but in services. This includes a whole grab bag of activities.

Among the most important is medicine. The Boston area is one of the world's major medical centers. Doctors and patients come from Europe, Latin America and other parts of the world for training or treatment.

Education is another big service, and New England is the leader in the field. Harvard, Yale, MIT and Brown, plus a host of smaller schools such as Dartmouth, Amherst, Williams, and Middlebury, are among the Nation's top-rated educational institution.

Many of the largest insurance firms have headquarters in New England, especially in the Boston and Hartford areas. Boston is one of the four largest financial centers in the United States. Its investment houses handle most of the major mutual funds.

WINTER PLAYGROUND, TOO

New England always has been a popular arear for summer vacations, and its share of the recreation industry is growing steadily. In 1965, excellent weather brought huge gains in the tourist business.

Now, the region is experiencing a winter-vacation boom. Ski resorts are rising all over, especially in the northern tier. Building of new lodges, motels, and roads has had a major impact on the construction industry. It is also driving up land prices. In one part of Vermont where land sold 5 years ago for about $5 an acre—less than it cost in 1760—the price rose to $200 an acre or more when a new ski center went up nearby.

Vermont has the fanciest of the new ski resorts. Some offer such lures as heated outdoor swimming pools, sauna baths, ice skating, closed gondolas to take people up ski slopes, rather than T-bar lifts or rope tows, and cocktail lounges, night clubs, and theaters.

The 1965–66 ski season got off to a roaring start. A 40-inch snowfall in Vermont in December is estimated to have been worth $250,000 an inch to the State. Holiday ski business in some areas ran 200 percent ahead of last season.

THE MULTIPLIER EFFECT

Skiing has what is called a "multiplier effect." State officials estimate that, for $1 spent for skiing, an additional $4 is spent for food, lodging, liquor, entertainment, gasoline and other needed goods and services.

Northern New England is one of the few undeveloped areas left in the Eastern United States. It is accessible to huge population centers in both the United States and Canada. Roads are being improved, making it easier to reach. With more people having 3 weeks or more of vacation a year, many employers are urging workers to take part of their vacation in winter—and New England is benefiting from this trend.

New England also is getting a boost from another development—the desire of many American families to own two homes. More and more high income families that live along the eastern seaboard want to get away from the congestion. With increased interest in skiing and other winter sports, people can use a second home in winter as well as in summer. This two-house trend is adding to the rise in land values, especially in southern Vermont and New Hampshire.

CITIES: MIRRORS OF PROSPERITY

The effects of prosperity can be seen by driving through some of New England's cities.

Greater Boston, still the "hub" of New England with 3.2 million of the region's 11.2 million people, has been changed radically in appearance by a group of new buildings.

In 1965, the $160 million Prudential Center, which now dominates the Boston skyline, opened its doors. In process of construction is a $200 million Government center in the heart of the city. The first building of the center to be completed, a $26 million State office building, was opened last year. Just finished is a new Federal office building. Still under construction: a large, crescent-shaped office building and a new city hall.

Another skyscraper nearing completion is the State Street Bank building, adjacent to the financial district. It was financed by British investors.

Construction is about to start on a $50 million electronics-research center for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It will rise close to MIT, across the Charles River from downtown Boston.

Boston also is having a boom in apartment construction. A large, high-rise building is going up across from the Boston Common. Others have been built overlooking the Charles River and in outlying sections of the city.

Progress is being made on new highways and expressways. In 1965, the last link of the Massachusetts Turnpike was completed, bringing it into the downtown part of Boston.

Urban renewal is evident in many other cities of New England. Hartford and New Haven in Connecticut have completed huge projects that have revitalized large areas.

A further example of a city which has come back is Providence, R.I. For many years, this city was listed as a "depressed area" by the Department of Labor, with "substantial and persistent unemployment." Last May, Providence and its environs were taken off the list. In October, joblessness was down to 3.9 percent—lowest figure in 15 years.

Providence has been helped by a new interstate highway which cuts through the center of the city and links it closely to Boston on the north and New York on the south. The highway has opened new industrial sites, and the city could become an important distribution center.

More spectacular than the progress of some of the larger cities is the change that has taken place in scores of smaller cities which were hardest hit when their textile mills closed their doors and moved south.

THE NASHUA STORY

Nashua, N.H., lost its major textile employer in 1948. In an effort to find jobs for thousands of people thrown out of work, a tax-free, nonprofit foundation was set up to buy the mill properties and either sell or lease them to any prospective employer.

Today, hardly a square foot of factory space is available of the 2½ million square feet originally purchased. Instead of one firm employing 3,500 workers, the space is occupied by 24 separate firms employing more than 6,000 workers.

In addition, the city has 16 new plants—five of them built by firms which outgrew their space in the old mill. Manufacturing employment, which stood at 8,400 before the textile plant left, has grown to 13,000.

Nashua, in fact, now has a labor shortage. Firms in the area are estimated to have 2,000 jobs they are unable to fill. As 1965 ended, unemployment was down below 2 percent of the labor force.

Much of the same story is true of Manchester. After the loss of a huge textile mill, Manchester had staggering unemployment. Like Nashua, it is now booming, has a much more diversified industry and is looking for more workers.

Another city which has gone from bust to boom is Burlington, largest city in Vermont. It lost its major employer, a large woolen mill. Burlington took a different tack. Instead of trying to interest employers in the old mill property, business leaders formed an industrial corporation and raised money to build a plant on speculation. They snagged International Business Machines. Employment at the plant has risen from 500 to 2,500 over the past 18 months.

THE AREA'S SERIOUS PROBLEMS

New England is not without problems. Railroad service is poor—Maine is the first State to be inaccessible to passengers on regular schedules by rail—but expected mergers of New England railroads with major rail networks may help.

The threat of severe drought hangs over the region unless it gets heavy winter snows and spring rains.

Some of the older cities still have financial problems and urban blight. Others have exceptionally high property taxes that could discourage new industry.

Another worry is that much of the boom in industries such as electronics, shipbuilding and transportation equipment is due to defense orders. Any major cutback in defense spending could have a heavy impact. But many business leaders aware of this danger are making efforts to diversify.

Right now, however, New England's greatest problem is its labor shortage. Both government and business leaders are making concerted efforts to attract labor.

Some employers are considering trying to recruit Cuban refugees, or Puerto Ricans and Negroes from crowded eastern cities. At present, New England has few nonwhites. Vermont's population is .002 percent Negro. Many New Englanders say they would like to keep the racial balance the way it is now.

IS THE COMBACK PERMANENT?

Because of New England's large urban population and heavy industrialization, few experts believe the region can match newer areas such as the Southwest or Far West in growth rates. But they see the present boom as more than a cyclical revival.

"The east coast still has the Nation's biggest market, the biggest population," says an industrial development official in Connecticut.

And, it appears, the view that New England is decrepit, out of tune with modern times, will have to be reviewed and updated as the boom continues.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam is being covered by New York Post Correspondent Pete Hamill. From that strifetorn area of the world he has been writing a series of articles which are very revealing.

On February 8, 1966, he discussed the Vietcong in his second article. I am sure my colleagues will find the following of interest.

VIETNAM: THE ENDLESS WAR—ARTICLE II: THE ENEMY

(By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—The boy was about 17 and he was squatting in the shade of a long, barracks-style building at the edge of a dusty road leading out of Ben Tre, in the Mekong Delta country. He had a close crewcut, hard black eyes behind a high ridge of cheekbones, and he was dressed in black pajamas and sandals cut from rubber tires. Three weeks before, he had deserted from the Vietcong.

An interpreter asked him why he had left. He looked up at the two American visitors. The interpreter asked him again. He started talking softly in the singsong cadence of the Vietnamese.

"He says he was tired," the interpreter said. "He says that he did not want to join the Vietcong anyway. He says they made him join. They told him that if he did not join they would chop off his index finger so that he could never fire a gun for the government. He says he had no choice."

The young man said that he had spent most of his 2½ years with the Vietcong in flight. His guerrilla unit of about 100 men traveled by night, slept in caves and tunnels by day. Most of their attacks on isolated hamlets and villages took place at night. He personally had killed 14 men, he said, and others had killed more than 50.

"He says that he wanted to live a normal life," the interpreter explained. "He says he wanted to have a wife and children and to work on some land. He wants to be left alone."

It could be said that most Vietnamese agree with him. There is no farmer, on either side, who wishes to live with the constant threat of Vietcong terror, American defoliation and bombing raids, or the conscription drives of the Vietnamese Army. But the war will not go away. Neither the Vietnamese, nor the Americans, nor the Vietcong will allow it to go away.

There are still great empty spaces in the known history of the Vietcong revolution, but the basic outlines are on the record. The roots of the movement lie in the long struggle against the French which ended in the slaughter of Dienbienphu and the complex of agreements made at Geneva in 1954.

Under the terms of the agreements, most of the Viet Minh—northerners and southerners—went to North Vietnam. About 5,000 stayed behind, to insure a revolutionary base in the event that the government of Ngo Dinh Diem reneged on the Geneva agreements. Diem had never signed those agreements (and neither had the United States) and showed his contempt for them by canceling the 1956 elections whose purpose was to reunify the country. There is some evidence that Ho Chi Minh was not anxious to face a free election that year either, because of peasant unrest in the North. But Diem was apparently convinced that Ho would be elected and canceled the elections anyway. Most observers here feel this was the most crucial decision Diem ever made, and that it was the wrong one.

There is no way to determine at this date what might have happened in South Vietnam if Diem had not been installed as leader. The country might have fallen to the Communists immediately. Most people at the time of the Geneva agreements gave him only a few months. But Diem was tough and resourceful, a man with an iron sense of righteousness. He broke the power of the religious sects, and crushed the criminals who ran Saigon like a private fiefdom. For a while, people talked of the miracle of Diem.

But by 1957 the revolt in the countryside was already underway. Some of the suppressed Cao Dai and Hoa Hao sectists joined the Vietcong, and the first sporadic raids on hamlets and villages started. By 1958, the revolt was spreading, and Diem reacted exactly as the Communists had expected. All opposition—Buddhist, nationalist, democratic—was labeled "Communists" and ruthlessly repressed. When a relatively free election was held in 1959, and Dr. Dan—an anti-Communist and anti-Diemist—was elected to the National Assembly, Diem reacted by imprisoning him. Many of Dan's supporters switched allegiances to the Vietcong because there was simply no other viable political organization.

One of the classic strategies of guerrilla war is the isolation of the countryside from the cities. Ho Chi Minh marched into Hanoi without ever fighting for that city. He didn't need to; he had the countryside. The Vietcong began a systematic campaign of blowing up bridges and railways, of cutting communication lines, of tearing up highways. They were isolating the city from the country with little serious opposition and they were aided in their work by the intransigent character of Diem himself.

There is neither room nor need to relate here the whole dreary story of Ngo Dinh Diem. Most of it in known: his remote, monastic character, his Catholic religion, which put him in a minority in his own country, his Mandarin background, his repression of the Buddhists, his growing fear of and separation from the people he ruled, his weakness in the face of the ruthlessness of his brother Nhu and his famous wife. The story has been told many times. But as Fidel Castro needed his Batista, the Vietcong needed a Diem. They thrived under his attempts at suppression.

Since the Vietcong could never compete with Diem's arsenal of American weaponry, they returned to the tactics used successfully at the beginning of the Viet Minh revolution. They used selective terror: assassinating unpopular province chiefs, tax collectors, conscription squads. In especially intransigent areas, they made examples of people loyal to the government. They struck swiftly, and brutally, often under the noses of government forces. In those places where they were not thought of as true representatives of the people, they became a mysterious, all-powerful enemy capable of striking with deadly effect whenever they wanted to.

From a hard core of 5,000, they soon grew into an army which now stands at about 150,000 in main-force battalions, with another 100,000 in looser guerrilla companies. (Essentially there are three kinds of Vietcong: the main-force soldiers, organized in battalion and regimental units and capable of conventional stand-and-fight warfare; guerrilla units, used for ambushes, swift harrassing strikes and terror; and local squads, made up of men who farm by day and freelance at terror at night.)

They set up a political arm in 1960—an amorphous, almost invisible organization called the National Liberation Front, and began demanding aid from Hanoi and Peiping. The NLF included non-Communists, Buddhists, and members of other groups united by opposition to Diem. Its platform was relatively mild. It began turning out trained political and military cadres and the drift of southerners from North Vietnam along the Ho Chi Minh trail began accelerating.

Today, the Vietcong is the most powerful political organization in the country.

Some well-informed Americans I talked to in Saigon point to the very anonymity of the Vietcong leadership as proof that the entire revolution emanates from Hanoi.

"Where is the Fidel Castro of this movement?" one of these men said. "Where is the Ben Bella? The Lenin? Why is the National Liberation Front so amorphous? The only reason can be that in the event of victory the only Communist personality in Vietnam can assume command. That's Ho Chi Minh. It's in his interest to keep the leadership anonymous. If the Vietcong win, he can move in and take the credit. If it get licked, he can blame it on the anonymous leaders. And if any of the NLF men get uppity, they can be murdered without fanfare. It's as simple as that."

It may not be as simple as that, but something which is obvious after weeks of crisscrossing this country is the tenacity of the Vietcong in the areas they control. Before any overt move is ever made against a village or a hamlet, the Vietcong intelligence men make careful, detailed surveys of the situation. All those capable of leadership or opposition are assassinated. A "shadow" system of government is set up, so that political control can be effected immediately. The process of selective terror stifles grumbling and opposition.

"They administer their areas with absolute control and great efficiency," one American adviser in the delta told me. "They run their own mail system, their own system of domestic courts, even their own public works programs. In every single case I know of, they govern their villages with greater efficiency than the Government does, and with a greater sense of justice. It's not nice to say so, but this is unfortunately the truth."

Most American military men I've spoken to also admire the Vietcong as soldiers. "They have great discipline, dedication, and courage," a marine major said. "If the Vienamese Army fought half as well, this war would have been over 3 or 4 years ago."

Despite some slackening of morale, and the manpower shortage, the Vietcong remains a formidable enemy. They might be beaten in any single large-scale military action. But most observers here feel that they will be around for years to come.

"They have a lot of the people on their side," one American province representative for the AID program said. "As long as they have that popular support, they will keep fighting. The way things are going, that could be for the rest of the century."

Too Smart To Fight?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I reported to the House of Representatives on the approval by the Department of Defense of my bill, H.R. 12522, to establish a special educational and physical rehabilitation program for enlistees and draftees rejected for service in the Armed Forces.

Mr. Rex Edmondson, a versatile and very astute writer for the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, had some terse comments on the rejection of Cassius Clay, the heavyweight boxing champion of the world, in his editorial column of February 4, 1966, which I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in support of my legislation:

TOO SMART TO FIGHT?

We sometimes wonder who makes such decisions as the classification of heavyweight boxing champ Cassius Clay as 4F because he couldn't pass the Army's mental tests.

He is (a) smart enough to get rich and (b) smart enough to win fights.

And after all, isn't fighting the main occupation of the Army? We've never heard yet of a man wearing his Phi Beta Kappa key in combat. Just his dogtags will be enough. On the other hand, perhaps Mohammed Ali is too smart to be a soldier.

Is the Poverty Program Creating Political Frankenstein?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Great Society's poverty program has been aimed at alleviating the concern which normally accompanies off-year elections by the party in power—substantial unemployment—their own. Using poverty funds to pay off those who will in turn continue to deliver for the Great Society, millions of dollars of taxpayers' money has been expended. The goal: To insure that no Great Society political supporter will fall below that basic level of income which is essential to keep him, and the administration, in business.

In the past, such funds have at least been expended under the aura, however illusory, of eliminating poverty. Thus poverty funds have been used for training people in such skills as political-machine operators and big-wheel oilers. And under the Great Society's program to strike at unemployment in big cities, the greatest cause of which is loss of city hall, big city Democrat mayors have been allowed to use poverty funds to grease, oil, and undercoat the machinery of ward bosses and other political lackeys.

That there is no business like the consultant business under the Great Society has been especially well demonstrated.

Principal poverty promoter Shriver has apparently become concerned with the disturbing possibility that these latent programs will not provide a long-range solution to the looming possibility of substantial Democrat unemployment. A new gimmick paid for out of poverty funds is being designed, therefore, to computerize the whole business of appealing to voters on a continuing, long-range basis.

An Information Center Division with a staff of 90 has been established in the Office of Economic Opportunity to program every city, county, and every congressional district in the Nation. This operation will, by the mere flick of a switch, provide its operator with all the information—economic, social, political—that he needs to know about any congressional district as well as the State in which it is located.

This setup has the disturbing potential of becoming a Frankenstein of dangerous proportions whose only relationship to the antipoverty program is the insatiable political appetite of the people administering it.

Following is an editorial which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale News discussing this new program:

SHRIVER'S COMPUTERS LOOM AS STOREHOUSE OF POTENT AMMUNITION FOR POLITICIANS

The report that poverty fighter Sargent Shriver is McNamara-izing his Department sounds at first blush, as though some business-like methods were being injected into the giveaway operations.

Computers are being installed, programs are going to be analyzed to see where the greater benefits are being achieved and other procedures are in the offing.

But, a closer look at all of this raises a strong odor of strictly party politics. Inherent in the operation is the potential of providing campaign ammunition which will make the party in power comparable to a nation using nuclear weapons fighting a foe with bows and arrows or slingshots.

Columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott detailed some of Mr. Shriver's plans on this page yesterday.

Reportedly, the poverty program policy now is to give priority to projects which have a long-range potential while playing down those which are geared to immediate returns.

Because of this, the educational experiment—Head Start—and the costly Job Corps project training teenagers at $7,000 yearly are due to receive increased appropriations, if Mr. Shriver has his way.

But Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the controversial Harlem Representative and chairman of the powerful Education and Labor Committee overseeing the antipoverty programs, has different ideas.

Representative POWELL is not a long-range idealist but a short-term, practical politician. He favors jobs for unemployed first and projects which are apt to return votes at the next election.

He has a point in saying that while the youth programs might reap long-term gains, "the jobless adults cannot be disregarded." He notes "that's where the dynamite is" and what the antipoverty program was supposed to accomplish.

The real political potential, however, is related to another phase of Mr. Shriver's operation. For this, he has brought in Leon Gilgoff who served under Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara as former assistant budget director of the Air Force. Mr. Gilgoff has set up the Information Center Division with a staff of 90.

The intriguing point is that this unit is busy compiling "a complete social profile of the country." When it is set up, it will be the most complete county-by-county analysis of the United States ever made. At a moment's notice, it will be possible to find out the problems of any given congressional district or county, what is being done about them and what should be initiated.

"I see the day," Mr. Gilgoff says, "when a Member of Congress can flick a television set in his office and in a few minutes, from a central computer set in Washington, get all the information—economic, social, political—that he needs to know about his State or district."

In placing some emphasis on the "political," Mr. Gilgoff is being honest. Imagine what all this can mean to a Congressman setting up a reelection campaign or one seeking to support and swing his district to the party's presidential nominee.

It is a ready-made tool for an astute campaign manager intent on putting issues in terms of local needs and "what the great Federal Government is doing for you, the voter."

Interestingly enough, Mr. Gilgoff hopes to have completed the first part of this unique profile by spring. This, of course, has nothing to do with the fact that 1966 is a congressional election year when some of this information might be a major factor in conning voters to swing one way or another in the interests of maintaining a lopsided control of Congress.

This has the potential of becoming a mighty pat political operation and one in which Mr. Shriver looms as the kingpin.

It would not be surprising in the least if some Congressmen, anxious to have this campaign ammunition, might vote generously for Mr. Shriver's programs to keep on his good side.

The question presents itself whether all of this was strictly Mr. Shriver's idea or whether his presidesntial-insipred brother-in-law, Senator BOBBY KENNEDY, may have visualized the possibilities of the vast resources being accumulated by Mr. Shriver's department.

And the American public might well ask whether a Frankenstein is being created.

—HARVEY A. CALL.

CIA Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago I extended my remarks in the RECORD and inserted several articles dealing with the CIA. In that statement I indicated that I strongly supported this organization and felt that they were doing a fine job.

Last Sunday on CBS, Senator SALTONSTALL, a respected Member of the Senate and a member of the Armed Services Committee and as such a member of the subcommittee dealing with CIA activities appeared on the program "Face the Nation." I was pleased with the Senator's remarks dealing with the CIA and was doubly pleased that he too rose to the defense of this organization. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that portion of Senator SALTONSTALL's remarks concerning the CIA:

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator, you are a member of the subcommittee of Senator MCCARTHY of Minnesota, and he seeks to investigate the influence of the CIA on foreign policy. He feels that it is perhaps too much, and that it is harmful. How do you feel about that?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I am very much against such an investigation, Martin, for this reason. We are the largest and most responsible free nation of the world. We know that there has got to be a certain amount of intelligence in other nations of the world which is necessary for us to know. We know that it is being done on us here in the United States.

Now you cannot have an intelligence agency operated entirely in the public. For what reason if for no other, that we would lose some of our agents. We know that there are a certain number of them that are taken away from us every year, not many we hope, but that operation has got to be under cover.

Now from a congressional point of view, I am on the subcommittee that has handled that ever since its inception. In fact, I was the acting chairman of the conference committee that adopted the Defense Department as a unit. And we can get any information from the CIA under its leaders, Dulles, McCone, and now Rayborn that we want to, and they are completely open. They give us anything we want. But we try to keep it secret. We have no reporter at those hearings or anything else. But we have got to operate it that way. And I would be very much against an open investigation.

Mr. Agronsky. But Senator, Senator McCarthy's concern is a different one. His feeling is that the CIA influences the conduct of foreign policy, and perhaps in a bad way as, for example, there are many indications that a CIA evaluation resulted in the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs. That is what concerns Senator McCarthy.

Senator Saltonstall. Well, I do not agree with that, Martin. The CIA gathers facts, just like the Armed Forces aids in various embassies, just like the State Department, and those facts are all put together in one memorandum, and I think every day it is given to the President and all our top leading officials, and the CIA is the whipping boy of a lot of these questions, because they know it can't answer. And futhermore we want to remember that the Department of Defense cannot carry on subversive warfare as that term is used. That has got to be done by the CIA.

Americans of Italian Heritage Oppose Valachi's Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Department of Justice to permit Joseph Valachi to submit his manuscript for publication has most understandably caused consternation and resentment among American citizens of Italian descent.

One principal reason advanced by the Department is that "it is possible and perhaps likely that law enforcement can be benefited substantially by publication of the book." This vague possibility surely does not justify an exception to the Department's long-standing policy not to permit publication of prisoners' stories of their lives of crime, particularly when the Valachi memoirs will cause embarrassment to, and defame the good name of Americans of Italian heritage. The intolerant and vindictive segments of our society will seize upon the Valachi book as a means of dishonoring and discrediting all Americans of Italian origin and of spreading divisiveness and distrust at a time when unity and good will are so essential.

The case against the publication of the memoirs is ably set forth in a letter to the Attorney General from Frank A. Nigro, president of the Federation of Italian American Societies, Newark, N.J., composed of highly respected citizens who are far more representative of their ancestry than are Valachi and his fellow criminals.

Mr. Nigro's letter follows:

February 4, 1966.

Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Katzenbach: As Americans of Italian heritage we strongly urge you to stop the publication of the intended memoirs of one Joseph Valachi.

We sincerely believe that if this book is published it will definitely be a setback to Americans of Italian heritage and their achievements and contributions given toward the building of this great Nation of ours; namely, music, art, literature, engineering, science and in law enforcement itself.

Why should so many millions of good and loyal Americans of Italian heritage be labeled or be associated with these few so-called cosa nostra, mafia, etc., or in plain words, "hoodlums," undesirables in this country or any other country, just to benefit Mr. Valachi, the publisher and the writers. To publish this book would antagonize millions of honest, law-abiding citizens. This nonsense should be stopped once and for all. Let's stop bringing up from time to time the insignificant things that degrade our race.

Mr. Valachi's case and any facts he gave should only be used for constructive purposes toward law enforcement.

Throughout our country everyone agrees in civil rights so as to erase prejudice against minority groups. There are many factions who until very recently (and in some instances even today) are considered minority groups and who have, through merit found a place in society. Why should this be destroyed through the media of this proposed publication.

Trusting you will consider our request, we are,

Sincerely yours,
Frank A. Nigro,
President.

One Man, One Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an admirer of the work of the League of Women Voters. I believe the league's contribution to better government and a more informed citizenry has been very great indeed.

I was delighted to learn recently that the league has taken a position in full support of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decisions on apportionment of State legislatures. I am very pleased to find myself on the same side of this vital issue as the League of Women Voters.

On January 12, 1966, the league's Washington office issued a press release announcing support for the principle of equality of representation in legislative apportionment.

The release follows:

League Favors One Man, One Vote

Washington, D.C., January 12.—The League of Women Voters of the United States today came out in favor of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision.

National league President Mrs. Robert J. Stuart said league members are convinced that the Court's standard for apportioning both houses of State legislatures substantially on population should be maintained and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended in any way which would allow consideration of factors other than population. Any such amendments introduced in this session of Congress, she went on to say, will be opposed by the League of Women Voters.

According to the league president, the overriding consideration influencing the league decision was the conviction that population is the "fairest and most equitable way of assuring that each man's vote is of equal value."

The new league position was announced at the close of a 5-day meeting of the organization's 17-member national board of directors.

Other considerations taken into account by the league in reaching its conclusion were the beliefs that the Constitution "should not be amended hastily or without due consideration because of an 'unpopular' court decision and that individual rights now protected by the Constitution should not be weakened or abridged."

By supporting the population standard, Mrs. Stuart said league members hoped to insure more representative legislatures and thus stronger and more effective State governments, a longstanding interest of the League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Stuart described the league position as reflecting a "truly nationwide consensus" for upholding the population standard. She said the national league had received local consensus reports from leagues in all sections of the country and that there was no evidence of a rural-urban or geographic split.

Although 30 State leagues had been active in the apportionment field within their own States, no effort was made to reach nationwide agreement until last May.

In light of congressional developments at that time, league delegates from all 50 States and the District of Columbia voted at a Washington meeting to take up a study of apportionment with the goal of reaching a nationwide agreement by January 1966.

(According to league procedures, no action either supporting or opposing specific legislation can be taken until a consensus of members has been reached at the appropriate organizational level.)

League members studied the issues involved during the summer and fall and last month sent their conclusions to the national office.

During this week's meeting, board members also discussed plans for the league's convention in Denver May 2 through 6 and proposed a 1966–68 program developed from recommendations reported by local leagues.

This proposed program will be announced in the National Voter, copies of which are sent to the league's 145,550 members, and will be voted on by delegates to the national convention.

National officers and directors attending the meeting were:

President: Mrs. Robert J. Stuart, Spokane, Wash.

First vice president: Mrs. William H. Wood, Bladensburg, Md.

Second vice president: Mrs. William S. Morgan, Norman, Okla.

Secretary: Mrs. Tyler Shinn, Fairfield, Conn.

Treasurer: Mrs. Hans-Arnold Fraenkel, Hartsdale, N.Y.

Directors:

Mrs. Bruce B. Benson, Amherst, Mass.

Mrs. John A. Campbell, Indianapolis, Ind.

Mrs. William N. Christopherson, Louisville, Ky.

Mrs. Louis Hirsch, Tucson, Ariz.
Mrs. John D. Kenderdine, Holtwood, Pa.
Mrs. Colin J. Macdonald, Dallas, Tex.
Mrs. K. E. Montgomery, Eugene, Oreg.
Mrs. W. Eugene Pharis, Webster Groves, Mo.
Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, Washington, D.C.
Mrs. Vernon C. Stoneman, Belmont, Mass.
Mrs. John F. Toomey, Narragansett, R.I.
Mrs. Robert Zurbach, Pasadena, Calif.

Mrs. George A. Little, of Old Greenwich, Conn., league observer to the United Nations, also attended.

Why the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty Should Be Rejected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of economics at Georgetown University and chairman of the National Captive Nations Week Committee, has written a scholarly article on the proposed consular treaty between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of the article, in which Dr. Dobriansky discusses four reasons for rejecting the treaty:

VII. BASIS FOR INTENSIFIED POLITICAL WARFARE IN LATIN AMERICA

Speaking of ramifications emerging from a shortsighted ratification of the treaty, the next four reasons for nonratification indicate what we can expect from this further appeasement of Soviet Russian desires. It should be evident now to the reader that all of these reasons against ratification are integrally related, though any one is sufficient cause for rejecting the treaty. To the recurring distinction made between the treaty as a body of guidelines for consular activity and the actual establishment of the consulates, which some even suggest the State Department might act upon devoid of any treaty, one can reasonably maintain the virtual inseparability of the two and the political certainty of no consulars if these many reasons, individually, in combination or as an integral whole, lead to a Senate rejection of the pact.

Thus, the seventh reason for nonratification is that a Senate confirmation of this treaty would open up a Pandora's Box of Soviet Russian pressure against every free government in Latin America. The immediate objective would be similar consular conventions; the ultimate objective would be a really intensified political warfare in the area. This at a time when many of our own officials have been warning us to expect stepped-up Red subversion throughout the continent.

Strangely enough, this reason against ratification was scarcely brought up in the August discussion. Few even knew that as of now no U.S.S.R. consulates exist in the Western Hemisphere. In a cogent rebuttal to a newspaper editorial, Congressman DERWINSKI stated the case eloquently: "Acquiescence of the United States to Soviet consulates would set an obvious precedent that would soon find the Communist rulers of Moscow spreading their influence in Latin America by means of consular activities. What Latin American government could refuse the request for a consulate after the leader of the free world has extended this benefit to the rulers of the Kremlin?"[39]

Need more be said on this point of consular proliferation for extended Red subversion in the Western Hemisphere? The ratification of the treaty would create a solid basis for intensified Russian political warfare in Latin America. As in the area of trade with the Red empire, or lack of firm and consistent policy will be another government's rationalization for its actions under pressure.

VIII. A TRADE WEDGE

Another reason for not ratifying the pact is the obvious use made of this treaty as a diplomatic wedge to liberalize and increase trade with the Soviet Union and the Red empire in general. Time and time again in his testimony Mr. Rusk spoke of the prospect of "increasing trade between our two countries."[40] At times it appears this argument of dollars and cents carried more weight with him than the argument of humane protection for Americans in the U.S.S.R.

The issue of increased trade with the U.S.S.R. and the Red empire is a controversial problem in and of itself. This writer has pointed out in testimony and in emphatic terms that any such liberalized trade would not be the first time the United States has contributed myopically to the economic strengthening of the Soviet Russian empire—always, of course, in the interests of "peace," "normal relations," "relaxation of tensions," and other self-legitimations.[41] Up to now those seeking such East-West trade have been careful to distinguish between our trading more liberally with the captive states in Central Europe and that with the U.S.S.R. The former is supposed to unlatch these Red totalitarian states from the chains of Russian domination, though for years Moscow itself has pursued the empire policy of division of national labor.

Now, curiously enough, we see Secretary Rusk injecting the trade issue into this consular one with evident abandon of the distinction mentioned above. Our fighting men in South Vietnam should take great comfort in this switch since economic-trade support of the U.S.S.R. should in turn bolster Moscow's support of Hanoi for an even more challenging conflict in that area.

The fragmented policy of our Government conduces to many blatant contradictions. This tactic of arguing for the treaty on the basis of trade prospects which in turn would facilitate the economic means of Moscow's global cold war operations against our interests is a gem of policymaking fragmentism. It's cause enough to reject the treaty as a trade wedge.

IX. THE MOST-FAVORED-NATION SIEVE

As in the area of trade with the Red empire, the most-favored-nation sieve exists in consular agreements. This ninth reason for not ratifying the treaty was emphasized by several scrutinizing Senators who wisely oppose the extension of the immunity eprivilege to 27 other nations and states, including Yugoslavia and Rumania.[42] As they pointed out, as many as 400 consular personnel would be eligible under the treaty and their covering conventions with the most-favored-nation clause for immunity from prosecution for all crimes.

On this point Secretary Rusk affirmed that "others would have the right to raise with us establishing various privileges, but only on a basis of reciprocity."[43] It is interesting that this concern for reciprocity shows itself here but not with the protection of American citizens in the U.S.S.R. on the ambassadorial or full diplomatic level. With this sieve the risks mentioned earlier become all the more magnified. Also, Red governments with no consular agreements at present would also seek the inclusion of the most-favored-nation clause in any future conventions.

The snowball effects of the treaty's provisions are thus not difficult to determine. They all point to a substantial net disadvantage for us. Recently, for example, our officials have uttered some tart remarks with regard to Japan's apathy toward the Vietnam war and its warm behavior toward the Red Empire. Encouraged by our action, Japan, too, is on the road to signing a consular agreement with the U.S.S.R.[44] If in short time it judges the U.S.S.R. to be a far greater threat to the free world than Red China could possibly be in the next decade, it would have a self-legitimating basis for establishing similar and probably closer relations with Peiping.

X. THE BALTIC DILEMMA

A final reason for nonratification bears on the Baltic dilemma to which the treaty exposes us. This reason is logically a derivative of the second reason we considered, as well as being based on an act of U.S. policy. The United States does not recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia in the U.S.S.R. Yet, despite the silent treatment proferred by the State Department's legal counsel, any consular activity in these Republics cannot but in practice and in time constitute de facto recognition.[45] With the allowable establishment of consular districts there, this condition would become crystal clear. At least Secretary Rusk admitted, "We do have a bit of a dilemma there, Senator."[46]

In conclusion, there are many dilemmas, contradictions, and risks posed by this consular convention. From Moscow's viewpoint, as an instrument of the cold war it is fraught without innumerable advantages—imperial legitimacy, propaganda, legacies, political warfare penetrations, espionage, and so forth. Our viewpoint is already so beclouded that many cannot see a real diplomatic alternative to this disadvantageous arrangement which would satisfy most of the reasons given for ratification of the convention, including the inadequacy of our Embassy in Moscow, and yet realize a substantial net advantage.

Before alternatives can be examined, the treaty itself should be subjected to full, critical examination. This has not as yet been done. The question is a simple one: Blind ratification or open, public hearings?

Footnotes at end of speech.

---

[39] Edward J. Derwinski, "The Consular Treaty," the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Aug. 27, 1965.

[40] E.g. "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 33.

[41] Lev E. Dobriansky, "Five Perspectives on East-West Trade," "East-West Trade," hearings, pt. II, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 1965, pp. 94–104.

[42] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," minority views, p. 4.

[43] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 23.

[44] "Japan, Russia Are Negotiating," Reauters, Moscow, June 10, 1965.

[45] "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," p. 26.

[46] Ibid, p. 25.

Letter From Chester R. Lindsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance Witness, the official organ of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, in its issue for February 2, 1966, has published a letter from Lt. Col. Chester R. Lindsey, division chaplain, for the 1st Cavalry Division, now in Vietnam, to the Christian and Missionary Alliance. This letter is a tribute to the work of missionaries in Vietnam from the chaplains and military personnel of the 1st Air Cavalry Division. They are so interested in furthering the work of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in Vietnam that they have made a substantial contribution to the voluntary missionary effort in that country.

In recent days our Government through the Declaration of Honolulu has indicated that we are going to give priority to economic and social welfare programs in South Vietnam even as the military effort continues. This letter indicates that in addition to this governmental effort the heroic and sacrificial effort of Christian missionaries in South Vietnam in establishing church buildings and ministering to the spiritual needs of the people is also going to be a vital part of the important effort of reconstructing a war-torn country. I take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude both for the work of the missionaries in South Vietnam, and also for the service of our faithful chaplains. I read somewhere recently that attendance at chapel services by our men in South Vietnam is almost 100 percent. To me this is one of the most encouraging bits of news to come out of the war zone in a long time. For it indicates that our fighting men feel a spiritual hunger and need even as they carry out the difficult tasks that fall to them as soldiers, sailors and airmen in the service of their country.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include with my remarks a copy of Lieutenant Colonel Lindsey's letter.

HEADQUARTERS, 1ST CAVALRY DIVISION (AIRMOBILE), OFFICE OF THE DIVISION CHAPLAIN,
APO San Francisco, December 16, 1965.

THE CHRISTIAN AND MISSIONARY ALLIANCE,
260 West 44th Street,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Our chaplains and the military personnel of the 1st Air Cavalry Division in Vietnam have become acquainted with many of the missionaries and have observed the work which they are doing.

We have received an offering at our chapel services and present this check for $696.75 for the work of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in Vietnam.

We have become acquainted with the work of Rev. and Mrs. Chester E. Travis, of Qui Nhon. We request the offering be designated for their work in order that they may assist the Christians of this Province in establishing church buildings in locations within this Province where refugees may be relocated and churches need to be established.

Although we are aware that all of your work is vital and filling a real need, we would be grateful if this offering could be used for the purpose stated above.

With every good wish for continued success in your work, I remain

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER R. LINDSEY,
Chaplain (Lieutenant Colonel) U.S. Army, Division Chaplain.

The Miami Business and Professional Women's Club Celebrate 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday the Miami Business and Professional Women's Club will celebrate its 50th anniversary of service to the south Florida community.

It is often remarked that behind every successful man there stands a woman. It is no less true of a city. During the last half century, while our globe was steadily shrinking, Miami has been busy growing from a small village to one of America's greatest cities with a population now over 1 million. Behind this growth has stood a dedicated, hardworking group of women—the Miami Business and Professional Women's Club. The contribution made by Miami's business and professional women, both as individuals and as members of their club is immeasurable.

Mr. Speaker, these 50 years of achievement are a source of pride to all of us in Miami, but they must especially be so for the women who have so ably lead the group over the years, including Mrs. Marjory Stoneman Douglas, who first organized the group in 1916, the current president Mrs. Florence M. Yoder, and Mrs. Edna Van Acker, twice past president and anniversary chairman.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate them and all the members of the Miami Business and Professional Women's Club on a job well done.

BUSINESS, PROFESSIONAL WOMEN OBSERVE THEIR 50TH BIRTHDAY

Miami Business and Professional Women's Club will light 50 birthday candles on February 12 at the Everglades Hotel. Actually the birth date was February 2, 1916, but the Saturday evening event was chosen for the convenience of guests from many places.

Chief hostesses will be the club's first president, Mrs. Marjory Stoneman Douglas (1916–17) and the current leader, Mrs. Florence M. Yoder (1964–66). Past President Mrs. Edna Van Acker (1944–46 and 1960–62) is anniversary chairman.

Official emissary from the Florida Federation of Women's Clubs is the State president, Della Rosenberg, of Starke. She will attend with other officers, district directors, and committee chairmen.

Minnesota-born Mrs. Douglas, a young welfare worker and writer from Massachusetts, arrived in south Florida in 1915 just in time to help charter the new club.

It was named the Business and Professional Women's League. Organizer and promoter was Alice Luebig, a telephone company supervisor who served as "club mother" throughout her lifetime.

When the national federation came into being at St. Louis in 1919 the Miami women changed their club's name and joined the new federation. Club history has been woven into that of the community ever since.

There were problems. During the early years of World War I there was no suitable place for the women to meet or eat.

Friends and ingenuity helped on the club decision to go into its own cafeteria. A tiny cottage was rented where lunches could be prepared, cooked, and served. With a later move into larger quarters the cafeteria facilities were opened to the public.

From the sale of that cafeteria ($700) plus $300 more from the club treasury, the Young Women's Christian Association received $1,000 for its building fund. It helped pay for the former Fort Dallas Hotel which became the YWCA home at 108 SE. Second Avenue in 1920.

The hurricane of 1926 brought property and job losses. Many BPW members left the city; membership dropped from an all-time high of 225 to a new low. Then the Oakland, Calif., BPW Club sent a check for $100 to the Miami club, for assistance to members.

"It was a gift that will not be forgotten by early-day members who learned just how big a $100 check could look," says a club historian.

When Mary V. Morris (retired) was president (1925–27) the Hialeah Business and Professional Women's Clubs (now Hialeah-Miami Springs) was organized by the Miami Club shortly after the hurricane. Clarissa Greene (also retired), a reporter for the Miami Daily News & Metropolis had signed up prospective members discovered during her posthurricane coverage for her paper.

Miami BPW Club became interested in scholarships by 1928 when Catherine Shelley Walsh, owner-operator of the Walsh School of Business Science, established one in the name of the club and maintained it for several years.

Then the club's scholarship loan fund was formed. During Miss Walsh's term as president (1933–35) the problems of Miami unemployed women were taken to emergency relief officials and the problems of juveniles were studied by active participation in the juvenile court council.

Among other needs, cleaner picture shows were sought, laws affecting women were studied and a registry maintained of unemployed club members.

One of the club's most important galas was a reception in honor of club member Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde prior to her departure for Europe as Minister to Denmark (1933–36).

Credit goes again to Miss Greene, and to Mrs. Faye Sherman (president, 1937–38), for establishment of a Red Cross highway emergency first aid station 40 miles west of Miami on the Tamiami Trail. During the first year 38 accident victims were treated there.

During the World War II years members served in every type of duty; bond and Red Cross drives. The Miami BPW Club decorated, equipped, and managed one of the largest USO services in the area in the old City Club. Many members served from the opening to the closing of the censorship office.

During Mrs. Van Acker's first term dues went up to $10, $3 into the Miami BPW building fund, for a long dreamed-of clubhouse not yet realized. In 1965 the club incorporated in order to be able to buy and maintain a clubhouse—at some future date.

Throughout the years the club has maintained a membership in the Dade County Crime Commission, begun during the term of the late Louise Simmons. Twenty-seven club members were charter signers of the

Women's Division, Miami Chamber of Commerce.

The club sponsored a 13-week traffic safety program on Channel 2 in 1958 and Edna Van Acker that year became Southeastern Regional Chairman of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

She previously had headed district 10 and the Florida Federation, which she also had served as scholarship chairman and membership chairman. In her latter role she assisted in organizing 25 clubs in Florida, with a membership of more than 1,000 women.

A BIRTHDAY HONOR: THE LEADING WOMEN OF MIAMI BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB

Business and professional women's club leaders have been heralded throughout the last half century in this community ever since the Miami BPW Club was organized February 2, 1916.

Miami Club will honor several of theirs at its 50th birthday party Saturday at Everglades Hotel including their first president, Marjory Stoneman Douglas, who has written many books that have brought her fame since that day when she took office.

Mrs. Douglas, a former newspaperwoman, is author of "The Everglades, River of Grass," "Road to the Sun," "Freedom River" and "Hurricane" as well as many magazine stories.

When the club's current leader, Florence McMahon (Mrs. Richard T.) Yoder left Detroit for Miami in 1956 she went back to college. Two years later she graduated with honors from the University of Miami, a bachelor of business administration.

Mrs. Yoder began her business career running a sewer cleaning business. Today she is external auditor for the Dade County Port Authority at Miami International Airport, employed by Morgan Altemus & Barrs, CPA firm.

She is a member of Alpha Lambda Delta, Beta Sigma Phi, and Phi Kappa Phi. Upon graduation from the university she received an award from the Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants. In September 1965 "Mac" married Richard Yoder of the Finance Office, Urban Renewal Project in Dade County.

One of the Miami club's past presidents, Mrs. Clara Caspar, will come all the way from Junction City, Kans., to attend the 50th birthday candlelight dinner. She served her club in 1941–42 and was the first of its World War II leaders. She saw her membership making quick response to wartime volunteer service.

With other past presidents Mrs. Caspar will be introduced during Saturday's celebration by another past president, Lila Mae (Mrs. Samuel L.) Durgan.

Lila Mae rose to be president of the Florida Federation of BPW Clubs in 1958. She was first State governor of Florida Opti-Mrs. Clubs; was chairman of the Poinciana Festival in the city of Miami in 1961. In 1962 she served as president of the United Church Women of Greater Miami.

It was during her administration of Miami BPW that she inaugurated the Club Chatter, a bulletin.

Traffic safety has long been a must in the lives of the Miami BPW Club members. Among past presidents who backed it with fervor is Irene Redstone, attorney, who served as prexy in 1946–47.

She inaugurated a traffic sticker program that employed the slogan "Safety Through Courtesy."

Miss Redstone is assistant staff counsel for the Florida Bar Association in charge of its grievance committee office. She specializes in child custody matters.

Her membership in Miami BPW was interrupted during World War II by 3 years in the Navy as Yeoman 1st Class. It was after the war that she studied law at the University of Miami and earned her degree.

She serves the American Bar Association's Council on the section of family law.

When Miamian Valley K. Bennett's husband Robert, died in Tifton, Ga., in 1917, she became president of Bennett's Hardware, Inc., dealers in hardware, paints, varnishes, and farm implements.

Mrs. Bennett learned "Ignorance is bliss. It stood me in good hand during many an incidental need for knowledge."

She started learning the business including how to assemble plows, mowing machines, milk separators, cultivators, much to the amazement of my customers.

In Tifton in 1918 she helped organize and became president of the Tifton Business and Professional Women's Club. Then came an exodus of many Georgians to Florida, among them Mrs. Bennett.

Through the first vice president of the First National Bank of Miami, Mildred Romfh, Mrs. Bennett became manager of the savings department of the bank. Miss Romfh was a past president of the Miami BPW Club, which Mrs. Bennett had joined. Valley herself became president in 1933.

Before her retirement in 1953 Mrs. Bennett had been an accountant for a factory representative of food products and allied lines. During World War II she was chairman of the business and professional women's division of the Dade County War Finance Committee for the U.S. Treasury.

She also is an active member of the Miami Soroptimist Club and the Miami Bookfellows.

While Judge Mattie Belle Davis was president of the Miami BPW Club (1952–54) Dade County women became incensed by the lack of enforcement of the 1951 meat inspection law in Florida.

Her Miami club joined other clubs in showing their disapproval. The result was favorable action by the State Livestock Board.

Judge Davis is the first Floridian to serve as president of the National Association of Women Lawyers and the only woman to sit on the bench of the Dade County Metropolitan Court.

She began her legal career as a secretary in the office of the late Troy Davis, whom she later married. With him she practiced law after passing her bar examinations in 1936.

Georgia-born Judge Davis was appointed as judge of the Metropolitan Court of Dade County by the board of commissioners in 1959 and reappointed in July 1964. She was a member of the American Bar Association's associate and advisory committee to the standing committee on the traffic court program.

She is active in Zonta Club of Greater Miami and is on the international safety committee of Zonta International. For 2 years she was president of the Haven School for Mentally Retarded Children; then its secretary. For 2 years she headed the Dade TB Association. She has served 8 years as legislation chairmen for the Dade County Federation of Women's Clubs.

NBC Honors Chicago's Len O'Connor on His 25th Year of Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last night the National Broadcasting Co. honored one of Chicago's most highly respected journalists, Len O'Connor, who is observing his 25th year of reporting.

Len O'Connor is one of Chicago's most popular television journalists and commentators. NBC is to be congratulated for honoring him on his 25th anniversary.

He is frequently called the "Guardian of Chicago's Conscience." Because of his thorough understanding of the problems of a large city like Chicago; his deep insight into problems of America and his thorough knowledge of international affairs, he today has several million people in the Midwest following his daily commentary both on radio and television.

Len O'Connor is a newspaperman's journalist. He is penetrating, perceptive, understanding and often pungent, but never unfair. He has earned the respect not only of those he reports about, but also those he reports for.

Mr. Speaker it was a privilege to be invited yesterday to see the top management people from the National Broadcasting Co.'s Midwest facilities present Len O'Connor with a wrist watch in grateful recognition of his 25 years of outstanding journalism.

May time be kind to him so he can observe his golden jubilee of enterprising and dedicated contributions to the highest standards of American journalism.

Hope and Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, America is at its greatest when it accents the positive, and this we are able to do when we fight "wars" on poverty and disease and thus lift up the spirits of mankind.

This is the step we are taking now in Vietnam—a positive step, reflected by the fact that the President took the Secretaries of Welfare and Agriculture to the Honolulu meeting.

The New-York Herald-Tribune said:

> It is in their fields that the United States can well take the offensive, against disease and poverty, and thus strengthen the defense of South Vietnam at vital points. For this is the positive side of the ugly war, the hope and the promise.
>
> And it is this that gives a particular moral content to the whole united effort to bring peace to a free South Vietnam.

I found the editorial to be most enlightening, and I therefore recommend that it be printed in the RECORD, where others also may read it.

COUNCIL IN THE PACIFIC

It is reasonable to suppose that the primary intent of President Johnson's journey to Hawaii to meet with the Americans and South Vietnamese concerned with the struggle in Vietnam is to discuss the prosecution of the war. Meanwhile, in the wake of the Security Council's decision to take up the Vietnam question, U.N. members have been stepping up activities intended to end the war. Yet the two efforts are not contradictory.

American aims in Vietnam are essentially defensive. They are to prevent the forcible absorption of South Vietnam by the north. Diplomatic efforts to end the war must take into account the stark fact that the goal of the North Vietnam Government and the Vietcong is to swallow up the south; neither has ever deviated in public statements from that goal. Naturally, the Communists would prefer to accomplish this without further fighting; naturally, they would accept surrender by the south. But since this is completely at odds with the American commitment, the diplomatic purpose must be to demonstrate that conquest is impossible. And unless this is credible, from events in the field, diplomacy will fail—again.

Whether Mr. Johnson's Pacific conference portends dramatic new developments, or merely the intensification of present military efforts, remains to be seen. But one interesting feature of the conference will be the presence—emphasized by President Johnson—of the Secretaries of Welfare and Agriculture. It is in their fields that the United States can well take the offensive, against disease and poverty, and thus strengthen the defense of South Vietnam at vital points. For this is the positive side of the ugly war, the hope and the promise. And it is this that gives a particular moral content to the whole united effort to bring peace to a free South Vietnam.

Failure To Remove Snow at District of Columbia Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I commented on the failure of the District of Columbia to deal effectively with the snow situation which paralyzed the city. Since then I have had many reports and examples of dangerous situations which were permitted to exist. For instance, I am told that a week after the snow fell, along the school grounds at 13th Street NW., at Military Road, little tots still had to choose whether to defy the deady rush-hour traffic on 13th Street or brave the chin-deep snow, still untrampled on the school walk.

In front of Wilson High School on Nebraska Avenue, the snow, higher than a tall man stands, remained untouched for days after the children returned to school. The report which came to me indicated that similar conditions were found at most other District of Columbia schools. It seems that the only thing brought to bear on the snow surrounding our public schools here were the cold, damp feet of courageous children beating a path to classes that were declared reopened, with a dare to get there if you can.

In times of such emergency, why cannot we recruit from among the ranks of those men who are drawing upon the various Federal sustaining programs, at least to perform the public service of clearing a path to our school buildings—before we order the children to return? Perhaps the Job Corps could help in such instances—or those who, under better weather circumstances, would be working on the beautification program.

Wheelchair Folk Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert two colums by one of Cleveland's most talented and interesting columnists, Winsor French, in the Cleveland Press. He points out from firsthand knowledge a situation confronting handicapped persons which certainly deserves the attention of the Congress in respect to Federal buildings.

WHEELCHAIR FOLK IGNORED

Every now and again I hear from a reader who, as I, must rely on a wheelchair and wants to know if I can tell her how one manages to get into certain buildings, if, indeed, it is possible at all. The last time I heard from her, her interest was in Public Hall where she had hoped to see the trailer show. This she was unable to do, persevere though she did.

Well, the auditorium, as so many of our public buildings, is the product of inept architecture. Even getting into the new multimillion-dollar wing is an impossibility for the chairborne.

The hall does have ramps but how to find them is a Chinese puzzle and no one is very cooperative.

In fact, after several futile attempts, and it was a snowy, blustery, bitter night, my friend was asked by a guard why she had even bothered to make the effort. In other words, if you are handicapped and present a problem, then stay home. Anyway, that did it. The disappointed lady and her quite rightly outraged husband drove away.

I suggested the next time she contemplated such an adventure that she call Paul Hurd, who manages the building, and leave it up to him. He must at least know where the ramps are.

But Public Hall is not the only offender. It would be easier to climb the pyramids than make it into the Federal Building on Public Square.

In fact, anyone in a chair must arrange to have the freight elevator brought up through the sidewalk, which is precisely what I did when I had to get a new passport not too long ago. Actually, I rather enjoyed it, but it was summer and the weather was fine.

The public library? I gave that up long ago. I went to the practically brand new art institute last week, however, eager to see the faculty show.

Well, it is a splendid exhibition, small and beautifully hung but the effort spent getting inside the building was exhausting and I will think twice before attempting it again.

It seems simply incredible that our great public buildings and museums shouldn't at least provide the people with narrow wooden ramps flanking the stairs. They would be very inexpensive to install and make life much easier for the multitudes of the handicapped. And even getting into the Press Building is no cinch unless you know the ropes.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been bringing to the attention of my colleagues a series of articles written from Vietnam for the New York Post by Correspondent Pete Hamill. I include at this point the third article in the series:

VIETNAM: THE ENDLESS WAR—ARTICLE III: OUR ALLIES

(By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—The one thing everyone was agreed upon when Nguyen Cao Ky took over as Premier of South Vietnam last year was that he had color. There was no question about it: At 34, he was young, handsome and dashing, with all the swaggering style of the Japanese movie star Toshiro Mifune.

As head of the country's air force, he led his squadron into battle in a tailormade black silk flying suit and lavender scarf, with a chrome-plated, pearl-handled revolver slung low on his hip. To celebrate his divorce from his wife—a Frenchwoman who bore him five children—and his remarriage to a pretty Air Vietnam stewardess, he led his squadron of 20 Skyraiders on a low sweep over Saigon to a bombing run on an empty clump of jungle not far from the capital. Embarrassed Vietnamese military spokesmen later said the area was a Vietcong stronghold, and the air strike had been a success. Ky's flying buddies toasted him that night with champagne, then moved to the backyard to empty their revolvers at tin cans. There were no casualties.

Away from the hazards of war, Ky acquired a garish reputation as a Tu Do Street hipster. He and his flyboy buddies would spend the evenings in restaurants like Brodard's, nursing brandy and coffee, listening to the melancholy songs of Edith Piaf on the jukebox, discussing endlessly the merits of their women. At parties, he would compose love poems on the spot, and recite them to the loveliest woman in the room, his voice choked, his eyes brimming with tears. When such pursuits wearied him, he turned for solace to his gamecocks, which he raised on the side.

Today, his intimates say, Ky is a changed man. The burdens of office lie heavily upon him. The girls don't see him around Brodard's any more, his literary talent is exercised on official documents and speeches, and even when he visits a battleground he brings his wife along. He hasn't done anything swashbuckling in months. Except, perhaps, to survive.

In the can of worms which is Saigon politics, to survive as long as Ky has is a very real accomplishment. When he took the job last June, as the front man for a 10-man military junta, he became the head of the ninth government in South Vietnam since the murder of Ngo Dinh Diem in November 1963.

One of the major reasons for Ky's survival is his realistic attitude toward the job. "The generals have picked me more to risk my life than as an honor," he said when he took the post last June. "I have told my wife to buy me a coffin."

One cannot blame him, Saigon today is a sinkhole of corruption, indifference, and greed. As the American millions are poured in, the number of hands reaching eagerly into the till are proliferating. On the Saigon waterfront, a shipping owner can get his ship unloaded out of turn by paying $500. At police checkpoints, Communist agents carrying contraband medical equipment into the countryside get by with a small bribe. The stalls in the black market are choked with American soaps, hair sprays, cigarettes, candy, shoe polish and even C-rations, most of it booty from pilfered PX deliveries.

The wives of prominent Chinese merchants smuggle diamonds out of the country every week, because gold is too bulky, and the paper currency is about as stable as the government which prints it. In the Indian bookshops on Tu Do Street, where you can still pick up dusty copies of such classics as "Dave Dawson in Libya," the rate is now up to 170 piasters to the dollar; the official rate is 73 to the dollar.

The rice merchants plead that the Vietcong have cut off their deliveries, and then, when the price has been sufficiently jacked up, they produce large quantities of it. The wife of at least one Vietnamese general, according to reliable sources, takes a monthly cut from a string of brothels. And the liveliest arguments among the members of the junta are not over methods of beating the Vietcong, but over who will control the customs, the port of Saigon and the communications systems.

When Ky first took office, he announced with loud fanfare that his major task would be the elimination of graft and black marketeering. (Has any military junta in history promised anything different?) He summoned the top 28 rice merchants in Saigon and told them that if prices were not lowered, one of them would be selected by lot and shot. The prices went down, at least for a while.

Ky also promised to reform the draft system. And it is true that in Saigon you can watch the police round up young men coming out of movie theaters every afternoon. But it is still possible to pick up a forged draft card for about $10, and for $250 a young man can obtain an exit visa and study medieval scholasticism at the Sorbonne in Paris for the duration. Meanwhile, in rural areas, the army—like the Vietcong—employs a system which differs from kidnaping only to the extent that no ransom is asked.

Aside from the usual tributes to freedom and a kind of glib anticommunism, no one really knows where Ky and the junta stand politically. Last month, in a Vietnamese equivalent of a state of the union message, Ky promised a new constitution for the country by October, and free elections to be held next year. Most old Saigon hands doubted that he would be around to vote in them.

Many officials in the American mission, here—civilian and military—shudder at the prospect of Ky's having a free hand. They realize that this war is as much a political problem as a military one, and that the political solutions will take years of hard, frustrating, grueling work.

The Vietnamese have also become quite touchy about what they feel is a growing American takeover of the war. Ky has made some statements asserting his independence, viewing that the war would never be solved without the consent of the Saigon government. But the hard fact is that we have committed billions of dollars to the war, and more than 200,000 troops, and we should have a major say in the solution.

"The Vietnamese want it both ways," one American political officer in Saigon told me. "They want our money, our guns and our men to die for them. But they don't want us to negotiate a settlement. Goddammit, the hard truth is that this has become our war and we should settle it our way without worrying about wounded feelings."

The man with the responsibility of maintaining some equilibrium between the American leaders and the Vietnamese is Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. Somewhere there must be a man with the adrenalin, ideas and style to handle this delicate, taxing job. Many here feel that Henry Cabot Lodge is not that man.

For practical political purposes Lodge could just as well be serving as the Ambassador to Patagonia. He was here as Ambassador once before, for seven months beginning in June of 1963, and performed creditably at that time. Arriving during the Buddhist crisis which eventually toppled the Diem regime, he had nowhere to move but up—everything having gone wrong under the tenure of the previous Ambassador, Frederick Nolting. Lodge worked relatively hard, and used his past experience as a professional politician to some advantage in defusing the anti-American sentiment caused by the Buddhist-Catholic argument.

Since replacing the icy Maxwell Taylor, however, it has become more and more evident that Lodge's prime qualification is that he is a Republican, and that he photographs well. The men who work under him say that he just does not seem interested in the job any more. They say he prefers swimming at the Cercle Sportif to the back-breaking homework that such a job requires.

"Cabot Lodge always had a lazy mind," one member of the American civilian establishment told me. "But there were times when he could rise to an occasion, as he did against the Russians in the U.N., as he did during his first tour here. But he doesn't care any more and I think I know why. He has stopped running for office."

Some observers say that the main problem with Lodge is his image; in a revolutionary situation the most important American in the country should not look like a representative of the landed gentry. "Hell, we'd be better off with some tough old roll-up-the-sleeve radical like Saul Alinsky," an officer in the AID program said. "That kind of guy would go out and pull rice with the peasants, drive bulldozers in the country, look like he understood what the roots of the war are all about."

Such criticism is harsh and, in some ways, unfair. Lodge gets along well with Ky, and is an improvement over Taylor in matters of tact. Many of the Vietnamese generals could not forgive Taylor for what they thought was his haughty, disdainful manner. The story is told that after one of the coups that plagued his year as Ambassador, Taylor summoned the generals to dinner at a restaurant, asked them if they understood English, dressed them down for pulling the coup, then told them he had wasted his money even buying them dinner. Lodge would never consider doing such a thing.

Meanwhile, Ky continues to walk the tightrope. His meeting in Honolulu should shore up his prestige and perhaps he can continue as Premier for a few more years. He has already lasted longer than anyone expected.

But if he survives, Ky will have to do more for his country than ask for more bombing, more American troops and more money. He has to become a leader of his people. And he will never do that sitting in an office in Saigon.

The Elkhart, Ind., Truth Endorses 4-Year Term for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the text of an editorial published on January 27, 1966, by the Elkhart, Ind., Truth endorsing a constitutional amendment providing 4-year terms for Members of Congress and expressing support as well for staggering the terms.

The editorial follows:

FOUR-YEAR TERMS, BUT WITH PROVISO

While we favor extending the terms of U.S. Representatives from 2 to 4 years, as proposed by President Johnson, we don't believe they should all be elected in the presidential election years.

To do that would greatly increase the power of the presidency, and thereby upset checks and balances as between the branches of the Government.

This would encourage the candidacy of "coattail riders," seeking to reach legislative office through the casting of straight tickets for a personally popular President or other presidential candidate.

Besides, it is important that people have recourse during an "off-year" election to the choice of some new Representatives in case they don't like what has happened in the 2 years past.

This could be taken care of easily by "staggering" the terms, for example by electing half of the House of Representatives in the presidential year and half in the off-year.

Yes, the 4-year term for House Members would be good. It would allow new Members more time to learn the ropes; it would require current Members to spend less time on campaigning for reelection, thus they could devote more time to the people's business.

But in drawing up the proposed constitutional amendment to accomplish this, let's apply the modification as to method of election we have indicated.

Tribute to William C. Burnham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper in my congressional district, namely, the Neighborhood Journal of Oakland, Calif., has a correspondent, Mrs. Elena Moneak Snite, who runs a continuous column entitled "Personality Profiles."

Mrs. Snite is a lady of great perspicacity who tends to focus on individuals whose daily endeavors contribute so much to our everyday life but who largely remain anonymous.

On January 26 her column was devoted to highlighting the work of Mr. William C. Burnham, who is superintendent of the Dimond branch of the U.S. Post Office in Oakland, Calif. I think that Mrs. Snite's column is a fitting tribute to Mr. Burnham and the hundreds of other loyal post office employees who do so much each day for those of us who depend on this important line of communication.

I am pleased to insert Mrs. Snite's column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PERSONALITY PROFILES

(By Elena Moneak Snite)

In approaching my personality profile for this week, Mr. Wm. C. Burnham, who is the very capable and alert superintendent of the Dimond branch of our Government Post Office, I immediately had the impression that here was a gentleman that demonstrated the fact that no man can prosper until he applies as much dignity to any labor he may perform as he would if he were writing a poem.

"Mrs. Snite, I feel blessed that I have found the work that I love to do."

"I was born in Connecticut and graduated from the high school there in the midst of the depression. My family at that time decided to come to California and after trying several jobs in California I knew that I wished to work for our Government. I then took and passed the required Civil Service examination which fortified me with the general knowledge pertaining to postal work and I have been in postal service since 1941. I was transferred from the main post office in Oakland to the Dimond branch where I have been since 1954. At this branch we handle about 10,000 pieces of mail a day—we have 26 carriers—4 clerks—and an assistant superintendent.

"I have learned that men seldom die of hard work and that activity is God's medicine. The greatest source of fulfillment is willingness and ability to do hard work. It's interesting work that rids us of three great evils; irksomeness—vice—and poverty. I know of no secret of success but hard work."

"Each day I am grateful for my many blessings. I have a good wife which we all know is heaven's best gift to man. We are so proud of our daughter Linda and her husband Jim and of course little Kandy Ann who is 3 years old and Patricia Marie just 4 months old. Our son William Gary is already busy chiseling his own niche in life and is at present employed with Todd Ship Building in Alameda."

"No man properly occupied is ever miserable. My wife is kept busy taking care of our home, our beautiful garden and many other services that demand all of her time. And I spend whatever extra time I have in the activities of the National Association of Postal Supervisors and the Independent Rifles Club of San Francisco."

Thank you Mr. Burnham for your time and the oppotrunity for your Dimond Clients to become better acquainted with you. You have proven the axiom that they that govern most make the least noise. In rowing a barge they that do drudgery work slash, puff and sweat: but he that governs, sits quietly at the stern and scarcely is seen to stir.

Mr. Michael Monroney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to join the Postmaster General, Lawrence O'Brien, in expressing my deep regret over the resignation of his Executive Assistant, Mr. Michael Monroney.

I am sure that I speak for my colleagues in saying that Mike Monroney's vast experience in Government affairs will be missed. He has made great contributions to the Post Office Department which will long be remembered by the citizens of the Nation.

Mike has served his country well under President Kennedy and President Johnson. Mike Monroney began his present assignment in early 1961 under former Postmaster General J. Edward Day, assisting him during the transition of the Post Office Department to the Kennedy administration.

Monroney brought to his postal job considerable and varied experience in journalism and in local and Federal Government affairs.

Moving into nearby Silver Spring, Md., following his graduation from Dartmouth College in 1951, he covered suburban affairs as a staff reporter for the Washington, D.C., Post and Times-Herald during most of his 5 years with the newspaper.

In 1957 and 1958, he served as a top aide to the county manager of Montgomery County, Md., adjacent to the District of Columbia. In 1956 he served on the presidential campaign staff of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson.

The 38-year-old Monroney served for 2 years as administrative assistant to Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, during which he worked on a variety of legislative problems, including aid to distressed areas, Federal aid to education, the Federal airport construction program and labor-management reform legislation.

He left Congressman BRADEMAS' staff in January of 1961 to assume his present position. As executive assistant to the Postmaster General, Monroney is in charge of congressional liaison for the Post Office Deparment in addition to other assignments at the direction of the Postmaster General.

Named Maryland Young Democrat of the Year in 1961, Monroney was also nominated that same year for one of the 10 outstanding young men of the year awards sponsored annually by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce.

A Navy veteran, he is the son of U.S. Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma.

I would like to wish him the best of success in whatever field of endeavor he chooses to enter. Past experience shows that Mike is a man who has a deep understanding and sympathy for his fellowman and is dedicated to serving his country.

Space Experts Must Soon Decide Question: Where After the Moon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Karl Abraham in his article in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of January 17 discusses the question of what programs NASA will undertake after the lunar landing. In his article Mr. Abraham points out that the Saturn V launch vehicle will soon be available with its tremendous payload capability and discusses manned as well as unmanned use of this large vehicle. He also clearly points out the need to reach an early decision so that our current space program will have sufficient time to allow for gradual changeover of the current work underway to the newer objectives that will follow our initial lunar landing.

The article follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Jan. 17, 1966]

SPACE EXPERTS MUST SOON DECIDE QUESTION: WHERE AFTER THE MOON?

(By Karl Abraham)

The men who run the Nation's space program, although they are not yet sure of successfully landing men on the moon, must decide soon what to do after the first lunar landings are made.

The alternatives are extensive explorations of the moon for a decade or a shift of emphasis toward planetary missions. Both are to be reckoned in the tens of billions of dollars.

For President Johnson, who omitted mention of the space program's future from his state of the Union message last week, it is largely a financial question to be weighed against his hopes for the Great Society and conclusion of the Vietnam war.

CRITICAL DECISION

But the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, its space centers, the industries, universities, and the Nation's scientific and engineering communities face a related critical decision within the space program itself.

The decision confronts them now—possibly somewhat earlier in the drive toward the moon than many had anticipated—largely because of a single technological development: the impending arrival, finally, of big, powerful rockets.

The moon rocket, the advanced Saturn, sometimes called the Saturn 5, with its 7.5-million-pound thrust booster and two upper stages, giving it a total power of 8.7 million pounds thrust, will be a mighty workhorse.

NEW POSSIBILITIES OPEN

With other upper stages, such as the new hydrogen-fueled Centaur, all kinds of new possibilities open up in space exploration.

The Saturn 5's primary mission is to send a 95,000-pound Apollo three-man moonship to the moon, including the lunar landing craft and enough rocket power for the trip back from the moon.

But it is capable of other missions also.

It can lift 250,000 pounds—125 tons—into a 500-mile-high earth orbit; carry 50 tons away from earth; 45 tons toward Mars or Venus; 20 tons to the giant planet Jupiter; and with a Centaur upper stage, it could even carry a probe weighing 7.5 tons clear out of the solar system.

WHERE NEXT

Saturn 5 will make possible the assembly, in Earth orbit, or other larger rockets—sent up a stage at a time, the fuel separately. A complete Saturn 5 could be assembled in space for all kinds of missions.

It is this impending prospect and the knowledge that many years of engineering and design of payloads will be needed to take advantage of Saturn 5 for these advanced missions that makes a decision on "where after the Moon?" such an urgent one.

The decision is by no means only a scientific or technical one.

The attitude of James E. Webb, NASA's Administrator—very much reflecting President Johnson's also—is tied up in a question he has posed to many of his workers and consultants.

BENEFITS QUESTIONED

"How can the space program most substantially benefit the American people? How can space exploration and what we learn from it help us on Earth," he asks over and over.

One segment of the Nation's scientific community, while mindful of these considerations, poses the question of the future in different terms.

Saturday's report by a space science board panel, which urged higher priorities for exploring the planets, put it this way:

"The exploration of the solar system bears on three central scientific problems of our time: the origin and evolution of the Earth, Sun, and planets; the origin and evolution of life; and the dynamic processes that shape man's terrestrial environment."

For many biologists, the search for forms of life elsewhere in the universe, beginning with Mars and possibly Venus, is the paramount challenge.

COMPARISON SOUGHT

Earth scientists look hungrily at the prospect of comparing one planetary body they have studied for centuries—the Earth—with others, hoping to learn from the historical and evolutionary comparisons.

Some geologists feel extensive studies of the Moon may open a door to early Earth history, while others see that doorway on Mars.

Astronomers, geophysicists, and others look upon space as a new, vast laboratory, where the workbench is as long as interplanetary distances, and the objects of experimentation are not tabletop-sized but whole planets.

Some of these scientists envision massive scientific laboratories in orbit around the Earth, the Moon, possibly Mars, in the distant future, inculding telescopes twice the size of the Earth's biggest, and opportunities to set out on the Moon and planets more sensitive or larger scale instruments than are feasible on Earth because of the restricting cover of atmosphere.

MONEY A FACTOR

They feel that technological progress is bound to put these opportunities within their reach in just a few years, if only the money for these projects can be obtained.

Many of these scientists feel that extensive exploration of the Moon—more precisely, a commitment to it before the first landing is even made—may take the space program in a direction that it would be very costly to retreat from should the Moon prove of less scientific interest than some predict.

In looking at new directions, the space agency itself must consider how particular programs will affect its farflung field centers and their specialized work in rockets, spacecraft, communications, electronics, and all the supporting research and engineering they require.

It has taken a long time, at enormous expense, to assemble the NASA field center teams and their installations, many of which would be entirely useless in any endeavor other than space exploration.

Indeed, some are so highly specialized that a sharp change of direction in rocketry or spacecraft and satellite objectives would tear them apart unless sufficient advance time were allowed for gradual changeovers to the new missions.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate again rejected motion to close debate on motion to take up right-to-work repeal and took up military procurement authorization bill.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Procedings, *pages 2792–2863*

Bills Introduced: 13 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2912–2924; and S. Res. 220. **Page 2793**

Bill Reported: Report was made as follows:

S. 2791, fiscal 1966 supplemental authorizations for military procurement, with amendments (S. Rept. 992). **Page 2793**

Bills Referred: Two House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. **Page 2800**

President's Message—Food: Message was received from President transmitting his legislative recommendations for a worldwide war on hunger—referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. **Pages 2729–2731**

President's Message—Reorganization Plan No. 1: President transmitted his Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, proposing transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice—referred to Committee on Government Operations. **Pages 2728–2729**

Sundry Measures Passed: Senate took up by unanimous consent and passed the following three bills and adopted the following resolution:

Without amendment and cleared for President:

World health: H.J. Res. 403, authorizing funds to enable the U.S. to extend invitation to the World Health Organization to hold its 22d assembly in Boston in 1969.

With amendment, to be sent back to House:

Overseas teaching: H.R. 6845, to adjust compensation for teachers in overseas schools operated by the Department of Defense.

Without amendment and cleared for House:

Petroleum: S.J. Res. 63, authorizing President to invite the States and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, May 12–21, 1966; and

Boy Scouts: S. Con. Res. 68, recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering of the Boy Scouts of America. **Pages 2731–2732**

Mexican Parliamentarians: Members of the Mexican delegation to the U.S.-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference visited and were introduced to the Senate. **Pages 2740–2743**

Right To Work: By 50 yeas to 49 nays, Senate rejected Mansfield motion to close debate on his motion to take up H.R. 77, repealing the right-to-work provisions (sec. 14(b)) of the National Labor Relations Act, and proposed amendments thereto. An affirmative two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting would have been necessary to adopt this motion. **Pages 2733–2740, 2743–2744**

Veterans: By unanimous vote of 99 yeas (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate concurred, with amendments, in House amendment to S. 9, to give "cold war" veterans educational and home loan benefits similar to those afforded veterans of World War II. **Pages 2745–2756**

Monday Session: By unanimous consent, it was ordered that when Senate completes its business today it adjourn until 10 a.m. Monday, February 14, when it will immediately adjourn without transaction of any business, until noon Wednesday, February 16. **Page 2756**

Authority To Report: Committee on Finance was granted extension of time until midnight February 16 to file reports on H.R. 136 and 3438, bills having to do with bankruptcy. **Pages 2765–2766**

Military Procurement: Senate made its unfinished business S. 2791, fiscal 1966 supplemental authorizations for military procurement. **Pages 2756, 2863–2864**

Private Bill: S. 1407, a private bill, was cleared for President when Senate concurred in House amendments thereto. **Page 2863**

Confirmations: Senate confirmed the following nominations: Lisle C. Carter, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and numerous nominations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. **Pages 2866–2869**

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 12784. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12785. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 12786. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12787. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12788. A bill to extend the period within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 12789. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 12790. A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 12791. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend to September 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 12792. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant fellowships for graduate study in highway transportation engineering; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12793. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from income pension and annuity payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's pension under chapter 15 of that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12794. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 12795. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 12796. A bill to authorize a separate sleeve insignia for Merrill's Marauders, a volunteer unit of the U.S. Army that served in the China-Burma-India theater of operations during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 12797. A bill to reserve certain public lands for a national wild rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 12798. A bill to protect domestic consumers against an inadequate supply of soybeans and soybean products, to maintain and promote foreign trade, to protect producers of soybeans against an unfair loss of income resulting from the establishment of a reserve supply, to assist in marketing soybeans for domestic consumption and exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 12799. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 12800. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from authorizing the development or removal of certain oil or gas deposits underlying the Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12801. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 12802. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 12803. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12804. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 12805. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 12806. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 12807. A bill providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. Con. Res. 588. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. Con. Res. 589. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H. Con. Res. 590. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Con. Res. 591. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Curency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 592. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Con. Res. 593. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials weer presented and referred as follows:

396. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to support of the U.S. policy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

397. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 12808. A bill for the relief of Sergio Samano Roche and Luz Maria Samano Roche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12809. A bill for the relief of Barbara Zakrzewska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12810. A bill for the relief of Maydis Esmada King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 12811. A bill for the relief of Cavit Alidede; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

325. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Pioneer Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., Piqua, Ohio, relative to loans to rural electric cooperatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

326. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to trading with the enemy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Appendix

Los Angeles at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. REES
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in early California, in the days of the dons and the ranchos, the visitor to a home was met with the traditional Spanish greeting of "Mi casa es su casa."—"My house is your house." This greeting has become the motto of a new civic organization, formed 4 years ago and known as "Los Angeles at Home." The warm hospitality implied in this salutation is being revived, and its recipient is the international tourist visiting in the Greater Los Angeles area.

The purpose of "Los Angeles at Home" is, of course, to enable the tourist to meet with to learn something of the American way of life, and for the host family, in turn, to learn about their guest's way of life. It makes possible an exchange of information concerning the differences and similarities in our peoples, our customs, and our nations, and thus strengthens friendship and understanding among the individuals and nations of the world.

Important, too, is the opportunity for the international tourist to spend a warm and delightful afternoon or evening in the home of a host family whose interests, hobbies, family, or business backgrounds are similar to their own. And over dinner or refreshments, around the fireplace, the pool, or in the patio they are able to discuss their mutual interests.

At the moment, "Los Angeles at Home" has over 700 host families on file covering a wide range of business, family backgrounds, and interests. These host families are drawn not only from the city and county of Los Angeles, but from the cities and towns in Orange, San Bernardino, Ventura, and Riverside counties—in short, from all of the Greater Los Angeles area.

In addition to these individual families, "Los Angeles at Home" has, too, the interest and support of many other civic organizations and clubs, as well as that of the newspapers, radio and television, governmental offices, the travel industry, and so forth.

In order to match up the tourist with a host family of similar interests, "Los Angeles at Home" asks the tourist to fill out certain forms which are then checked against the host family forms already on file. The length of the visit—it may be for the afternoon, for dinner and the evening, or for a few hours after dinner—is arranged to the mutual satisfaction of both the visitor and the host family. The type of entertainment is left entirely to the discretion of the host family. "Los Angeles at Home" can give its host families at least 24 hours notice so that they can make the necessary arrangements about picking up their guests at their hotel, and so forth.

There is no charge to the tourist for this service, nor does the host family receive any remuneration. The host families act solely out of a desire and interest to make the tourist feel welcome to the United States and to the Greater Los Angeles area. The organization is incorporated under the laws of the State of California as a nonprofit corporation and as such is supported financially by various civic-minded individuals, corporations, and foundations throughout the metropolitan area.

The guiding light of "Los Angeles at Home" is Mr. Donn Gift. It is through his untiring efforts that this program continues to flourish. Mr. Gift and all those who participate in the program deserve the thanks and admiration of all of us.

Rehabilitation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems facing urban Members is the deterioration of once sound neighborhoods within their districts. I think those of us who have this problem have a responsibility to bring Government agencies into the area to reverse the trend. I have been working very hard on such a project in the Highbridge neighborhood of my district.

I have prepared a newsletter to be sent to the residents of the area explaining what I am doing and enlisting their cooperation. I include the text of the newsletter for the benefit of those of my colleagues who may be considering similar projects.

DEAR HIGHBRIDGE RESIDENT: I am delighted to greet you and to wish you and your family the best of health and good fortune for 1966.

This year has begun in a truly auspicious way for Highbridge. The city of New York and the Federal Government has officially committed themselves to arresting the deterioration of the neighborhood. A massive aid program, which will include $1,600,000 for enforcement of building, sanitation, and electrical codes, street improvement work, streetlighting, street signs, and tree planting, will start in Highbridge in a few months. By spring, we should all see the beginnings of a new and more beautiful Highbridge.

In addition, construction for a combination new P.S. 126 and middle-income housing project at Ogden Avenue and 167th Street, will also commence this year. This is most welcome news to the community. I would like all the Highbridge residents who have worked unceasingly over the years to improve their community to know that their unselfish efforts are now being capped by concrete success. The power and resources of the Federal and city governments are being martialed to serve Highbridge and its residents.

P.S. 126 BECOMES A REALITY

After years of promises and negotiations, New York City announced on December 23 that construction on the P.S. 126 housing complex will begin this spring. The new P.S. 126 will replace P.S. 11, which was built in 1890.

In an important "first" for Highbridge, a 25-story apartment house will be built on top of the school. This is the first school-housing project ever built in the United States. I am hopeful that many Highbridge residents will obtain apartments in the project. It is now estimated that the apartments will rent at approximately $25 per room per month.

The announcement by the city that construction on P.S. 126 will start this spring is the culmination of years of effort by several people living in Highbridge and a stepped up campaign by my office, headed by Jack Delaney. Jack and I worked very closely with Ernie Minott, Jim Egan, and the PTA's of P.S. 11 and 73 in bringing the attention of the highest echelons of Government to the many years of frustrating and disappointing delays in the development of P.S. 126.

We held repeated meetings with Eugene Hult, director of construction for the New York public school system; Herbert Evans, Director of Housing and Redevelopment Board; Budget Director Shea, and Chief Engineer Joseph Fitzpatrick, to get this project moving.

P.S. 126 will accommodate about 1,200 students. I will do everything in my power to assure that construction does start on schedule and that P.S. 126 is an example of the best in school architecture and design in the United States.

REHABILITATION OF HIGHBRIDGE BEGINS

When I was elected to Congress last year I assigned a top priority to the rehabilitation of Highbridge. Over the last few years, I have been concerned with the continued deterioration of the area. I was determined that this trend should be arrested promptly.

The first step I took was to invite a large number of civic, community, business, and religious leaders in Highbridge to become members of a Highbridge Conservation Committee.

The response of the community to my plea was immediate and encouraging. Within a few weeks, the committee was operational and Leo Weins, vice president of H. W. Wilson Co., took over as chairman. Leo brought to the committee his tremendous organizational and administrative expertise, and his splendid leadership qualities. We were also fortunate in having the full cooperation of Father Kavanagh and Father Reisig of Sacred Heart Church as well as Rabbi Taragin of the Highbridge Jewish Center.

The committee worked swiftly to draft a report outlining the specific problems in Highbridge for submission to Herbert Evans, director of the city housing and redevelopment agency. After a series of meetings with our committee, Mr. Evans agreed to assign a full-time staff director to coordinate the rehabilitation effort in Highbridge. The staff director will work out of an office which the Highbridge Conservation Committee has just leased at 1155 Woodycrest Avenue, at 167th Street.

We plan to invite all of you to a gala opening of this office, later this month, to help us drink a toast to the "New Highbridge."

The details of the program to rehabilitate Highbridge are as follows: The city of New York has applied to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for Federal funds under the Housing Act of 1965. As a result of our joint efforts, Highbridge will receive $1,600,000 over 3 years. The largest single amount of money, $500,000, will be spent to provide for strict enforcement of building, sanitation, and electrical codes, for community organization specialists, and for architects and planners; $300,000 is allocated for street improvement work, $175,000 for curbs and gutters, $220,000 for street lights, police and fire communications systems, $5,000 for new street signs, and $120,000 for the planting of trees.

In addition, property owners will receive federally insured 3-percent loans to carry out rehabilitation and the FHA will insure mortgages at 6½ percent interest. Low income homeowners are eligible for $1,500 outright nonreturnable grants to improve their homes.

As you can see, the mighty resources of the Federal and city governments will now be used to give Highbridge a thorough facelifting and will serve to stabilize the neighborhood.

The new borough president, Herman Badillo, has offered his full cooperation and that of his staff and office to insure the success of our project.

The members of the Highbridge Conservation Committee include: Leo Weins, chairman; Father Reisig, Father Kavanagh, Rabbi Taragin, Dan and Barbara Cetrone, John Clark, Al Correa, Bob Croghan, Jim Egan, Harold Finkelstein, Theodore Frank, Lillian Friedlander, Tom Goldrick, Pearl Granoff, Phyllis Grunauer, Eddie Green, Joe Hirsch, Rita Karig, Bernard Marcus, Mary McCrystal, Douglas Merrill, Ernie Minott, Frank Negron, Daniel Noonan, Florence Parker, John Respol, Stuart Rosensweet, Jean Sealo, Carl Sontz, Max Silverman, and Joe Polser. (These members have attended two or more meetings.)

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CLEAN VACANT LOT

To the tune of the latest rock and roll music provided by the Highbridge Crickets, 80 Highbridge youngsters cleaned the vacant lot opposite P.S. 73 (Anderson Avenue between 164th and 165th Streets) on Saturday, December 4.

The young men who worked from about 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., were supervised by Father Kavanagh from Sacred Heart Church, who, in a scene reminiscent of the Pied Piper of Hamlin, led the lads from Sacred Heart Church over the hill and down onto Anderson Avenue to attack the assortment of beer cans, broken bottles, abandoned bed springs, mattresses, ancient ice boxes, and other debris which disfigured the lot.

Other supervisory "straw bosses" were Patrolman Tom Goldrick, Charlie Minsberg of PAL, and John Minnich of the Boy Scouts.

By 1 p.m. the lot was cleaned and some 30 tons of debris were removed by a shuttle of sanitation department trucks. This is a great day's work which demonstrated once again the unusually high caliber of community spirit in Highbridge so evident in young and old alike.

The lot cleaning was organized by John Respol and Leon Weins of the Highbridge Conservation Committee in cooperation with Jack Delaney of my office. The men who worked so hard that chilly December morning are: Capt. Anthony McNally, of the 44th precinct; Supervisor Charles Byrnes, of the sanitation department; Dan Cetrone, of the Highbridge Capital; Roland Carpenter; William Cronin; Dan Duggan; Dr. Benjamin Fleissig; Joseph McTiernan; John McNamee; John Minnich; Paul Noonan; Dan Quinn; and Neil Sullivan.

WATCH FOR THE OPENING OF THE HIGHBRIDGE CONSERVATION PROJECT, 1155 WOODYCREST AVENUE (167TH STREET)

As you can see, Highbridge is finally on its way. I would like to thank the entire community for the vital support and cooperation which has enabled me and my entire congressional staff to serve you effectively in pushing forward with these exciting programs. I look forward to working closely with an increasing number of Highbridge residents in the months ahead, for a newer and finer Highbridge neighborhood.

Iowa Farm Task Force for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. HANSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Congress established the Peace Corps on September 22, 1961. Objectives defined by the act for the Peace Corps are to promote world peace and friendship by making available to interested countries Americans who will:

First. Help the people of these countries meet their needs for trained manpower.

Second. Help promote a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served.

And third, help promote a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people.

This has probably been the United States most successful endeavor in foreign affairs in many years. The Corps success stands as a tribute to our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, in whose fertile mind the program was first conceived.

The great State of Iowa has actively participated in the Peace Corps program. Dedicated young Iowans now represent their State and their country from Afghanistan to Venezuela.

If we Iowans have any one speciality, it would have to be agriculture. To more fully utilize this particular talent, the Peace Corps is now recruiting an all-Iowa task force for service in India.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I herewith submit recent articles from the Shenandoah Weekly Times and the Des Moines Register which explain this Iowa project. Perhaps some of my colleagues would be interested in a similar plan for their own States.

[From the Des Moines Register, Feb. 2, 1966]

IOWA FARM TASK FORCE FOR INDIA

The idea of forming an all-Iowa Peace Corps unit for agricultural assistance in India appeals to commonsense. We are sure it will receive a favorable response in the State. The plan originated with the Iowa State Manpower Development Council and has been warmly supported by Gov. Harold Hughes, the Peace Corps, and the Indian Ambassador to the United States.

Recruitment of volunteers has begun, and applications may be made to the Peace Corps in Washington, to the Governor's office or through the State universities and the State college. India has requested older people, retired farmers, and others who are experienced in farm work and farming technology, so emphasis in recruiting will be placed on that kind of volunteers. Iowa has a good supply of such people, many, we fancy, who will welcome an opportunity for useful service to their country.

The Iowa task force would be located in northern India, presumably in the Punjab and Rajasthan. These are states in the area near the national capital of New Delhi. The major crops are wheat and other small grains. Iowa farmers could contribute much valuable assistance in production of these crops. Through the Agency for International Development and the Ford Foundation, considerable progress has been made in Punjab toward developing chicken and egg production, another field in which many older farmers are expert.

India's problem of food production to meet the needs of a rapidly increasing population is the most critical in the world. After encouraging gains for several years following independence, progress has lagged recently. A record grain crop was harvested in the spring of 1965, but severe drought reduced output of fall and winter harvests, and these fall-winter crops account for about two-thirds of India's food grains.

An Iowa Peace Corps unit cannot make the rain fall, but it could help farmers make better use of the irrigation water available and could pave the way for improved farm output in the future.

U.S. foreign aid programs often have been criticized for lack of practical farmers and too many scientific experts who are unable to communicate with farm people and who cannot improvise to do the best job with what is available. Iowans of practical farm experience, even though their experience is with a different type of agriculture, could make a contribution to Indian agriculture. This is not to say that young agricultural college graduates, even without farm experience, could not be useful in such a team, also.

Iowa has an opportunity to pioneer a potentially important new instrument in foreign aid with this task force for India. Peace Corps officials believe this might be an example for many other States to send similar units to undeveloped countries.

[From the Shenandoah Weekly Times, Feb. 2, 1966]

PEACE CORPS SEEKING ALL-IOWA TASK FORCE TO SERVE IN INDIA

DES MOINES.—The Peace Corps will recruit an all-Iowa task force oriented toward agriculture to serve in India, Gov. Harold Hughes announced recently.

Hughes said recruiting of both younger and older volunteers will begin February 1 and continue through March 15. Those accepted will be trained this summer and go to India as a unit this fall.

The projects is believed the first time a Peace Corps unit has been formed of volunteers from a single State.

The Governor said the idea for the all-Iowa task force originated with the State Manpower Development Council and has been under examination by the Peace Corps since last fall.

Huges noted that India faces a severe food shortage and urgently needs Peace Corps workers with farming skills. He urged Iowans to volunteer for 2 years of service.

Peace Corps officials said they hoped at least 200 Iowans would join the India task force, and that even more could be used.

They said most of the Iowans probably would be stationed in northern India where the famine problem is at its worst.

Governor Hughes, who proclaimed February as Peace Corps Month in Iowa, said the program provides an excellent opportunity for Iowans to use their agricultural skills for saving lives and helping international relations.

United States at the Fork: More Lunar or Planet Trips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Karl Abraham, in the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, January 16, 1966, examines the alternatives of our national space program following the lunar landing in this decade. He clearly describes several alternatives and cites the recent studies of the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences and the findings of a group convened by NASA last July at Falmouth, Mass. I commend this article to your reading as an illustration of major decisions that must be taken in our national space program in the future.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES AT THE FORK: MORE LUNAR OR PLANET TRIPS

(By Karl Abraham)

Why did President Johnson's state of the Union message omit mention of the American space program? Because its future has never seemed so unsettled.

Its current and future costs—it is expected to command 4.0 percent of the Federal budget—have never stood so inconveniently alongside the Nation's domestic, foreign, and defense obligations, as the President sees them.

The President and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, while still really in the infancy of the space age, have been carried to a perplexing crossroads by successes—achieved or imminent—that they were barely prepared to face, even without two new major problems now crowding them financially.

THE BACKGROUND

Today, the Nation's exploration of space must be conducted against the background of the broad, costly, and end-out-of-sight Great Society projects and the war in Vietnam.

When President Eisenhower, on July 29, 1955, announced that the United States would launch small unmanned earth-circling satellites he plainly did not foresee that a decade later the nations would be halfway to the moon.

Not even in 1961, when President Kennedy started the country on the path toward landing men on the moon by 1970, could he foresee that in 1966, while still short of the lunar goal, the Nation would be confronted by a comparably large decision.

The decision is this:

Should the United States, when it has gained a foothold on the moon, follow this with a decade of expanding bases and operations there?

Or, should it, after the early landings, then set its sights on exploration of the near planets and later the remoter reaches of the solar system?

TWO LOOKS AHEAD

Since the first of this year, separate extensive reports analyzing these alternatives, have been issued in Washington. They help cast light on President Johnson's omission last Wednesday night.

The first, on "Lunar Exploration and Science," constituting an extensive plan for post-Apollo landing operations on the Moon through the 1970's, represents the findings of a group convened by NASA last July at Falmouth, Mass. This report was made public January 5.

The second, on "Space Research: Directions for the Future," considering both planetary and lunar programs, but emphasizing upgrading of planetary explorations, was produced by the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences. This group met last summer at Woods Hole, Mass. Its report was released yesterday in Washington.

WHICH WAY TO GO?

The alternatives are these: Give the exploration of the Moon highest priority and retard preparation of planetary lunar explorations sufficiently missioned; or lessen the pace * * * to engage in a comparable or slightly larger effort toward Mars, Venus, and other planets.

For the NASA-organized study of lunar exploration, the group included nearly 70 Government employees, just over 40 from universities or nonprofit institutions and about 10 industrial scientists and engineers. It was heavily weighted with representatives of NASA's manned space programs and with scientists interested in Moon studies.

The lunar proposals include: A program of manned flights orbiting the Moon to survey larger portions of the surface than is practical from the ground.

Then, through 1974, perhaps five or six landings, with stays on the Moon of up to 2 weeks; lunar surface surveys extending up to about 10 miles from the landing site; the placing of automatic data reporting packages. Also, development of a surface roving vehicle for these excursions, perhaps a small lunar flying vehicle and equipment to drill about 10 feet into the Moon's crust.

In the next phase, between 1975 and 1980, missions at a rate of about one per year, each lasting from 2 months to a year.

SPACEWARD, HO

In the Space Science Board's study, the working group of 34 included only 3 Government scientists, 1 industrial representative, and was otherwise made up of university or institution scientists.

They arrived at the following priorities for the 1970–85 period.

First, Mars. Second, either the Moon or the planet Venus. Then, in this order, the major planets, most notably Jupiter and Saturn; then comets and asteroids; Mercury; Pluto; and studies of interplanetary cosmic dust.

These represented priorities of scientific interest revolving around major scientific puzzles.

As a program, the group recommended:

Beginning immediately and through 1975, emphasis of the space exploration should be shifted "toward the planets and away from the moon, progressing toward a roughly equal expenditure for lunar and for planetary exploration in the 1970–85 period."

Primary emphasis to be given to Mars, with secondary emphasis to Venus and the major planets.

The types of spacecraft envisioned to undertake these projects, leaning heavily, in the case of Mars and possibly Venus on the search for evidence of present or past life forms, include: Mars orbiters; a Voyager soft-landing capsule; an advanced automated biological laboratory; and suitable orbiting and landing vehicles for the other planetary missions.

NONSCIENTIFIC OBJECTIVES

No prominent attention was given to landing men on Mars (or any of the other planets). The panel approached the scientific problems with the apparent assumption that unmanned probes would provide enough information to support useful work in the 1970–85 period.

The financial and possibly technical considerations of manned voyages to the planets now appear immense, although some have suggested a manned landing on Mars by 1985 is possible.

The Space Science Board group recognized it faced some stiff competition in the quest for such a program, not all of it entirely on the scientific or technical side.

"We further anticipate," said the report, "substantial demands on NASA's limited resources for programs the justifications of which are based on considerations other than those of science.

"MORE THAN $5 BILLION A YEAR

"Since we believe the exploration of the solar system bears so directly on major central scientific questions of our time, we recommend that the percentage of support of lunar and planetary exploration be maintained over the 1965–85 time period and be devoted predominantly to scientific objectives and that programs whose objectives are other than scientific be started only as additional resources become available."

If either of these series of proposals, lunar or planetary, is to be undertaken within the recommended time periods, decisions must be made soon on starting the advance work.

It is difficult to see how President Johnson could have said anything meaningful about the future of the space program without betraying a leaning in one direction or the other, possibly even committing the administration.

The President made it clear he intends to maintain, indeed expand his Great Society programs, and that he is prepared if he must to support more vigorously the military operations in Vietnam.

Unless the space program presented him now clearly captured the public imagination as assuredly as did President Kennedy's drive for the moon, President Johnson would find it difficult to undertake a major new space effort to the possible impairment of his other objectives.

The space program, which may consume more than $5 billion this year, represents an immense involvement of the national economic life. Decisions to be made this year may have far-reaching affects on industrial activity and employment, and all that follows from that.

THEN WHAT?

If the Nation's space workers and companies are deprived of another major project after the first moon landing, then what?

In another 2 years, most of the work to put men originally on the moon will have been completed, and most of the required $20 billion or more will have been spent.

As the administration makes up its mind about the future of the space program, the long-range economic impact of any decision will be an important factor to consider.

When the President's budget message goes to Capitol Hill, and as the Congress approves or alters the next year's space expenditures and objectives, the new directions of the space program may become clearer.

Alternatively, the omission of "space" from the state of the Union message may mean that the great decision has already been put off, for a year or more.

Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, for some time during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, I had been prodding some of my friends on the Veterans' Affairs Committee to report out H.R. 12410, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, so I was extremely pleased to see it on the calendar early in this session.

Many of my constituents have written expressing their concern about this measure, particularly with respect to our boys fighting in Vietnam.

This is an excellent bill, Mr. Speaker, as it designs a permanent program for our veterans. As the committee pointed out, the structure of veterans' laws which have developed over the past 200 years has been based on the concept of wartime and peacetime service. In the past, war veterans have been given substantially more benefits than peacetime veterans and this system worked very well through World War II. However, after World War II, when we entered the so-called cold war, problems began to arise. It has been during this period that we have continued compulsory military service for an extended period of time for the first time in our history. Prior to World War II, we had few servicemen stationed outside the United States. Today, however, our servicemen are scattered throughout the world, and in many instances are serving under combat or near combat conditions. During the period of time which is covered by this bill, our Nation has gone through a series of crises associated with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, Laos, and Vietnam. The perpetual cold war condition, with its crises, compulsory military service, and expanded overseas commitments, makes this bill necessary if our servicemen, during this period of our history, are to receive equitable treatment.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to: first, enhance and make more attractive service in the Armed Forces of the United States; second, extend the benefits of a higher education to qualified and deserving young persons who might not otherwise be able to afford such an education; third, provide vocational readjustment and restore lost educational opportunities to those servicemen and women whose careers have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty after January 31, 1955; and fourth, aid such persons in attaining the vocational and educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

The committee emphasizes that, as in the case of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, it is not the intention of this legislation to establish a program which completely subsidizes the cost of a veteran's education program, as well as his living costs. This legislation is designed as an aid program and it is expected that in many cases the veteran will be required to make a contribution to the cost of his own education program. It is believed that the veteran will maintain a greater interest in the use made of the funds provided by this bill, if he is required to make a contribution from his own resources.

Moreover, the purpose of the committee is not to equalize educational opportunities for the veteran population, but rather to provide assistance to help a veteran follow the educational plan that he might have adopted had he never entered the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation further insures that the Nation shall be able to utilize the highest skills and abilities of the veterans who benefit from it. This is especially important since at this time the number of young men available to fill the essential technical and professional posts is the lowest in ratio to our total population which we have had or probably ever will have for a decade to come. In my opinion, it is doubly essential that we make fullest use of the skills of the young men who are available.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, this bill has my unconditional support.

Milwaukee Journal Cites United Nations Responsibility in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, while we all know that the road ahead may be long and arduous, the submission of the Vietnam issue to the United Nations is a hopeful step forward.

The charter of the U.N. makes clear that the Security Council is the forum where threats to world peace are initially discussed.

The resolution offered to the Security Council would open the way toward a durable peace in southeast Asia based upon the 1954 Geneva Conference.

The Milwaukee Journal's recent editorial, "It Is U.N. Duty To Seek Peace," follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Feb. 3, 1966]

IT IS U.N. DUTY TO SEEK PEACE

The U.S. resolution seeking a full-scale debate on Vietnam has reached the United Nations Security Council agenda and a long debate probably is in store. The Soviet Union will undoubtedly offer a counterresolution demanding that the United States pull out of South Vietnam completely. In the end a compromise may be reached as a first step toward peace negotiations. Or it may reach a point where the Soviet Union vetoes the whole effort.

Original French and Soviet opposition to any consideration of peace moves in the Security Council ignored the clear responsibility U.N. members have to seek peace. Chapter 1, article 1 of the U.N. Charter starts by saying that among the purposes of the organization is:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: To take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

To argue that action is not possible because China and North Vietnam are not members is to ignore article 2(6) of the charter, which says:

"The organization shall insure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security."

Peace is primarily the responsibility of the Security Council. Chapter V, article 24(1) says:

"In order to insure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf."

Chapter VI clearly states the methods the Security Council is to use in settling disputes. Chapter VII even provides that the Council may use land, sea, or air forces to maintain international peace and security.

George Kennan Statement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, last week the eminent diplomat and scholar, George F. Kennan, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee concerning our involvement in Vietnam.

Mr. Kennan, after many years in the State Department as an Ambassador to the Soviet Union and later Yugoslavia, is considered by many to be our top expert in the cold war.

His remarks, I believe, present a very clear and rational picture concerning American involvement in Vietnam:

KENNAN STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

(NOTE.—George F. Kennan, former Ambassador to Moscow and now a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N.J., testified on Vietnam yesterday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Here is the official transcript of Kennan's prepared statement, as delivered.)

Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the subject on which I am invited to give my views this morning is, as I understand it, the complex of problems connected with our present involvement in Vietnam.

I would like to explain, in undertaking to speak to this subject, that southeast Asia is a part of the world for which I can claim no specialized knowledge. I am not familiar wtih the official rationale of our policy there except as it has been revealed in the press. I cannot recall that I have ever, either during my official service in Government or subsequently, been drawn by the executive branch of our Government into consultation on the problem of our policy in southeast Asia, or even been made privy to the official discussions by which that policy was decided.

I am sure that there are many data that are relevant to any thoroughly founded judgment on these matters which are not available to me, and this being the case, I have tried in recent weeks and months not to jump to final conclusions even in my own thoughts, to remain sympathetically receptive, both to our Government's explanations of the very real difficulties it has faced and to the doubts and questions of its serious critics.

EXPERIENCE NOTED

I have not been anxious to press my views on the public, but I gladly give them to you for whatever they are worth, claiming no particular merit for them except perhaps that they flow from experience with Communist affairs that runs back now for some 38 years, and also from the deepest and most troubled sort of concern that we should find the proper course, the right course, at this truly crucial moment.

The first point I would like to make is that if we were not already involved as we are today in Vietnam, I would know of no reason why we should wish to become so involved, and I could think of several reasons why we should wish not to.

Vietnam is not a region of major military, industrial importance. It is difficult to believe that any decisive developments of the world situation would be determined in normal circumstances by what happens on that territory.

If it were not for the considerations of prestige that arise precisely out of our present involvement, even a situation in which South Vietnam was controlled exclusively by the Vietcong, while regrettable, and no doubt morally unwarranted, would not, in my opinion, present dangers great enough to justify our direct military intervention.

Given the situation that exists today in the relations among the leading Communist powers, and by that I have, of course, in mind primarily the Soviet-Chinese conflict, there is every likelihood that a Communist regime in South Vietnam would follow a fairly independent course.

There is no reason to suspect that such a regime would find it either necessary or desirable in present circumstances to function simply as a passive puppet and instrument of Chinese power. And as for the danger that its establishment there would unleash similar tendencies in neighboring countries, this, I think, would depend largely on the manner in which it came into power.

In the light of what has recently happened in Indonesia, and on the Indian subcontinent, the danger of the so-called domino effect—that is, the effect that would be produced by a limited Communist success in South Vietnam—seems to me to be considerably less than it was when the main decisions were taken that have led to our present involvement.

Let me stress, I do not say that that danger does not exist: I say that it is less than it was a year or two ago when we got into this involvement.

From the long-term standpoint, therefore, and on principle, I think our military involvement in Vietnam has to be recognized as unfortunate, as something we would not choose deliberately, if the choice were ours to make all over again today, and by the same token, I think it should be our Government's aim to liquidate this involvement just as soon as this can be done without inordinate damage to our own prestige or to the stability of conditions in that area.

It is obvious on the other hand that this involvement is today a fact. It creates a new situation. It raises new questions ulterior to the long-term problem which have to be taken into account; a precipitate and disorderly withdrawal could represent in present circumstances a disservice to our own interests, and even to world peace greater than any that might have been involved by our failure to engage ourselves there in the first place.

This is a reality which, if there is to be any peaceful resolution of this conflict, is going to have to be recognized both by the more critical of our friends and by our adversaries.

But at the same time, I have great misgivings about any deliberate expansion of hostilities on our part directed to the achievement of something called victory—if by the use of that term we envisage the complete disappearance of the recalcitrance with which we are now faced, the formal submission by the adversary to our will, and the complete realization of our present stated political aims.

I doubt that these things can be achieved even by the most formidable military successes.

There seems to be an impression about that if we bring sufficient military pressure to bear there will occur at some point something in the nature of a political capitulation on the other side. I think this is a most dangerous assumption. I don't say that it is absolutely impossible, but it is a dangerous assumption in the light of the experience we have had with Communist elements in the past.

The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have between them a great deal of space and manpower to give up if they have to, and the Chinese can give them more if they need it. Fidelity to the Communist tradition would dictate that if really pressed to extremity on the military level these people should disappear entirely from the open scene and fall back exclusively on an underground political and military existence rather than to accept terms that would be openly humiliating and would represent in their eyes the betrayal of the future political prospects of the cause to which they are dedicated.

Any total rooting out of the Vietcong from the territory of South Vietnam could be achieved, if it could be achieved at all, only at the cost of a degree of damage to civilian life and of civilian suffering generally for which I would not like to see this country responsible.

And to attempt to crush North Vietnamese strength to a point where Hanoi could no longer give any support for Vietcong political activity in the south would almost certainly, it seems to me, have the effect of bringing in Chinese forces at some point, whether formally or in the guise of volunteers, thus involving us in a military conflict with Communist China on one of the most unfavorable theaters of hostility that we could possibly choose.

This is not the only reason why I think we should do everything possible to avoid the escalation of this conflict. There is another one which is no less weighty, and this is the effect the conflict is already having on our policies and interests further afield. This involvement seems to me to represent a grevious misplacement of emphasis on our foreign policies as a whole.

Not only are great and potentially more important questions of world affairs not receiving, as a consequence of our involvement in Vietnam, the attention they should be receiving, but in some instances assets we already enjoy and, hopefully, possibilities we should be developing are being sacrificed to this unpromising involvement in a remote and secondary theater.

Our relations with the Soviet Union have suffered grievously, as was to be expected, and this at a time when far more important things were involved in those relations than what is ultimately involved in Vietnam and when we had special reason, I think, to cultivate those relations, and more unfortunate still, in my opinion, is the damage being done to the feelings entertained for us by the Japanese people.

The confidence and the good disposition of the Japanese is the greatest asset we have had and the greatest asset we could have in east Asia. As the greatest industrial complex in the entire Far East, and the only place where the sinews of modern war can be produced on a formidable scale there, Japan is of vital importance to us and indeed to the prospects generally of peace and stability in east Asia.

There is no success we could have in Vietnam that would conceivably warrant, in my opinion, the sacrifice by us of the confidence and good will of the Japanese people.

Yet, I fear that we abuse that confidence and good will in the most serious way when we press the military struggle in Vietnam, and particularly when we press it by means of strategic bombing, a process to which the Japanese for historical reasons are peculiarly sensitive and adverse.

I mention Japan particularly because it is an outstanding example, both in importance and in the intensity of the feelings aroused, of the psychological damage that is being done in many parts of the world by the prosecution of this conflict, and that will be done in even greater measure if the hostilities become still more bloody and tragic as a result of our deliberate effort.

It is clear that however justified our action may be in our own eyes, it has failed to win either enthusiasm or confidence even among peoples normally friendly to us.

Our motives are widely misinterpreted, and the spectacle, the spectacle emphasized and reproduced in thousands of press photographs and stories that appear in the press of the world, the spectacle of Americans inflicting grievous injury on the lives of a poor and helpless people, and particularly a people of different race and color, no matter how warranted by military necessity or by the excesses of the adversary our operations may seem to us to be or may genuinely be, this spectacle produces reactions among millions of people throughout the world profoundly detrimental to the image we would like them to hold of this country.

HOLLOW VICTORY

I am not saying that this is just or right. I am saying that this is so, and that it is bound in the circumstances to be so, and a victory purchased at the price of further such damage would be a hollow one in terms of our world interests, no matter what advantages it might hold from the standpoint of developments on the local scene.

Now, these are the reasons, gentlemen, why I hope that our Government will restrict our military operations in Vietnam to the minimum necessary to assure the security of our forces, and to maintain our military presence there until we can achieve a satisfactory peaceful resolution of the conflict, and these are reasons why I hope that we will continue to pursue vigorously, and I may say consistently, the quest for such a peaceful resolution of the conflict, even if this involves some moderation of our stated objectives, and even if the resulting settlement appears to us as something less than ideal.

I cannot, of course, judge the military necessities of our situation. But everything that I can learn about its political aspects suggests to me that Gen. James M. Gavin is on the right track in his suggestions that we should, if I understood him correctly, decide what limited areas we can safely police and defend, and restrict ourselves largely to the maintenance of our position there.

I have listened with interest to the arguments that have been brought forward in opposition to his views, and I must say that

I have not been much impressed with some of them. When I am told that it would be difficult to defend such enclaves, it is hard for me to understand why it would be easier to defend the far greater areas to which presumably a successful escalation of our military activity would bring us.

I also find it difficult, for reasons that I won't take time to go into here, to believe that our allies, and particularly our Western European allies, most of whom themselves have given up great territories within recent years, and sometimes in a very statesmanlike way, I find it hard to believe that we would be subject to great reproach or loss of confidence at their hands simply because we followed a defensive rather than an offensive strategy in Vietnam at this time.

In matters such as this, it is not in my experience what you do that is mainly decisive. It is how you do it, and I would submit that there is more respect to be won in the opinion of this world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than by the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or unpromising objectives.

And finally, when I hear it said that to adopt a defensive strategy in South Vietnam would be to rat on our commitment to the government of that territory, I am a little bewildered. I would like to know what that commitment really consists of, and how and when it was incurred.

What seems to be involved here is an obligation on our part not only to defend the frontiers of a certain political entity against outside attack, but to assure the internal security of its government in circumstances where that government is unable to assure that security by its own means.

Now, any such obligations is one that goes obviously considerably further in its implications than the normal obligations of a military alliance.

If we did not incur such an obligation in any formal way, then I think we should not be inventing it for ourselves and assuring ourselves that we are bound by it today.

But if we did incur it, then I do fail to understand how it was possible to enter into any such commitment otherwise than through the constitutional processes which were meant to come into play when even commitments of lesser import than this were undertaken.

Now, just two concluding observations: I would like it understood that what I have said here implies nothing but the highest respect and admiration for the fighting qualities of our forces in the field. I have the greatest confidence in them, men and commanders alike.

I have no doubt, in fact, that they can and will, if duty requires, produce before this thing is over military results that will surprise both our skeptical friends and our arrogant adversaries. It is not their fighting qualities; it is the purpose to which they are being employed that evokes my skepticism.

Secondly, I would like to say I am trying to look at this whole problem not from the moral standpoint but from the practical one. I see in the Vietcong a band of ruthless fanatics, partly misled, perhaps by the propaganda that has been drummed into them, but cruel in their purposes, dictatorial, and oppressive in their aims. I am not conscious of having any sympathy for them.

I think their claim to represent the people of South Vietnam is unfounded and arrogant and outrageous. A country which fell under this exclusive power would have my deepest sympathy, and I would hope that this eventuality at any rate would be avoided by a restrained and moderate policy on our part in South Vietnam.

But our country should not be asked, and should not ask of itself, to shoulder the main burden of determining the political realities in any other country, and particularly not in one remote from our shores, from our culture, and from the experience of our people.

This is not only not our business, but I don't think we can do it successfully.

WORDS OF ADAMS

In saying this, I am only paraphrasing and very poorly the words once uttered by one who had at one time been a Member of the U.S. Senate, and who, had a Foreign Relations Committee, existed in his day, would unquestionably have been a member of it. This was John Quincy Adams, and I would like your permission to recall, before I close, the words of his that I have in mind.

They were spoken in this city 145 years ago on the 4th of July 1821:

Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT. 1821.

KENNAN. 1821, thank you.

Some of you may be familiar with them but they stand repeating at this moment:

"Wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or shall be unfurled, there," Adams said, "will be America's heart, her benedictions, and her prayers. But she goes not abroad," he went on, "in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own.

"She will recommend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and by the benignant sympathy of her example. She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication, in all the wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy, and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standards of freedom.

"The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force. * * * She might become the dictatress of the world. She would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit."

Now, gentlemen, I don't know exactly what John Quincy Adams had in mind when he spoke those words, but I think that without knowing it, he spoke very directly and very pertinently to us here today.

News Media Comments on Proposed Thompson Burial Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News, in its February 10 edition, included an extensive article on Robert Thompson, who died in October of last year, was cremated, and whose ashes the Communist Party determined to use in a way embarrassing to the United States. Thompson, a national leader in the Communist Party in this country, was convicted of trying to overthrow the U.S. Government. The article by Milton Berliner says in part:

On January 22, a short press dispatch from New York reported that, according to Mrs. Thompson, her husband would be buried in Arlington Cemetery on January 31.

But, said Mrs. Thompson, to point up her disagreement with the Government's Vietnam policy, there would be no rifle salute.

The Daily Worker boasted "his ashes will be interred at the famed burial place where President Kennedy lies," and immediately began organizing a memorial march on Washington for the burial ceremonies.

Lt. Col. Douglas C. Jones, at the Pentagon, said: "As far as we know, no known Communists are buried at Arlington."

The history of the man over whom all this commotion was raised would seem to indicate that he wouldn't have cared less about being buried in Arlington Cemetery—unless it caused the establishment embarrassment.

The January 27 copy of the New York Daily News carried the following account:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By Jerry Green)

WASHINGTON, January 26—Snow fell gently against the little white crosses in Arlington National Cemetery this morning. A sharp wind out of the northeast twitched the brown lace of the bare trees. The wind, the shrouding snow and the stillness of the rolling hillside muffled the crack of the rifle volleys and muted the voice of the bugle sounding taps.

It was a small funeral. An enlisted man rates only the firing squad, six pallbearers, and a bugler, in addition, of course, to the chaplain. Only a handful of mourners huddle under the awning of the grave's green canopy; the honored dead had lived in a distant city, and not many could come to his service.

Not far away another open grave stood waiting. Across the slopes another firing squad cracked off the three volleys from their M14's.

It was brisk, military, poignant. There were 30 of these funerals in Arlington today. By midafternoon the snow was nearly 4 inches deep, the flakes dropping steadily.

On Monday they had buried a lad killed in Vietnam. Two more bodies flown from Saigon rested in the cemetery depository, with funeral services set for tomorrow.

Below the Lee mansion, the construction crew that had come to work at 7 a.m. knocked off 2 hours later. The snow was thickening too heavily for the workmen to accomplish much more this day in their preparation of the memorial tomb for John F. Kennedy. Despite the dreary weather a few mourners had come by to bow their heads at the fence protecting the presidential gravesite and its eternal flame.

A visitor could hear a growl from one of those workmen, an angry word of bitter protest.

This one had seen a headline in a morning paper and he was sickened. The Communist Party, he had read, was seeking to turn these hallowed acres into a mockery. They were planning, these Reds, to profane the Nation's symbolic memorial to all its heroes with the interment of a Communist chieftain. They almost got away with it.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS HOLDER WAS HIGH COMMIE OFFICIAL

The plan had the earmarks of a routine matter when it began. Had it not been caught, it could have been turned into a propaganda coup of international magnitude, and even today during the delaying process, Moscow's Tass news agency was screaming protests.

An unsuspecting Army received a normal, ordinary request for permission to inter the ashes of former Staff Sgt. Robert Thompson. A legitimate hero, winner of a Distinguished Service Cross, the Nation's second highest decoration, he would appear to be more qualified for the burial than many.

The Army was rocked when it read in the January 23 issue of the Worker, official Communist newspaper in New York City, an announcement that Thompson had been a top party official and "his ashes will be interred at the famed burial place where President Kennedy lies."

An angry Army discovered in the January 25 issue of the Worker that the Commies were drumming up a march on Washington to participate in the burial ceremonies, set for January 31 at 1 p.m.

FIVE YEARS IN PRISON AS COMMIE PLOTTER

The Army quickly asked for a ruling by the Justice Department, an opinion which could have but one conclusion. Thompson had served 5 years and a month of sentences totaling 7 years after his conviction in 1949 for conspiracy to advocate the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government. Under regulations, the 5 years in prison seemed sufficient to bar the burial.

The Kennedy Memorial workman wasn't alone in his disgust. Members of Congress fired protests to the Pentagon. Andy Borg, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, telegraphed President Johnson this afternoon that the Commie plot "comes as a shock to the conscience of this Nation."

Of all the tricky, smelly outrages the Communists have sought to sneak across, this was one of the worst. The issue chosen for exploitation was delicate. The timing was perfect for the purpose of stirring discord. Thompson died and was cremated last October only a few days ago came the sudden desire for an Arlington interment—with speeches.

GENUINE HERO WAS VETERAN OF SPAIN'S CIVIL WAR

Word was sent to the Army that there should be no firing squad, no guns to remind anybody that the rest of the Nation was involved in a war in Vietnam.

There was no question that Thompson was a genuine hero, that his Distinguished Service Cross was well earned in a display of extraordinary heroism in leading an assault against machinegun positions in New Guinea in 1943.

Without faulting the heroism of this single event, it might be noted that perhaps Thompson had a trifle more experience than some of his fellow draftees. He was a veteran of the Communists International Brigade in the Spanish Civil War.

He had been a Communist Party member since 1933, spent more than a year in Moscow, and held high office in the American branch before and after World War II, finally rising to the post of national executive secretary. Convicted under the Smith Act in 1949, Thompson jumped bail while an unsuccessful appeal was pending in 1951 and was finally captured by the FBI in 1953. He drew another 4 years' sentence for contempt of court and was paroled after 5 years and a month.

Thompson's ghost could find consolation in the knowledge that not all military heroes make it to Arlington. Once there was a major general. His name was Benedict Arnold.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Commemorated by Lithuanian American Council, Inc., of Racine, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the undiminished hope for freedom of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia now enslaved by communism should make all Americans feel even more determined to remain firm against aggression which seeks to erase liberty and democracy from earth.

The Racine, Wis., branch of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., in my hometown, recently commemorated the 48th anniversary of the restoration of independence to Lithuania. These friends of mine adopted a resolution at their gathering in St. Casimir's Hall calling for the United States to continue its support of needy and developing nations voicing praise for this Nation's resolute stand in Vietnam and for America's nonrecognition of the Soviet aggression and occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

I am personally pleased with their resolution, and, therefore, include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RESOLUTION BY LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC., RACINE, WIS., BRANCH, RACINE, WIS.

Whereas the independence won by the Lithuanian people 48 years ago was erased in 1940 by the illegal colonialization of Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has been and still is striving to win official recognition of its illegal seizure and incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the United States of America has been in forefront of the United Nations activities ending foreign colonializm all over the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States extend its support to all nations which are seeking to maintain their sovereignty are making positive efforts to improve living standards of their people; also be it

Resolved, That we are grateful for all the efforts being made by the U.S. Government in fighting back Communist aggression in the jungles of Vietnam; also be it

Resolved, That we thank our Government for its just and firm stand in refusing to recognize the Soviet aggression and occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and finally be it

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, to the Senators of the State of Wisconsin, the Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE and the Honorable GAYLORD NELSON, and the Congressman from the First Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin the Honorable LYNN STALBAUM.

Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966—H.R. 12410

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the House has passed the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. Based on the experience of the Nation with the results of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, the enactment of this new legislation should enrich greatly the human resources of this Nation. In addition, the action by the House expresses the philosophy that the Nation is grateful for the time and effort sacrificed by those who have shared the burden of providing for our physical security, often at extreme peril to themselves.

On the 20th anniversary of the GI bill of rights enacted in 1944, Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., then Administrator of Veterans' Affairs stated:

> Today we are a far stronger nation for the infusion of the skills manpower gained through the GI bill: 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses, 360,000 schoolteachers, 150,000 scientists, 243,000 accountants, 107,000 mechanics, 383,000 construction workers, 288,000 metalworkers, 138,000 electricians, and the almost 700,000 who trained for business and executive careers.
>
> Altogether, it was the largest program of mass adult education ever undertaken at bargain rates. The $14.5 billion cost has been more than recouped.
>
> The GI bill continues to pay for itself at close to $1 billion a year. The return comes from additional income tax paid by better educated, higher earning GI bill veterans.
>
> Equally beneficial has been the long-range effects of the GI bill loan program. Structural evidence of it dots the countryside. One out of every five homes built since the end of World War II was financed with a GI loan. As someone said, the landscape architect of postwar America has been the VA loan guarantee officer.
>
> More than 5,268,000 World War II veterans were granted Veterans' Administration home, farm, or business loans totaling more than $43 billion. The almost 5 million home loans in this total helped touch off a postwar housing boom that turned Americans into a nation of homeowners. This infusion of credit, of course, resulted in an enormous stimulus to our national economy. For purchases of new housing dilate the economic arteries. Purchases of new furniture, new appliances, and new cars follows; and school construction and other public works are not far behind as new suburban communities mushroom. (These are communities with good credit ratings, it might be said, for more than a third of the GI loans are paid in full.)

The potential stimulation of self-improvement in the areas of job training, advanced education, and home ownership resulting from the 1966 act hold similar promise for benefits to American veterans and to the development of the human resources of the Nation. This is not largesse; this is an investment in humanity, with a visible payoff in dollars and cents, and incalculably greater returns in the enrichment of lives and the nurturing of talent and competence.

It is my earnest hope that final action on this bill can be taken by the other body, and that the President will sign this into law as expeditiously as possible.

Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966—H.R. 12410

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, this bill recognizes what all of us and what the American people have known, that since the beginning of the Korean war we have been in a continuous global war against communism everywhere. It is impossible to say when it will end. This bill starts with 1955 and it is open-ended until this conflict is resolved.

The benefits of the bill have been discussed. There is a training program. While the on-the-job-training and farm training has been left out, there is available under this bill vocational training of any and every kind available to any veteran and any veteran has the right to go to any agricultural school in the United States of America or to go back to his high school if he has not finished high school and take an agricultural course. These do not make up the full programs that were in the original bill but it does offer as much opportunity for this training as the veteran wants to take advantage of. This bill was considered for a long time by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Many of us have introduced bills. I introduced one last year, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] introduced the first one back in 1955, immediately after the President had declared the Korean bill to be ineffective.

This bill has the unanimous support of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and of every single individual on the committee. It has the support, I am sure, of every veterans' organization in the United States.

It does not perhaps please every individual in every particular, but it is overall an excellent bill and one that should pass this House today.

Plenty of Fish in the Sea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I enclose herewith for reprint in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely article entitled "Plenty of Fish in the Sea?" by Martin Kane. It appeared in the January 31 issue of Sports Illustrated and effectively portrays a dangerous situation for sports fishermen.

The article follows:

PLENTY OF FISH IN THE SEA?

(By Martin Kane)

(Don't believe it. An ancient technique of commercial fishing has proved so efficient that sportsmen fear it will destroy big game fishing in a few years. Called long lining, and used on an enormous scale by the Japanese, the practice already has begun to deplete the world stock of tuna, marlin and swordfish.)

The world population of big game fishes—most notably swordfish, the marlins, sailfish, and the various tunas—is threatened with early decimation. A technique of commercial fishing that is centuries old but has been applied on a large scale only recently is ravaging the oceans. It is called long lining, and it is the subject of dismayed denunciation in every big game fishing port on the coastal perimeter of the United States, throughout the Caribbean, along the coast of Mexico, in Scandinavia, Australia, and New Zealand. It has sparked skirmishes between sport and commercial fishermen. It has alarmed marine scientists, most of whom concede its devastating effects as a matter of commonsense but urgently need funds to establish scientifically the precise extent of the harm it has done to fish populations already and what its continued untrammeled use portends. Objective of the research: international controls. To many a salt water angler the prospect that such controls can be instituted in time is dim.

Robert S. Nyburg, a Baltimore sport fisherman and advertising man who specializes in billfish, fears that "there may be no more salt water sport fishing in this country" by 1970. (If you think striped bass are a sport fish, Nyburg does not know you. He thinks in terms of bigger game.) "There is a real and present danger," Nyburg says, "that, unless some fast action is taken, there will be no more marlin, sailfish, giant tuna or broadbill fishing on either coast of the United States in a very few years."

At least equally alarmed is Ed Louys, executive secretary and director of the Caribbean Gamefishing Association.

"Soon there will be no fishing in the Caribbean," he said recently in Miami. "Commercial fishermen themselves told me this in Venezuela, in Trindad, in Jamaica—that, unless restrictions are placed on this fishing, they will be destroyed. Since the long lining thing came out we have been answering questions from hundreds of people asking what we should do, what can we do, to prevent overfishing."

Gerald Talbert, head of the Tiburon (Calif.), Marine Laboratory of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, believes that since the Japanese are by far the most extensive users of long lining, "our only hope is to appeal to the basic good nature and the sense of fair play among the Japanese people. If properly approached," he says, "I believe they would understand and withdraw from the sport-fishing area. So far as I know, no official protest has ever been entered."

Though there are others who hold that the only effective recourse would be a threat of economic sanctions in areas other than fishing. Talbert's view is by no means naive. The Japanese have been singularly cooperative in game-fish tagging programs aimed at understanding and eventual conservation of the fish involved and are more aware than any other national fishery of the excessive efficiency of long lining. But they do need enormous quantities of fish to supply the protein requirements of their national diet, as do many island peoples. To pose the importance of recreational fishing against the need may be difficult, but there is more to it than that. While long-line fishing has been profitable for them, their catches have begun to thin out under long-lining pressure and they might well be amendable to international controls if these were to be proposed with sound scientific backing.

Unfortunately, sound scientific backing does not exist. If sufficient research grants were available immediately, it might take 5 years or more to put together a persuasive argument of solid scientific validity. In 5 years, many sport fishermen believe, the whole matter may be tragically academic.

Long lining is as simple as it is ancient. Tie a line to the handle of a glass jug, add a hook and bait to the line and toss the jug over the side. As the jug drifts free, the bait will attract a fish. When a fish is hooked it pulls against the resistance of the jug and seemingly tries to drag it under. The jug always wins. The fish is inevitably exhausted. The fisherman recovers the jug and hauls in the fish.

Multiply that single hook by thousands and the glass jug by hundreds of glass-ball floats, all connected by surface lines that, strung together, may extend 10 miles or more, and you have long lining, the deadliest method of ocean fishing ever devised.

The long line's basic unit, called a basket because the line is coiled into baskets on deck, is a main line about 300 yards long, buoyed to the surface by float lines. Branch lines, to which baited hooks are attached, extend down into the water at variable depths. About 10 hooks are used for every 300 yards or so of main line. Baskets are connected one to another until a length of 10 miles or more may be reached. Adrift in a current, such a line has the effect of a wide broom sweeping the sea.

Tuna constitute 85 percent of the Japanese catch in Pacific waters, the remaining 15 percent being billfish. The boats put out individually and in fleets, some accompanied by a mother ship, aboard which the catch is processed and canned. There is one major fishing firm which operates two mother ships and 112 catcher boats, each of them long lining. At 10 miles to a line, though actually some lines are shorter, these 112 boats would represent 1,120 miles of fishing line in simultaneous operation.

Long-lining can deplete the sea itself. It has done just that in the Indian Ocean, which is the world's third largest and second deepest sea. Long-lining so drained it of yellowfin tuna—the catch dropped from 12 fish per 100 hooks set to about 5 per 100—that the Japanese all but quit fishing for them there. They switched to marlin and sailfish and in 1956 began to concentrate on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in ever-widening scope. Now the Japanese seem to be fishing themselves out of the Atlantic. With declining catches there, half the Japanese Atlantic fleet has been ordered back to Japan. The bankruptcy inherent in long-lining is being seen in the Pacific, too. According to the Sport Fishing Institute in Washington, "Marlin harvests by Japanese long-liners fishing off the Pacific coast of Central America" were poor in 1965—only three or four fish per boat, compared with catches of hundreds per boat in 1964. Average weight per fish was about two-thirds of what it used to be, a fact confirmed by sport fishermen, who note that along the Pacific Coast marlin once averaged 110 pounds and now are down to 60 or 70 pounds. Mexican resort owners, largely dependent on sport fishermen, are in a state of panic.

The Sport Fishing Institute, which is largely supported by tackle manufacturers and provides research grants for scientific institutions, observed in its November Bulletin that "bluefin tuna stocks in the Atlantic Ocean also may soon be in trouble." Not just long-lining but purse-seining threatens the Atlantic tuna population, to such an extent that O. V. Wells, Deputy Director General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, said last summer that "the rational utilization of tuna resources in the Atlantic Ocean requires urgent international attention." During 1962, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found, U.S. fishermen landed a mere 40,000 pounds of tuna at Middle Atlantic ports. Two years later the U.S. figure had jumped to 6 million pounds, and the fishery had become so attractive that purse seiners were moving in from as far away as the Pacific coast.

The Japanese are by no means the only long-liners. The Norwegians are in the Atlantic, off the U.S. coast, concentrating on sharks but getting a share of swordfish and other gamesters, too. Swedish sportsmen are decrying the fact that long-lining has begun to affect their salmon catch. Canada has some 250 vessels in the summer and 25 in the winter long-lining the Atlantic for swordfish, once taken mostly by harpoon as they lolled on the surface. The U.S. fishery has a score or so of long-lining vessels in the Atlantic, and these have been averaging 300 swordfish a trip during the peak fall season. Red China is long-lining, but no one knows to what extent, and the same is true of the U.S.S.R., which has just announced a new 5-year plan aimed at increasing its catch more than 50 percent. Cubans are long-lining for marlin. And the Spanish are at it, too.

But all these, separately and together, are minuscule in comparison with the Japanese operation. Its growth from 1956 to 1963 was astronomical. In 1956, when 164,000 hooks were set by the Japanese, they caught 7 metric tons of striped marlin (100 fish) and 50 metric tons of blue marlin (400 fish). By 1963 they had more than 50 million hooks out and took 8,236 metric tons of striped marlin (126,700 fish) and 9,413 metric tons of blue marlin (75,300 fish). Not to mention countless other billfish and tuna.

Today Japan has 625,935 persons engaged directly in the fishing industry, a decline *from the 790,000 so occupied in 1963.* The decline was due largely to the fact that expansion of Japanese industry and higher wages on land pulled many a fisherman away from the sea.

Japanese boats, ranging in size from 300 to 800 tons, fish through the south seas and deposit their catches in southeast Asia, then move on through the Indian Ocean to unload their next haul in Mediterranean ports. From the Mediterranean their course takes them into the South Atlantic, down through the Caribbean—some to the east coast of South America, others through the Panama Canal and out into the Pacific again, where they deposit their catches in Samoa before sailing back to Japan. This marketing system somewhat compromises the theory that the Japanese are seeking protein only for home consumption. Thirty percent of the fish taken by their wandering fleets, in fact, is sold to foreign countries.

Behind the explosive expansion of the long-line fishery is the development, in 1955, of the tuna hot dog, which has become widely popular in Japan. This sausage made possible the exploitation of the bigeye tuna, which had been held in low regard until then, the yellowfin and bluefin being preferred. Then the marlins began to be used for sausage and the billfish kill became a valuable adjunct to the tuna fishery. The Japanese also like marlin raw as sashimi, an appetizer. (North Americans seldom eat marlin, though it is esteemed in Latin America.)

Last year the Japanese fleets did not do too well, especially with tuna, but it is impossible to say whether the decline was due to overfishing, as sport fishermen insist, or changes in water temperature, available food and salinity, as some marine scientists suspect.

There is no reason to suppose that it was not both. There is every good reason to believe that overfishing, by purse seiners as well as long-liners, is the leading villain. The 1964 annual report of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission recalled that in 1962 Dr. Milner B. Schaefer, then its director of investigations, was able to assert that the maximum average equilibrium catch of yellowfin tuna would be in the vicinity of 183 million pounds. In other words, overfishing would begin at this point. The catch in 1959 was 145.4 million pounds, jumped sharply to 234.2 and 239.8 in 1960 and 1961 respectively, fell off for a couple of years, then rose again to 197.8 in 1964.

On the other hand, some few commercial fishermen, perhaps responding to long years of warfare with sport-fishing interests, profess to see no threat to the tuna-fishing industry from long-lining. One of these is August Felando, general manager of the American Tuna Boat Association in San Diego. Felando points out that the Japanese are primarily interested in bigeye tuna, which are deep swimmers and unimportant to either the U.S. commercial fishery or sport fishery. The yellowfin has become a secondary prize (20 percent of the total catch in the eastern Pacific), and bluefin tuna are only occasionally taken by the Japanese in the Pacific.

But Felando does concede that his association's boats see increasing numbers of Japanese long-liners fishing off the Mexican coast and that these are working primarily for swordfish and marlin.

Bruce Barnes and Bill Poole, partners in a San Diego charter-fishing operation, believe that the decline in the marlin catch out of San Diego during the 1965 season could well be attributed to the more extensive use of the long-line technique off the Mexican and Souh American coasts. In 1963 the confirmed count of marlin at San Diego docks was 1,500. In 1965 it had dropped to 400.

There is something approaching terror on the Atlantic side of the Mexican-Central American land strip.

"*This year (1965)* is the worst Jamaica has had," says Ed Louys. "In the blue-marlin tournament only five fish were caught and the biggest weighed 162 pounds. But a Japaneses vessel which needed medical attention for one of its crew put into Montego Bay in late September. It was loaded with blue marlin."

Sportsmen like Louys are not impressed by the fact that the Japanese and other long-liners are harvesting protein. The profits derived from sport fishing, they feel, are a source of life, too, for those engaged in boatbuilding, tacklemaking, resort maintenance and allied servicing of sport fishermen. In the United States alone, salt water sport fishermen spent $626,191,000 in 1960, according to the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Talbert notes that in 1960, 1.7 billion pounds of edible fish were caught commercially, but marine sport fishing brought in almost as much—1.4 billion pounds. So, say the sportsmen, their kind of fishing is a rich source of protein, too, and does not deplete the available stock.

But the high seas are free, whether they be considered to begin 3 miles, 12 miles, or 200 miles out from shore. Besides, it is not just coastal overfishing that threatens the sportsmen. The pelagic fish he most esteems are far-ranging wanderers, and it matters not a whit whether they are destroyed 5 miles out or 500.

Since no practical means of controlling the long-liners has yet been devised, or even proposed, a few frustrated sport fishermen have been taking matters into their own hands. Long-line sets have been destroyed in the Atlantic. Off Acapulco, sport fishermen, persistently wreaking havoc on long-lines off their coast, forced one Japanese vessel to abandon the area as too expensive. U.S. sport-fishing boats sailing off the shores of Baja California play a game called ocean skeet. They shatter the long-liners' glass buoys with shotguns.

The damage inflicted by such means is, of course, a mere nuisance and will have little or no effect on the enormous enterprise that long-lining has become. But when a Japanese long-liner ran aground last September on the southernmost tip of Baja California gleeful Mexican fishermen indulged in soul-satisfying fantasies to account for the wreck and take credit for it.

The 350-ton vessel crashed onto a reef about 2 a.m. The 18 men aboard all got ashore safely. Some commercial and sport fishermen went aboard and found the boat equipped with the very latest in navigational and fish-finding equipment, from radar to sonar. Stacked in her freezer locker below decks were an estimated 140 tons of tuna, 40 tons of marlin, and an unknown quantity of shark meat, in addition to dolphin, wahoo, and sailfish.

How to account for the wreck? The Mexicans wink and tell any of a number of stories:

1. Mexican fishermen turned off the light in the lighthouse. (Ah, but with all that electronic gear a modern vessel does not bother with lighthouses.)

2. They turned off the light and set up another light atop a high cliff to lead the Japanese astray. (But the radar would have indicated the huge landmass—cliffs several hundred feet high on the beach—behind the Judas light.)

3. Long-line sets are equipped with transistorized homing buoys that send out a signal to guide the fishing boat to where the sets have drifted. The Mexicans took one such buoy and put it on the beach. (This one is more ingenious than plausible. The Japanese navigational gear again would have foiled the plot.)

What hope is there, since even the wishful cleverness of Mexican wreckers is no match for the vast Japanese fleet? One theory, not very attractive, is that overfishing will solve *itself.*

"In some ways long-lining may be considered self-limiting," says Frank J. Mather III, associate scientist at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution and himself a sport fisherman. "When the catch declines enough it becomes unprofitable. I think there is cause for concern but don't know what can be done. Agreement among all the nations involved would be very difficult."

"We know the extent of long-lining," Mather says, "but we have no idea of the size of fish populations." Such knowledge would be essential to the establishment of meaningful international controls, but it simply is not there to be laid on the bargaining table.

There is unanimity among marine scientists that research is a sine qua non of international controls.

"We are getting more and more letters from Congressmen inquiring about long-lining," says Albert H. Swartz, Assistant Chief of the Division of Fishery Research of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. "Some people are advocating an extensive research program. Others are talking about an international convention—but there are no facts to bring to it. A research program would take about 5 years before we could go to the Japanese regarding conservation measures."

Swartz made a point that sport fishermen and their associations might consider.

"Until now," he said, "international conventions have always been on food fish. The sport fishery has never been represented. Now sport fishing should be represented. The International Game Fishing Association should have a voice."

It should indeed. And so should all sport fishermen, organized or unorganized, who know the names and addresses of their Congressmen, who, in turn, might well be persuaded to initiate preliminary negotiations with the Japanese while a crash research program is under way. The extent of this crisis cannot wait for precise scientific determination. The commonsense evidence is plentiful now. At this juncture the need for controls is clear. In the long run, controls need not deprive the Japanese of their protein supply. They could, in fact, preserve it.

Edward W. Allen recently was chairman of an international meeting which sought, unsuccessfully, to institute new controls on fishing in the north Pacific. Though he spoke in another context, in a statement to the conference he may have suggested the theme for a preliminary meeting of world sport-fishing associations and the leading fishing nations. He put it this way:

"Ocean fisheries should not be deemed to exist merely for the benefit of [commercial] fishermen and cannery operators, but should be considered to be a great trust for the benefit of humanity."

U.S. Space Program Chalked After 1970

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an article by Neal Stanford in the Christian Science Monitor, January 18, discusses the recent report of the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences completed at the request of the White House on post-Apollo programs. This study clearly outlines the need not only for our efforts in space in the 1970's but makes a strong case for sufficient Earth-based effort to supplement our space effort. This brief article by Mr. Stanford identifies well several of the most promising opportunities for our national space program following the lunar landing in this decade. The article follows:

U.S. SPACE PROGRAM CHALKED AFTER 1970

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—The American space program is outlined until 1970, when it is to put men on the moon.

While there is a lot of talk and speculation about what the United States does after that in space, there is no official program, no announced goal.

The first step toward nailing down a specific space program for the post-Apollo years, running from 1970 to 1985, has been taken now.

The Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences, at the request of the White House, has come up with a long list of projects and given them priorities.

Top priority goes to unmanned exploration of Mars.

Next comes detailed investigation of the lunar surface.

Third is unmanned exploration of Venus.

EARTH-BASED STUDY STRESSED

Then comes investigation of other major planets, comets, asteroids, and interplanetary dust.

This program is not too different from what has been expected, and from what probably will be approved. But what the space science board has done now is propose 50 different specific space investigations for the post-Apollo years, and explain why these have been chosen.

The report takes issue with certain present policies and premises on space research and exploration.

It suggests that earth-based studies of the planets and solar system must not be neglected just because man now has a means of making deep-space probes. It says with some sharpness: "There is great concern over the gap between present programs in ground-based observation of the planetary system and what could be done with existing facilities."

In other words: Don't do in space what can be done more cheaply on earth.

QUESTIONS OUTLINED

Here are some of its proposals and recommendations for this period:

Launching an orbiting planetary observatory.

More observation of planets through ground-based telescopes.

Landing a Martian capsule early in the 1970's.

Putting life-detection experiments in early landers on planets, even though they have a low chance of success.

The report makes pertinent points about various space programs:

Mars: The purpose is not only to look for existence of life on Mars, but to see if it geographically has a core, a mantle, a crust; not just study volcanic activity, but determine whether Mars came from the same chemical crucible as the Earth.

Moon: The moon should be mapped both from lunar orbit and then from landings and traverses. It is important to know such a simple thing as how a handful of moon dust would distribute itself if allowed to fall back.

Venus: It is possible scientists have been too hasty in accepting the assumption from radiation measurements that the surface temperature is too high to support life. Such heat could come from nonthermal sources, and low temperatures could exist at the summit of the high mountain ranges. Also some form of life could even develop in suspension in the dense atmosphere.

This is only the first of three reports the space science board is making on space research directions for the future.

There is no question but that there will be a space program after 1970. This first report tries to suggest what it will—or should—look like.

Lutz Cabinet Co., a Wyoming Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, Americans have always taken pride in the recitation of a single man's success in our free enterprise system. An integral part of our culture is the firm and abiding belief that our economic system offers each man an opportunity to seek a better way of life through dedication, hard work, and a continuing faith in our Nation's potential.

This lesson is all the more valuable when it demonstrates that there are still developing markets in our Nation that offer great rewards to men of these aspirations. Wyoming is such a place, with abundant natural resources, reserves of trained manpower, an excellent transportation system, amidst an area of well-to-do consumers.

I am proud today to call attention to the achievements of a friend of many years, Louis Lutz of Laramie, Wyo. Beginning as a carpenter in Laramie, Mr. Lutz recognized Wyoming's potential and pursued his career in Laramie, ultimately building one of Wyoming's fastest growing industries. His cabinet company, founded in 1949, now represents an investment of over $300,000, employing 25 persons. It is Wyoming's largest wood milling shop and one of the largest custom furniture producers in the Rocky Mountains.

The following article from Wyoming Progress Reports, a monthly publication of the Wyoming Natural Resource Board, explains Mr. Lutz' good cause for faith in Wyoming's growing ability to sustain profitable industrial ventures. I recommend his philosophy to those who seek a promising and profitable career in the great undeveloped markets of the Rockies.

The article follows:

One of Wyoming's fastest growing businesses recently occupied a new plant in Laramie, representing an investment of more than $300,000.

Lutz Cabinet Co., the State's largest wood milling shop, began operations at its new 26,000-square-foot facility late in 1965, signaling the latest achievement in a proud growth record.

Louis Lutz, a native of Laramie, founded Lutz Cabinet Co. in 1949 as a small-scale operation. The company now employs 25 persons and is among the largest custom furniture producers in the Rocky Mountain region.

The firm does not manufacture furniture for the general market. Its products are custom built for specific contract purposes. For example, work is currently underway on a $500,000 contract to supply dormitory furniture for the University of Wyoming in Laramie.

Major supply sources for the company are the East (for birch and oak) and the Pacific Northwest (for plywood).

Lutz Cabinet Co.'s principal product is cabinet work for Laramie area contractors on such projects as apartments and residential developments. In recent years, the company has broadened its base of operations with the receipt of many contracts for college dormitories, hospitals, and State institutions. For these projects, Lutz Cabinet Co. produces drawers, wardrobe units, and desks.

As an added feature of its operations, the firm designs many of its products and much of its equipment, enlisting the assistance of University of Wyoming specialists as consultants on specific projects.

Lutz cites several advantages of his Laramie location. Transportation facilities—both truck and rail—are excellent. In addition, the Laramie area offers an abundance of skilled labor. The firm's proximity to its growing market facilitates shipping of the highly finished company product.

Within a 150-mile radius of Laramie are the University of Wyoming, Colorado State University, Colorado State College, Colorado School of Mines, University of Colorado, Denver University, and several junior colleges—comprising an excellent market for Lutz Cabinet Co.'s products in Wyoming, Colorado, and Nebraska.

Finally, Lutz credits the Laramie area's highly favorable business climate with helping the growth and prosperity of his company.

The Future Farmers of America—Guardians of the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, our country is once again preparing to celebrate the birthday of our first President. Americans, throughout the land will pause on that day, February 22, and pay due tribute to the splendid and unselfish genius of his great man who gave so much of himself and his talents in his efforts to establish and sustain this then fledgling young Nation. History records George Washington as a leader in many fields and certainly not the least of his accomplishments were in the area of agriculture. At heart, George Washington was a farmer and recognizing this, a group of America's finest young men have selected the week of his birthdate as their national week. I am speaking of the Future Farmers of America who will observe their 38th anniversary the week of February 19 to February 26.

I am sincere when I speak of the Future Farmers of America as a group of this Nation's finest young men. At home, in the Second District of Kentucky, one cannot but be aware of the very strong and the very positive influence that the members of this organization exert in their homes and in their communities. I know of no group that commands more respect or receives more wholehearted support than our Future Farmers and I am sure this is true not only in our section of Kentucky, but across the board expanse of our country.

Thirty-eight years ago, some high school students in Kansas City, Mo., believed in the future of farming. They formed a new organization—an organization for farm boys—and employed this belief in their creed. Their faith has been justified, for it was then as it is now—farming is the backbone and the heart of agriculture.

It was in 1928 that these boys first met and set forth their ideals and goals. The outgrowth of their meeting has been a national organization, the Future Farmers of America, with more than 454,516 active members in 9,156 local chapters. This membership is distributed throughout our 50 States and Puerto Rico. Operating under the provisions of the National Vocational Education Acts, it has become an educational, nonprofit, and nonpolitical farm youth movement and has as its aim and purpose the development of agricultural leadership, of citizenship, and of patriotism.

As our great Nation has expanded its growth and power, as our population has increased, and America, in its compassion for the hungry of the world has increased its foreign commitments, so too have the Future Farmers of America augmented their program to meet these new demands upon our agricultural resources. Vocational Agriculture now embraces the study of science, technology, and management. The American farm and American farmworkers remain the center link in our present agricultural system. Servicing and supplying these 7 million people are some 6 million workers. In the third and final link, an additional 10 million handle and process our abundant farm produce. Agriculture, in a sense, has become agribusiness.

To those who love the land, however, agriculture is more than a career—more than a business. It is a very rich and rewarding way of life. The dreams of forefathers are nurtured and harvested and the good earth is replenished with hope for the farmers of tomorrow to tend. A farm is a masterpiece of nature and a symbol of the eternal bond between man and soil.

I salute the Future Farmers of America upon their 38th anniversary. A great trust is their and I wish for them a future of even greater achievement.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Pete Hamill, who is reporting on the war in Vietnam for the New York Post, has been writing a series of articles from that region which shows great insight into the nature of the struggle. I include the fourth article in the series which was published on February 10. I especially want to call to the attention of my colleagues his two concluding sentences:

> If anything at all is clear about this confused war, it is that its roots are political. Ultimately, its solution will be political too.

The article follows:

VIETNAM: THE ENDLESS WAR—ARTICLE IV: THE MILITARY STRUGGLE

(By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—The correspondents who were there still remember the last terrible days of the French in what was then known as Indochina. Every evening in that spring of 1954, the bars of Hanoi would grow emptier. The young French officers would toast each other with champagne, sing gay, brave songs, and then fly off in the morning, heading 180 miles to the west for a town in the valley of the Namyoum River called Dien Bien Phu.

The young men would leave in groups of 50 or 60 in those first days of the 57-day siege; then in groups of 30 or less; and at the end, one or two at a time. The music in the Hanoi bars played to empty rooms. The prostitutes walked home alone. The customers of both were off being slaughtered.

And while those thousands of young men were again proving that France produces the bravest soldiers and the worst generals of any modern nation, while they were being shot down like trapped animals in that valley without exits, the French military kept lying. The war was not finished, they told visiting correspondents, no matter what happened at Dien Bien Phu. Small military gains were being made in the Red River Valley. The Vietminh were getting discouraged. The pacification program was spreading like oil on water through the countryside.

The Vietminh were resorting to terror in the collection of troops and the peasantry was abandoning the cause. It was all related in careful, rational tones, and all of it was nonsense.

On May 7, 1954, Dien Bien Phu was overrun, by the forces of Vietminh Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap; the next day, the Geneva Convention opened and the colonial empire France had fought so bravely and stupidly to retain was finished. Today, the second part of that war continues, though the names of most of the players have changed. In what Bernard Fall describes as the second Indochina war, the old hands have a distinct sense of deja vu.

"There are some crucial differences between the French phase of the war and the American phase," one veteran American journalist told me several weeks ago. "For one thing, the French were fighting to stay in a colony; we're fighting to get out. We have overwhelming air power and, with the helicopters, more flexibility. Despite the peace movement, we don't have anything like that antiwar feeling in France at the time of the war, which choked off supplies and needed manpower; the French after all had a large, powerful Communist Party. But in other ways, it seems to me we're making a hell of a lot of the same mistakes."

Even some of the American politicians admit that host of our mistakes to date have been political; but they also feel that we are in danger of making some of the same military mistakes.

"Our greatest weakness here is the ARVN," one American military man told me. (The initials are for Army of the Republic of Vietnam.) "If they were doing their job, we wouldn't be here. We could stand off like the Chinese are doing, give them the guns and let them do the fighting. But even though they are individually brave, they are lousy as an army."

There are about 250,000 troops in the South Vietnamese Army and some units perform well. Others are a hopeless grabbag. One unit I visited in the Mekong Delta was made up of 250 fighting men and 750 women and children, all dependents of the soldiers. It is rather difficult to get a soldier to desert the warmth of his family bed at 3 in the morning to do battle with the Vietcong. Desertions continue to bleed the army of its stability. The pay is abysmally low—$20 a month for a private, or about what a prostitute earns in an hour on Saigon's Tu Do Street.

Few ARVN soldiers have any respect at all for the commanders, most of whom seem more interested in turning their weapons on the latest Saigon government than in fighting the Vietcong. In addition, the Vietnamese Army is riddled with Vietcong agents, to the point that some American outfits refuse to work on operations with them. "It's impossible to plan a large operation with them," one Marine colonel said. "By the time we get to where we want to go, the Vietcong are gone. It's like a cop from the vice squad working for Lucky Luciano."

An even more serious problem is that most of the Vietnamese officers have been trained by either the French or the Americans. Their military thinking runs along conventional lines. The Australians—some of whom are most caustic about American military strategy—say that the Vietnamese would be great soldiers in some open flat field in the south of France, but that they still don't understand jungle warfare.

"In this kind of war," one Australian officer who had served in New Guinea said, "you have to slide up on your man and cut his throat. You don't come barging in like a horde of bloody elephants, letting him know you're coming."

(The Australians, by the way, rate the Americans third in the jungle warfare league. "The Japanese were best, because they used the jungle; the Australians were second, because they learned to live with the jungle; Americans—they remove the jungle.")

The French thought they could hold Indochina with strings of forts from which they could strike with some sort of mobility; but the Viet Minh controlled all of the countryside, had the support of most of the peasantry, and knocked off each fort with brutal efficiency until at Dienbienphu, they knocked off the biggest fort of them all.

Many observers feel we are doing the same thing. Our position at Da Nang, Anh Khe, Bien Hoa, Pleiku, and Nha Trang are reasonably well defended (though the Vietcong slipped through two regiments of Vietnamese to mortar Bien Hoa a year ago, and managed to blast the Da Nang airstrip a few weeks ago). The Americans, because of the kind of warfare they are waging, must have these bases. Unfortunately, they control no more of the countryside than the French did. When I asked to visit the battlefield of the Ia Drang Valley where, last November, we took heavy losses, and killed almost 2,000 Vietcong, I was laughed at. "Unless you can find a spare battalion around here," I was told, "forget it."

So we are killing Vietcong, but regaining very little territory for the Vietnamese Government we are fighting for. In some areas, such as the Mekong Delta, we have less territory under Government control than we had 18 months ago.

Gen. William C. Westmoreland is in charge of the American military effort here. Like Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in World War II he finds himself spending almost as much time in the airy sphere of diplomacy, soothing the wounded egos of other military men, as he does in fighting the war.

Unlike Eisenhower, though, Westmoreland doesn't even have the luxury of a unified command. In theory at least he must ask permission from the Vietnamese generals before moving his men into battle. And for reasons stated above this is often not in his best interests. Too often in this war, large, expensive military operations are pulled on empty valleys. One operation last year resulted in a net kill of 28 water buffaloes. No one could determine whether they were Vietcong sympathizers.

In certain ways, Westmoreland is representative of the entire American effort here. For one thing, he looks like a general. He is lean of jaw, steely of gaze, with fierce black eyebrows that John Ford's makeup men would have a hard time inventing. He doesn't smoke, seldom drinks, and utters only an occasional "dag nabbit" when upset. To some of those working with him, he is still the Eagle Scout he once was.

"Westmoreland is a very nice guy," one American political expert says, "but I don't think he understands much about evil. He wants his men to be gentlemen, noble warriors preserving freedom for an imperiled country. They should be out cutting throats."

Most homefront heroes cannot understand why a war in a small country like Vietnam should be giving a great power like the United States so much trouble. They believe we should blow up Hanoi or Haiphong, drop our nuclear weapons and blast the Communists off the map. (It is interesting that the atom bomb advocates are always willing to drop the bomb on Asians; it is doubtful they would drop it if this war were being fought in Sweden.)

The American military men understand some of the folly of these arguments. For one thing, Saigon is the hostage for Hanoi. If our bombers took out Hanoi—no simple matter, since it is conceded that the Communist capital has more formidable antiaircraft facilities than wartime Berlin—the Communists could take out Saigon in 3 days. Their supporters could blow up most major facilities, hotels, and the communications and sewer systems; if Haiphong goes the Saigon River could be bottled up with a few well-placed mines and mortar fire could wreak havoc at Ton Son Nhut airport.

So the strategy has become relatively simple. The military must operate on the theory that no peace will be negotiated. Starting from that point they believe that for the next several years an all-out war of attrition must be waged against main-force Vietcong and North Vietnamese units.

While the Americans and the best Vietnamese units are waging that kind of war (it will require at least another 200,000 Americans), the Vietnamese Popular Forces and regional militia units will have to deal with the guerrilla units in the countryside. Keep the pressure on, and the guerrilla war will simply peter out. The lowest time estimate for accomplishing all this is 7 years.

A lot of people have severe doubts about this strategy. It echoes the French methods, and denies the fact that large-scale operations too frequently result in the deaths of the very peasantry the government is supposed to be winning over.

Probably the only hope of winning lies with the kind of pacification program being run under the direction of Gen. Lewis Walt and his marines out of Da Nang. The marines have been treated harshly by some critics because they have not gone out and killed as many people as possible. But Walt understands the futility of battles like that of the Ia Drang in which great numbers are killed and the government still cannot walk back in. His men have been working quietly, with some efficiency, village by village.

It would be unfortunate if the Marine Corps alumni association forces them to give up and go back to all-out assault. If anything at all is clear about this confused war, it is that its roots are political. Ultimately, its solution will be political too.

Marine Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is ever-increasing interest and discussion on the future of our great maritime industry. The technological aspects of it are of particular concern to us all.

It was with a great deal of interest when I read the remarks of Adm. John Harllee, U.S. Navy, retired, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, before the Transportation Association of America's National Transportation Institute on January 12, 1966, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City.

His remarks follow, and I commend them to the attention of the Congress:

REMARKS OF ADM. JOHN HARLLEE, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, BEFORE THE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA'S NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE ON JANUARY 12, 1966, AT THE WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL IN NEW YORK CITY

These are exciting times in the marine transportation industry and unquestionably one of the most exciting phases is the new impetus in containerization which could achieve a technological revolution in ocean transportation.

But, while the year ahead will unquestionably see the first manifestations of transatlantic containerization it might be years before the full impact of this new type of shipping service is felt by the industry.

Before containerization arrives full blown, we at the Federal Maritime Commission must reexamine and reassess our governing statutes, the rules and transportation principles enunciated thereunder, and our body of case law, all formulated under traditional concepts of break-bulk service, and determine whether they meet future transportation needs and whether, in their present form they are equal to the task of providing regulatory guidance and assistance to steamship operators and protection to the prospective users of containerized ocean transportation.

As you know, the transatlantic steamship trade is one of our most important, whether it be viewed in terms of the number of vessels committed to it, the type of cargo moving, the volume of that cargo or its value. Today the carriers in that trade operate services largely indistinguishable from those existing when the Shipping Act was passed in 1916. That is changing fast and within the next few years the trade may become unrecognizable. Within that time at least four major U.S.-flag carriers and four foreign-flag carriers will inaugurate integrated container service with significant numbers of high speed vessels between the United States and northern Europe. Most of these vessels expect to load and discharge containers on a lift-on, lift-off basis, but some may be designed for roll-on, roll-off operations. This technological revolution has been long in coming to our foreign trade and should be welcomed not only by this Nation and its trading partners in Europe but also by the shippers and consignees engaged in that trade.

The need for high-speed container service in the transatlantic trades is manifest. Obviously, operators of containerized vessels will continue to be confronted by operational and labor problems. There is also the problem of international trade rivalries. While the United States may feel it has the advantage of a head start there is every indication that foreign-flag interest in containerization is accelerating. All in all, however, the prospects for the success of containerized service in this and other trades appear encouraging. The capital required to move these new vessels from the drawing boards to the berth is staggering. We should tender a hearty well done to all those steamship companies who intend to participate in this venture to so dramatically improve service. Containerziation should bring benefits to carriers and shippers alike and make a substantial contribution toward achieving the national goal of expanding our foreign trade.

The full impact of the operational changes that will be forthcoming from containerization of the transatlantic trade cannot be evaluated until we have had actual experience with this method of ocean transport. Nevertheless, prudence and commonsense dictate that we make preparations now for what is coming. The Federal Maritime Commission and the other agencies who regulate transportation must reevaluate their regulatory programs on the basis of what is about to happen rather than what happened yesterday. We do know that containerization will bring changes in more than the physical features of the vessels involved. We do know that the maximum efficiencies of containerized service can be realized only when the containers are loaded at inland points, where most of the cargo originates, and are tendered for delivery at inland points of destination. We know that containerization has encouraged the through movement of goods and that this trend will be greatly accelerated when containerized service is fully established in the transatlantic trades. The carriers have been attempting to comply with existing legislation by segmenting the charges for the service they perform by filing with various regulatory agencies those applicable segments of the through rates. For example, motor carriers file with the Interstate Commerce Commission rates covering the portion of the haul in the United States. Under present rules those carriers must file with the Federal Maritime Commission their port-to-port rates based on the theory that they are non-vessel-owning common carriers by water in foreign commerce. That portion of the haul occurring within the foreign country is not required to be filed anywhere. When such transportation involves air carriers they must file a portion of the through rate with the Civil Aeronautics Board and their port-to-port rates with the Federal Maritime Commission.

This type of segmented rate regulation may be unwieldy, time consuming, costly, and of marginal utility to both shippers and carriers. A single factor through rate filed with a single governmental entity may be more conducive to an effective transportation system. Perhaps a joint board similar to the one proposed by the Federal Maritime Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Civil Aeronautics Board to exercise jurisdiction over through rates in certain of our domestic offshore trades should be expanded to include our foreign trades. Matters such as these have been under continuing study by the chairmen of all three of the major transportation regulatory agencies and we intend to maintain this liaison. However, neither a joint board nor the respective staffs of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, or Federal Maritime Commission can effectively deal with these problems unless we receive the counsel, advice, and cooperation of the carriers involved and the users of their services. We need to know more precisely the types of services contemplated, the problems both operational and regulatory that are envisaged by the carriers and the shippers, and most important the views of all concerned as to how the joint efforts of the Government transportation regulators can be utilized to accommodate carriers and shippers alike while maintaining the protection of the public interest.

We must also direct our efforts to find answers to these problems which are likely to arise from major containerization problems:

Will containerization bring changes in traditional rate patterns and rate structures?

Will containerization change the method of pricing transportation service?

For instance, under containerization will pricing relate more to the movement of the container rather than to its contents?

Will "freight all kinds" rates be available in these services?

Can a single bill of lading with a single factor rate be utilized to cover the through movement of goods from an inland point, across the ocean and then to another inland point?

Will containerization reduce the need for the proliferation of shipping documents that are now necessary to move cargo from an inland point in the United States to an inland point in Europe?

Will containerization permit simplifications of the shipping documents that will be required?

What effect will containerization have on independent ocean freight forwarders and nonvessel owning common carriers now regulated by the Federal Maritime Commission?

Containerization will obviously bring manifold changes in the method of loading and unloading vessels. What effect will these technological changes have on traditional terminal operations? Indeed, considering the heavy capital outlays that will be required to adapt present terminal facilities to containerization will it be possible for the lines to operate such facilities at all ports presently being served? If not, will it mean that certain ports will have the benefits of containerization and others will not? More important perhaps is the question of whether containerization will draw substantial amounts of cargo from ports where such service is unavailable. If this is so, will it be consistent with the public interest and compatible with sound transportation policy?

Is it feasible to move all types of general cargo in containers? If not, what accommodations will be made for moving such items?

Will containerized vessels attract only the highway paying cargoes? If so, what will happen to those operators of modern yet conventional vessels who will be relegated to the carriage of low paying cargo?

How are the regulatory agencies to police such malpractices as misdeclaration of freight, misweighing, and rebating? Which agency will have jurisdiction over these matters? Who is to be held responsible for these practices, the shipper, the freight forwarder, the non-vessel-owning common carrier, the inland carrier, or the ocean carrier? Fortunately, the Federal Maritime Commission with the cooperation of the Interstate Commerce Commission has embarked on a compliance program on containerized freight moving in our domestic offshore trades. We are hopeful that that program when adequately tested will serve as a model for similar programs in foreign trades.

I would be less than candid if I pretended to know the answers to all the questions raised here. But I intend to do my part in preparing myself and the staff of the Federal Maritime Commission to be in a better position in the days ahead to come to grips with these problems and others, and if possible to formulate rational and effective responses. I know my colleagues at the Interstate Commerce Commission and Civil Aeronautics Board join me in these pursuits. Time is one of the luxuries seldom enjoyed by a regulatory agency. Usually, we are required to react to a crisis already in being. Here we are confronted with a grand opportunity to lay plans for a revolutionary change in the techniques of transportation. But we cannot wait too long or this problem too will be upon us.

Every regulatory program should have a purpose and I can assure this audience and those with whom the Federal Maritime Commission deals more directly that if our programs are found purposeless in the light of changing transportation conditions they will be promptly reevaluated. When our programs and policies no longer serve to protect those involved in ocean transportation from the evils the Shipping Act was designed to eliminate the Federal Maritime Commission will act promptly. It is essential that technological advances in transportation not be hamstrung and frustrated by governmental policies which have no place in a modern transportation system.

I solicit your assistance and advice as to how the Federal Maritime Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board can effectively discharge their regulatory responsibilities in the technological challenges we all await. The information and assistance you are able to provide regarding this new concept of transportation may be determinative of whether we spend our time wisely.

Misdirected Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, too often the Congress and the Federal Government are unfairly criticized for assuming legitimate responsibilities in meeting the needs of our people.

When editorial praise for a controversial Federal service occurs, it is an occasion to be noted. For this reason, I request to be inserted in the RECORD at this point, the following editorial from the February 12 edition of the Sheboygan, Wis., Press:

MISDIRECTED CRITICISM

The forthcoming meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which opens a 4-day session at Las Vegas Monday, is a timely reminder that the rural electrification program in this country is approaching its 30th birthday with a becoming maturity.

In the present era, it is difficult to recall that as recently as 1935 only about 10 percent of the Nation's farms were receiving electric service. The inability of private industry to extend electric service in those days led to the passage of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. This measure promoted farm electrification through low-interest Government loans. As a result, today more than 98 percent of the country's farms have some sort of electrification.

Despite this worthy accomplishment, the REA unfortunately is constantly being made the whipping boy by ultraconservatives and disgruntled politicians. They attack the Rural Electrification Administration program as another form of Federal bureaucracy that is creating unfair competition for private industry.

Such criticism is unfair. Should the Federal Government be criticized for stepping in and meeting a need that obviously should be met? Certainly the Nation has benefited by the Government's rural electrification program. Perhaps there were good reasons why private industry was not able to extend its services in the 1930's. But that does not mean that the necessity for rural electrification could be overlooked or indefinitely delayed.

When private industries or individual States fail to function to provide a necessary public service, the Federal Government inevitably steps in to meet the need.

Shortage of Technicians a Problem for All of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, improved and expanded vocational and technical education is vital to the continued growth of our economy. The United States—indeed, the world—is faced with a gigantic rebuilding task, and this can be successfully accomplished only with the assistance of thousands of new technicians.

This is a problem in which I am vitally interested. Last year, I sponsored the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965. I had the honor of seeing this act become Public Law 89-287. This is one step and one approach toward providing more technicians to our workforce.

The problem in general is being vigorously approached by the U.S. Office of Education's Division of Vocational and Technical Education, under the direction of Assistant Commissioner Dr. Walter M. Arnold. A training program on the vast scale envisioned, however, can only be successful if there is close cooperation between all parties concerned—Government, educational institutions, and private industry.

This point is brought out effectively in a stimulating article, based in large part on statements made by Dr. Arnold, which appeared this month in Testing World, a magazine published by Soiltest, Inc., long a pioneer in the use of electronic methods in subsurface investigations and quality control of construction work generally.

It is a pleasure to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WE CAN TRAIN TECHNICIANS NOW

Although there is still a serious shortage of technicians in civil engineering and other engineering and science fields, it should be possible now to solve this problem if we can see it not as a problem just for educators but for all of us—employers, businessmen, government officials, and students alike. This, plainly stated, is the belief of Dr. Walter M. Arnold, Assistant Commissioner and Director, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Department of Health Education, and Welfare.

The solution to the technician shortage is now possible, says Dr. Arnold, because of new Federal vocational education legislation and the joint Federal-State vocational education and training programs this legislation makes possible. In short, the money is available. Now, the people must use it.

STEPS TO VOCATIONAL PROGRESS

The money, the legislation, the programs for educating and training technicians and others in vocational fields did not come easily or quickly. Attempts to meet the Nation's vocational education needs have come in gradual stages, through the years.

Step by step we have pursued the solution to the vocational education problem with new laws, new provisions, but always the ultimate solution has seemed illusive. If we have met the needs for vocational education in one field, then needs in another field have developed. And gradually, in recent years, a great need has been mounting for more and more technicians. It is reassuring for our faith in the democratic method, however, that as the problems of technician and other vocational education have grown more serious and complex, our national solutions have become more ingenious and now, it is believed, ultimately successful.

The major steps toward vocational education progress began with the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, which provided $7.2 million to the States for vocational programs, and range forward to the Higher Education Act of 1965, which gives financial aid for work at the college and university level.

WHAT EMPLOYERS CAN DO

Clearly the legislation exists now to do this job of education. But just as clearly, says Dr. Arnold, "vocational educators cannot carry this new and tremendous burden alone." What is needed is the help of employers, the Nation's businessmen. Says Walter F. Carey, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

"The businessman is the key element in this whole education picture. Far better than any educator or government administrator, he is in a position to know what his company's manpower requirements will be for the next 5 years, the next 10 years."

And yet at the same time the businessman himself often is impeded in playing his full potential role in the education and employment of technicians. Dr. Arnold comments:

"The character effectiveness and economic value of capable technicians is still not universally appreciated in American industry * * *. Some employers have never had a chance to hire a really good technician, much less appreciate him." The probable cause for this situation, Dr. Arnold reasons, is the limited number of schools training highly competent technicians combined with the ready employment of these graduates by the relatively few firms near to the schools.

THE NEED, THE LEGISLATION

This short supply and restricted employment of technicians in past years was one of several causes which has contributed to the overall national technician problem—and its solution.

Some of these causes have grown more intense and others have developed anew during the great period of national growth since World War II. Taken together they have produced the push that in turn produced the surge of corrective Federal and State legislation of the late 1950's and the 1960's from the beginning of the decade to the present.

The national need for technicians is further indicated in Dr. Arnold's enumeration of conditions that he says led directly to Congress enacting title VIII of the National Defense Education Act of 1958:

"First of all, the highly skilled technician was becoming an increasingly essential part of the scientific and management team in modern scientific research, development, production, and services. The team is composed of professional scientists, engineers, specially trained technicians supervisors, and skilled production or laboratory workers.

"Second, technicians are in short supply. The ratio of technicians to scientists or engineers is usually less than 1 to 1, but there is need for two or more technicians to support each engineer or professional scientist.

"Third, * * * the explosion of scientific knowledge (has been) creating changes in scientific education so that the professional scientist or engineer (has) received little laboratory experience. Thus, a vacuum (has developed) in the area of applied laboratory knowledge which (has) had to be filled by highly skilled technicians."

To cope with these interrelated factors the Federal Government, in the past few years, has moved to vastly improve American vocational education, including the education and training of technicians.

AUDIOVISUAL AND OTHER METHODS

One of the key areas in which the new education laws effectively help technical education is in the research and development of new techniques, methods, and materials for teaching.

The intent here is to educate and train technicians more efficiently by developing and using new teaching aids such as the Soiltest, Inc., 35-millimeter training film strips. Other provisions are made for research and development of programed learning techniques.

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 covered specifically the construction of facilities for public and nonprofit colleges, authorizing $1.2 billion for this purpose. Of this total, 22 percent is earmarked for public community colleges and public technical institutes, institutions which offer numerous vocational courses.

FIGURES TELL THE RESULTS

These have been the plans, the new laws, the techniques aimed at producing enough technicians and other vocational workers to meet the needs of the United States which has grown from 140 million population at the end of World War II to 200 million in just two decades. The needs of other nations in the world are comparable.

The results can be seen in some simple statistics, as explained by Dr. Arnold:

"For many years (prior to the new laws) the number of new technicians formally prepared to work with physical scientists and engineers had been limited to about 16,000 graduates of a relatively few publicly supported institutions and a number of private nonprofit technical institutes. Studies of physical sciences and related engineering fields indicate a need for at least 100,000 new technicians each year."

How close is the United States coming to these goals? Is the Nation meeting its needs for the technically educated?

Since 1958, when the NDEA was passed, some 63,000 new technicians have completed training under the provisions of the act.

Enrollment of full-time students in technical education programs swelled from 20,000 in 1958 to 102,000 in the 1964–65 school year. Total enrollment, both full time and part time, has grown from about 94,000 in 1958 to about 250,000 in the 1964–65 school year. Of these, 148,000 were employed adults in upgrading and refresher courses.

The number of schools offering technician training has grown from 260 at the beginning of NDEA in 1958 to nearly 1,000 in 1965.

The Nation, it is apparent, has recognized its need for educating technicians. It is beginning to meet these needs.

"We are all in this endeavor together," says Dr. Walter M. Arnold. "* * * Leaders in industry and in vocational and technical education * * * are being called upon to provide realistic, high-quality occupational education to meet present and future manpower needs at the lowest net long-term cost. Modern America requires technicians * * * and their counterparts in management, marketing, and servicing—with better basic training at the start of their careers than ever before. The pattern of the past * * * is not good enough largely because of the impact of research on all facets of modern living.

"Educators alone cannot perform this task, but together we can meet the challenge in a truly American tradition of cooperative accomplishment."

Appointment of Bob Fleming as Presidential Press Secretary Is Good News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the appointment of Robert H. Fleming as Presidential press secretary was good news. He brings outstanding talents to a very demanding job.

Mr. Fleming has had a long and distinguished career in journalism. He is a native of Wisconsin, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin, and a former reporter for the Milwaukee Journal.

I include hereafter an article written by Milwaukee Journal reporter Laurence Eklund on Mr. Fleming's appointment:

FLEMING'S NEW JOB MEANS HECTIC PACE

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The leisurely weekends of Robert H. Fleming, his wife, Jean, and their sons, Robert, Junior, 17, and Fred, 14, are coming to an end. Usually the Flemings drive 40 miles to their quiet retreat, a cabin they own in the country near Mount Airy, Md., leaving home Saturday morning and returning Sunday evening.

This weekend, the jaunt to their refuge was cut to only Saturday, because of the flurry caused by President Johnson's appointment of Fleming, former Milwaukee Journal reporter, as his new press aid.

HAS ABC WORK

Before assuming the hectic job of maintaining liaison with all the news media covering the White House, Fleming must wind up his affairs at the American Broadcasting Co., where he has been Washington bureau chief since 1960.

When Fleming takes over the White House hot seat—probably the hottest in all of official Washington—his family's mode of living will change.

The long hours of the demanding job mean that he will see much less of his family. It probably means that Mrs. Fleming, as the wife of a key Government official, will be caught up in considerably more social activity.

That is uncertain, however, considering the fact that most of the people around Johnson, a hard taskmaster, are too busy for much social life. Certainly the Flemings will be sought out socially, since they are now in the White House inner circle.

JOB PAYS LESS

Even though his family will see less of him, they approved of his taking the job, which at $28,500 a year pays somewhat less than he made at ABC.

Mrs. Fleming was the first to know about the offer of the job made to Fleming on February 1, by Bill D. Moyers, White House press secretary.

She talked it over with Fleming at length. After conceding that the longer hours would keep him away from home, she agreed with him that the job presented an opportunity and challenge that would have its compensations.

The Fleming boys were not told of the offer until the following Friday—February 4—just before Fleming took off for Honolulu with the President. They took the same attitude as their mother.

BORN IN MILWAUKEE

It was generally agreed that being thrust into the middle of national and international affairs would supplement the boys' schooling.

Robert, Junior, is a senior at Woodrow Wilson High School, not far from his comfortable four-bedroom home in northwest Washington.

Fred is in the ninth grade at Alice Deal Junior High School. Both boys were born in Milwaukee.

As a result of the earlier family discussions of the matter, the excitement was partly over by the time the President made the announcement Friday at an impromptu news conference.

The telephone began to ring immediately at the Fleming home. For an hour Fleming took the calls, which were from Washington correspondents and associates in the broadcasting industry who were calling to congratulate him.

GET ACQUAINTED DINNER

Then the Flemings drove to the Moyers home for dinner. This was a get acquainted session for Jean Fleming and Judith Moyers, who had not previously met. And it gave Fleming and Moyers a chance to talk business.

The conversation was interrupted by a number of calls transferred from Fleming's home to Moyers' home through the White House switchboard. Presidential press secretaries are always reached through the White House, since the operators there know where they are.

The first call to Fleming through the White House came while he was at Moyers' house. It was from Mrs. Polly Greenberg, daughter of Lindsay Hoben, editor of the Milwaukee Journal. One of Fleming's sons had told her he was at the Moyers.

Mrs. Greenberg wanted to arrange for ABC coverage of the visit to Washington of a child development group from Mississippi composed of 48 children and 25 parents and teacher involved in Project Headstart.

MORE CALLS SATURDAY

The group came here to demonstrate the quality of the Head Start program to Congress and to express its disappointment over the delay of the office of economic opportunity in refunding the project.

Fleming called ABC from Moyers' home to assign a camera crew to the Mississippi delegation.

Fleming took a few more congratulatory calls when he got home just before midnight as well as Saturday morning before he finally escaped to the weekend cabin.

But even there the calls kept coming, from old friends and associates like Anthony G. DeLorenzo, former Wisconsin newspaperman now vice president for public relations of the General Motors Corp., and Fred W. Friendly, an official of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Fleming spoke wistfully Saturday of those restful weekends in the country. He still holds out hopes of continuing to go there.

Hopeful Sign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, from a magnificent height, United Nations delegates can look over the East River and a part of the world and perhaps be inspired to play a meaningful role, with some quiet diplomacy, which could eventually lead to peace negotiations in Vietnam.

The realist cannot be too optimistic, but still the presenting of a resolution on the Security Council agenda represents a victory for this administration.

According to the Des Moines Sunday Register:

> The Security Council set no date for debating the resolution in the hope that quiet diplomacy would accomplish something.
>
> The U.N. meeting was worth while—

The editorial continued—

> because it showed in action that the U.S. peace drive is not ended, even though U.S. bombing in North Vietnam has been resumed. It reminded U.N. members who have been reluctant to spend money for U.N. peacekeeping operations how valuable a U.N. peace force might be.

Despite what may be a long road ahead, the Des Moines paper sees the U.N. Security Council meeting as a sign of hope—as "one more drop of water on the stone." So that others may see this summary of why reasonable talk might eventually lead to peace, I recommend this editorial and include it in the RECORD:

THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

> The United Nations is the worst possible form of world organization (to paraphrase Winston Churchill), except any other form of world organization the world has yet had. For years people of good will have been saying, "Why doesn't the United States bring the Vietnam war before the United Nations?" Now the U.S. Government has done so.
>
> The results so far show why referral was delayed so long.
>
> U.N. member nations in the charter conferred on the U.N. Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and power to issue binding orders, enforceable by their combined armed might, to members and nonmembers alike. That was on paper. The practice for 20 years has been rather different.
>
> The practice has been to refer disputes back to the disputing parties, sometimes with mild suggestions about principles to follow.
>
> The most the United States thought it practical to ask of the U.N. Security Council was a nonbinding resolution. The proposed resolution "notes" that the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962 on southeast Asia "have not been implemented." It calls for immediate discussions without preconditions "among the appropriate interested governments" to arrange a conference "looking toward the application of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in southeast Asia."
>
> The proposed resolution also "recommends" that the parties start by reaching agreement on a ceasefire "under effective supervision." The resolution goes on to offer U.N. assistance "by all appropriate means," including arbitrators or mediators if desired, a "call" for "cooperation by all concerned," and the services of Secretary General U Thant.
>
> The United States just barely got this mild resolution placed on the agenda, and the debate showed there would not be the votes needed to pass the resolution and that in any case there would probably be a Soviet veto.
>
> The Security Council set no date for debating the resolution in the hope that quiet diplomacy would accomplish something. Even if the resolution should be adopted, it simply passes the buck to the Geneva conference powers, some of whom have been refusing for months to reconvene the conference.
>
> Yet the U.N. meeting was worthwhile. It showed in action that the U.S. peace drive is not ended, even though U.S. bombing in North Vietnam has been resumed. It reminded U.N. members who have been reluctant to spend money for U.N. peacekeeping operations how valuable a U.N. peace force might be.
>
> In Vietnam, both sides say they accept the principles of the Geneva agreements, but each wants to control South Vietnam militarily while the people decide in free elections. The United States would accept a properly constituted U.N. force or neutral force pending free elections. So far the Communist side will not. North Vietnam and Red China say they won't accept any U.N. role there at all. They have not been admitted as members and regard the U.N. as a U.S. front.
>
> But North Vietnam and the Vietcong might come to accept some kind of neutral force (1) when they find that is the only way to get U.S. Armed Forces out; and (2) when they become convinced that the United States really is willing to get out on those terms.
>
> The U.N. Security Council meeting was one more drop of water on the stone to drive these points in. Not blood, water.

Statement by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey Before the 25th Anniversary Celebration of United Service Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 3, 1966, there were held throughout the Nation a series of celebrations marking a quarter of a century of service by the United Service

Organizations. No one who has been a member of our Armed Forces or who has had a loved one serving for our flag could fail to be indebted to this great organization for the wholesome entertainment and recreation it has provided our troops throughout the world.

In New York City, the principal speaker at the USO banquet was Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey. His vital theme was the historic challenge facing our Nation for the defense of Vietnam against Communist aggression.

A Gold Medal Award was presented to the Vice President. Previous high winners of the award, I am happy to point out, included His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman and Gen. Douglas MacArthur—posthumous.

I insert the text of Vice President Humphrey's outstanding address in the Record and precede it by the inscription of the award which was so appropriately conferred upon him.

Text of Inscription on Gold Medallion Presented on February 3, 1966, by USO of New York City

The USO of New York City takes pride in presenting to the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, its Gold Medal Award in recognition of his dedicated leadership and wholehearted support of USO as it continues to keep the faith with America's Armed Forces, February 3, 1966.

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, USO, New York City, February 3, 1966

It is a high honor to receive your Fifth Annual Gold Medal, as it is a privilege to join with you in celebrating the 25th anniversary of the USO.

During this quarter of a century, over 20 million American men and women who have worn the uniform of their country have found in the USO a home away from home.

USO seeks to answer the two questions always on the mind of every GI wherever he is:

"Does anybody know I'm here? Does anybody care?"

And to these two questions you answer, in actions as well as words: "Yes, we do know and we do care."

We have an obligation to our American young men away from home—young men serving without complaint and with a high standard of performance.

At Clark Field, near Manila, I saw recently young Americans—some of them terribly wounded—fresh from the battlefields of Vietnam. As I talked with them, they showed in every word and action those special qualities of courage and determination which Americans have always demonstrated in every war. We can surely be proud of them.

In Korea, I traveled north to the truce line and talked with American and Korean soldiers in this cold and bleak place.

Here, over a decade after the U.N. repelled Communist aggression, our American soldiers are still standing guard in one of freedom's loneliest and most remote frontiers.

The soldiers I saw in Clark Field and Korea, like those in other remote and often dangerous areas of the world, deserve the assurance that the American people have not forgotten them. And USO—which I saw in action at Tokyo, Manila, and Seoul—provides that kind of assurance.

And I think it is in the best spirit of American democracy that USO, representing our three major faiths, is nongovernmental and represents a wholly voluntary commitment on the part of the American people.

Why are so many American soldiers in Asia either standing guard or engaged in a shooting war?

They are there, primarily, to insure the peoples of the countries in which they are stationed the right to choose, the right to decide their own futures—in other words, to have the basic human rights of self-determination and of independence.

Self-determination and independence are threatened today by Asian communism. And so is man's search for peace. For we face adversaries who seek to prove that peaceful coexistence is a fraud—that militancy and force are the paths to final Communist victory.

During my two recent trips to Asia, I had the opportunity to talk with many national leaders. I sought their impressions of Asian communism, with which all of them have had firsthand experience. I did so because it is vital to know one's adversary as thoroughly as possible, and through many different eyes.

I did not come back with simple answers or simple panaceas.

Asian communism is a complex ideology. It is deeply rooted in the tragic past of Asia, yet it is raw and dynamic.

It isn't the timeworn, bureaucratic communism that has evolved in other places. It is aggressive. And its leaders are convinced of their ultimate success.

Its approach is not merely economic, although it capitalizes on the poverty and despair of the Asian peasant.

Its tactic is not merely political, although its hard-core followers are dedicated believers in Marxist doctrine, and although it wraps itself in the robes of nationalism to attract those who aren't yet ready for the full gospel.

Its thrust for power is not simply military, although it never has won power except by ruthless use of force—and I believe it never will.

The immediate threat is in Vietnam. What are the realities of today in Vietnam?

First, there is the reality that we face in South Vietnam no mild-mannered liberal evolutionary reformist party. We face dedicated Communist-led revolutionaries seeking by force to subject a nation to their will. Some of these revolutionaries are from the south. Some are from north. Some are irregulars. Some are regular North Vietnamese soldiers. Some of their supply and direction comes from the south. Some of it comes from Hanoi. Some of it comes from Peiping. Their creed is communism and their means is terror.

Second, there is the reality that what is happening in Vietnam is not an isolated occurrence, unconnected to events elsewhere. Those who inspire and support the the use of force in Vietnam have made their plans clear. Those plans include the use of subversion, of propaganda, of assassination, of sabotage, and of outright military action to gain their objectives throughout the world. In some places, such as Vietnam, aggression has come in the guise of a war of national liberation. In others, such as India and Korea, it has come as movement of regular troops across a national frontier.

The Communist-backed terrorism in Vietnam is being felt not only in Asia, but also in Africa and in Latin America.

Third, I would point to the reality that—faced with this aggressive force—our response has been measured and our objective peaceful.

Last April, President Johnson, at Johns Hopkins University, made clear the unconditional nature of our offer toward peaceful negotiation. He has reiterated that offer many times. He has emphasized that so-called National Liberation Front representatives could be represented in the negotiations.

Last May the President ordered suspension of bombing in the north in the hope that this might stimulate negotiation. In December we suspended the bombing again.

In the past several weeks, the President has sent emissaries throughout the world to seek some means toward peaceful negotiation.

Initiatives outside our own—by the U.N. Secretary General; by 17 nonalined nations; by the United Kingdom, Ghana, India, and other Commonwealth nations; by Japan, by the United Arab Republic; by Pope Paul VI—have been undertaken without success.

We have stated unequivocally that we support any effort toward negotiation, no matter where initiated. And we have directly communicated to Hanoi our willingness to begin immediately unconditional discussions.

What has been the response from Hanoi and Peiping? I read from Ho Chi Minh's letter of last Friday:

"The U.S. imperialists are clamoring about their desire for peace and their readiness to engage in unconditional discussion in the hope of fooling world opinion and the American people.

"Obviously the U.S. search for peace is only designed to conceal its scheme for intensifying the war of aggression."

From Peiping has come an unusually violent torrent of hate propaganda regarding President Johnson's—and I quote—"filthy and vicious * * * basket of peace."

It is clear that—in this time as in the past—those whose creed is force disbelieve the determination of democratic societies to resist their force.

Given this response to the U.S. peace offensive, President Johnson had no choice but to take steps to restore military pressure on North Vietnam.

In announcing this decision, the President emphasized that "the end of the pause does not mean the end of our own pursuit of peace."

For we must not permit the struggle to become purely military, either in Vietnam or elsewhere.

We must persist with diplomatic initiatives for peace, in the United Nations and in all the capitals of the world.

We must counter the Communist political thrust with better politics—the politics of democracy, of self-determination, of human dignity.

We must help the nations of Asia move forward with economic and social reform so that the Asian citizen will have a real stake in his country.

This is where the struggle will be decided in the long run.

We have a clear obligation to help the people of Asia and of other continents to help themselves. It is for this reason that I commend to you the foreign aid program which President Johnson submitted to Congress this week.

The President has proposed, and I quote, "to help give the people of the less developed world the food, the health, the skills, and education—and the strength—to lead their nations to self-sufficient lives of plenty and freedom."

We have set ourselves no easy task. It will require patience and fortitude for years ahead.

But I believe we can, in the end, succeed. For I believe Americans have learned the lessons of history so that we may not be doomed to repeat them.

We have learned that the appetite of aggressors is never satisfied.

We have learned that a threat to freedom elsewhere can soon become a threat to freedom here.

Can we accept the possibility that the struggle against Communist expansion can go on for years ahead?

Can we adapt the use of our military power to achieve limited goals while possessing military power in almost limitless quantity?

Can we persevere in our search for peaceful negotiation in the face of rejection by our adversaries?

Can we devote ourselves to patient efforts toward economic and social progress in an environment of violence and terror?

Can we maintain our own devotion to free institutions while opposed by those without regard for them?

Can we, finally, convince those who live by force that time is on our side?

Can we demonstrate to them that we are too strong to be afraid, too determined to be defeated?

I answer: Yes, we can and we shall.

Americans are capable of waging the long, hard battle for freedom around the globe for as long as freedom is threatened. We have the leadership and the resolution to fulfill our responsibility as leader of the free world. And we shall.

Our Stand Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the President's recent peace offensive was not the utter failure it has been made out to be by Mr. Johnson's critics. Despite Hanoi's refusal to even take notice of our invitations to negotiate, the President's overtures met with success in other areas.

Our motives for being in Vietnam and our determination to stay there were made clear to other nations throughout the world. We showed the world that we want peace—but not at any price. If nothing else were gained by our peace offensive, it still must—in light of this fact—be considered at least partially successful.

The district which I represent, the Seventh Iowa District, is well known for its conservative nature—especially in foreign affairs. I am presenting a recent editorial from the Carroll Daily Times Herald to give my colleagues the benefit of the views of a conservative section of Iowa concerning Vietnam.

OUR STAND CLEAR

The war in Vietnam is apparently back where it was at the end of December, before the moratorium on bombing raids on the north began.

Yet the nature of the conflict has changed in a very important way, despite the failure of the peace offensive to move the Hanoi regime toward the negotiating table.

It is now clear to all but the most rabidly anti-American that no nation is more anxious to put an end to the fighting than the United States. It is now clear to all but those immovably committed to viewing the world through red-tinted glasses that this country desires peace and will take any feasible and honorable steps to secure it.

Our call for a full-dress Security Council debate on Vietnam was such a step. The pressure for peace has now been placed upon the international community, and some of that pressure must inevitably permeate to Hanoi.

On the surface, the bombing lull accomplished nothing, though no one can say with certainty just what went on during those 37 days in the minds of the North Vietnamese leaders.

The resumption of the raids will likely have little effect on the immediate course of the fighting. It was essentially a stalemate, though slowly escalating on both sides. It will remain essentially a stalemate until either a cease-fire is achieved or until all possible paths that could lead to a cease-fire have been explored and found useless.

But while both the military effect of the resumed bombings and the political force of a United Nations resolution may be limited, the two combined would amount to considerable and continual pressure on the North Vietnamese.

Whether they realize it or not, the nature of the war has changed.

The Vietnamese Communists can no longer pose as the sympathetic underdogs fighting valiantly against an immoral, imperialistic bully. They have nothing to gain by disdainful rejection of the peaceful offices of other nations. Neither now nor next year nor 10 years from now are they going to take over South Vietnam and drive the United States out by force of arms.

Sooner or later, these truths must get through to Hanoi and Peiping. Until they do, however, continued fortitude, patience and restraint will be required of the American people, and continued sacrifice will be asked of their sons.

Statement by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey Before Panel on Science and Technology of House Committee on Science and Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, January 25 to 27, 1966, the Committee on Science and Astronautics held its seventh annual meeting with its Panel on Science and Technology. Under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, the committee was pleased to welcome one of the great spokesmen of science in the world, Sir Charles Snow.

It was appropriate that this eminent forum began with an address by the Vice President of the United States.

His talk covered many of the great scientific and technical challenges of our time. He stressed the need for increased partnership between Government and science in order that the greatest benefits of this age might be realized.

. I include the text of Vice President HUMPHREY's address in the RECORD:

OPENINGS REMARKS, VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, PANEL ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 25, 1966

I would like you to know, Mr. Chairman, how proud President Johnson is of the work which your committee has performed. This committee has provided a model of congressional oversight. Your panel of 15 outstanding scientists and engineers has provided invaluable counsel—not only to the 31 members of this committee but—indirectly—to the Congress as a whole.

May I say to our distinguished Speaker, you can be very proud of having been a father of this House committee. The record of history will show that you, Mr. Speaker, played a crucial role in the House of Representatives effective response after Sputnik I.

May I say, too, to my friend JIM FULTON that one of the most gratifying aspects of this committee's work is that you have acted on a bipartisan or better still, nonpartisan basis.

In the full committee, in the Subcommittee on Scientific Research and Development chaired by Congressman DADDARIO, and in other subcommittee work, there has been a scientificlike search for facts and for the best opinion. The committee and its subcommittee have "experimented" and the experiments have been very successful.

. It is appropriate that this committee, which enjoys so outstanding an international reputation, should be host today to so great a world scientist and scholar as Lord Snow. We are proud to have him as our guest.

May I begin today by saying that, as Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, I am continually astounded by the expansion of scientific knowledged and its technological applications.

One brief visit to Cape Kennedy is all the average citizen needs to realize how far science and technology have gone beyond his everyday capacity for understanding.

I am in fact often reminded of the words of the Queen to Alice in Wonderland:

"Now here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."

Sir Charles Snow has warned of the gap between science and the humanities—the two cultures, as he has called them.

There is danger of another gap: a gap between public policy and advancing science and technology. In government we face the task of closing that gap.

One of our panelists, Dean Price, has stressed the importance of this in his scholarly and helpful book. "The Scientific Estate." He says:

"Only if a nation can induce scientists to play an active role in government, and politicians to take a sympathetic interest in science (or at least in scientific institutions) can it enlarge its range of positive freedom, and renew its confidence that science can contribute progressively to the welfare of mankind."

It has often been said that to govern is to choose.

Those of us in government, who have the responsibility to choose, must have the insights and foresights that scientists and technologists, in government and outside, can offer us.

Among the decisions that have faced the President in recent months, many have involved scientific and technological considerations. I think of decisions concerning water resources, desalting, oceanography, arms control and disarmament, transportation, urban problems, education, defense—and the list is by no means complete.

And our Government is not unique in this respect. Virtually every developed nation is wrestling with the problem of adapting its laws, procedures, and institutions to meet advanced science and technology.

To cite only two examples, the British Government has recently reorganized its structure for dealing with scientific matters, and so has the French.

Here in the United States the President has had a Special Assistant for Science and Technology since 1960. The Office of Science and Technology has been in existence only since 1962.

We are fortunate that, when the space age began, the Congress responded to it promptly and foresightedly, by establishing the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Our discussions here today illustrate the kind of creative partnership that has been established between the legislative and executive branches of our Government, the scientific community, and industry.

This is a partnership which we must maintain.

It is a partnership which, in time, may be able to develop solutions to many of the pressing problems of this half-century.

For instance: I think of the application to major public problems of the systems analysis techniques which have been so effectively used by industry.

These techniques, as you know, involve defining the goal to be accomplished, developing various hypothetical methods to achieve it, and testing out these solutions, through use of computers, to determine which one yields the highest ratio of effectiveness to cost.

Under this approach, for example, we would consider transportation as the problem of how to move men and materials most effectively, rather than in terms of the particular problems of railways, airlines, highways, and waterways.

At present, we in government are ill-prepared to do so, for transportation is parcelled out among various government agencies—35 in all.

The establishment of a Department of Transportation, as recommended by President Johnson in his state of the Union message, would make it possible to look at the transportation problem as a whole, and if appropriate to draw upon systems analysis for its solution.

The State of California, where many of our progressive aerospace industries are located, has already made a pioneering experiment in directing their expertise to some of its principal government problems. Under contract with the State, four leading aerospace companies recently analyzed specific problems—transportation, garbage disposal, crime, and paperwork—and came up with new ideas for their solution.

I can visualize similar techniques being applied in the analysis of the most effective ways to deal with the pollution of our environment, our spiralling education and health requirements, the chaotic sprawl of our cities, and other priorities which face us as a nation.

Another promising area of partnership between *government and science lies in the* international field—in what I like to call science for peace.

International cooperation in the field of science and technology was, in fact, one of the most important matters discussed at the White House Conference on International Cooperation 2 months ago, which I had the privilege of chairing.

A distinguished Citizens' Committee, headed by Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, of Rockefeller University, and Dr. Harrison Brown, of the National Academy of Science, made imaginative proposals for further practical areas of international cooperation.

Above all, the committee stressed the need to narrow the technological gap between the industrial and the developing nations—not by slowing down the technological progress of the former, but by speeding up that of the latter.

The application of technology does not *take place automatically or easily,* but is an extraordinarily complex and difficult process. Even in the United States, there are wide variations in the degree to which existing, on-the-shell technologies are known and applied. (It was to speed up this process that the Congress enacted the State Technical Services Act last year.)

In the developing nations, people must be trained to understand and apply the new technologies. Moreover, these technologies must often be substantially adapted to meet local needs and conditions—a process requiring not the mere skills of a copyist but creative scientific and technological imagination.

No one who has seen the festering social and political unrest in the poor two-thirds of the world—as I have seen it—can doubt the priority of helping to bring precious technological education to those who need it most.

Yes, there are an abundance of opoprtunities at home and abroad for our partnership. As President Johnson has stated:

"It is imperative for political science and physical science to advance together, and to grow together and to have mutual understanding of each other. The politician who closes his mind to science is a disservice to his people and his time. The same is true of the scientists who closes his mind to politics."

Let us, then, in today's discussions participate with open minds and in the knowledge that we are in the midst of an age when man possesses not only the power to destroy himself but, for the first time, to bring mankind's benefits to parts of the earth still living in darkness and hunger.

Have You Registered To Vote?

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on January 25 of this year, I introduced H.R. 12297, which is designed to encourage voter participation by reminding citizens through a special postal can*cellation mark of the need to register to* vote. The cancellation mark proposed by the bill would bear the words, "Have You Registered To Vote?"

When I originally introduced this legislation during the 88th Congress, it was endorsed by the president of the Advertising Council, Mr. Theodore S. Repplier, and Mr. Thomas D'Arcy Brophy, president of the American Heritage Foundation. Most of us are aware of the continuing efforts of these organizations to encourage more Americans to vote.

Since reintroducing my bill, I have again heard from Mr. Repplier. I include his letter of February 10 as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL, INC.,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1966.

Hon. JAMES G. O'HARA,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you very much, indeed, for your letter of January 26 enclosing a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25.

I was happy that you included my letter and am encouraged that you have reintro*duced your proposed legislation* authorising a postal cancellation mark to encourage registration for voting.

We are, of course, still enthusastic about this idea. We have by now had sufficient experience with the problem to know that constant reminders do increase the number of people who go to the polls. Certainly such a mail cancellation mark would be an effective remainder.

With kindest regards.

Cordially,

T. S. REPPLIER.

Women's Club Offers Resolutions on Trade With Communist Countries, Recognition of Red China in U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., is a most worthwhile organization performing a valuable service to residents of the area. The 160,000 members of the groups comprising the federation are fulfilling in a practical way the responsibilities of good citizenship we all share.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. George J. Conway, of 94 Payne Whitney Lane, Manhasset, N.Y., an officer of the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., sent me copies of two resolutions passed unanimously by the more than 200 delegates to the federation's recent convention, and under unanimous permission I include them in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON TRADE WITH COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

To the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc.:

Whereas an intensive campaign is under way for greatly increased trade with the Communist bloc, despite increased Communist aggression in Vietnam and elsewhere; and

Whereas *Soviet Russia is providing North* Vietnam with surface-to-air missiles which already have sent U.S. airmen to their graves; and

Whereas trade with Communist nations involving technical processes developed under free enterprise helps Communist economies to leapfrog ahead of American competitors; and

Whereas trade with Communist countries does not create bonds of friendship and understanding with Communist peoples, but passes through government-owned businesses and thus further entrenches the power of government over the people; and

Whereas there are no such things as nonstrategic goods, as all goods in an economy are strategic; and

Whereas Communist governments are seeking expanded trade with, and long-term credits from, western democracies in order to overcome their economic plight—since the military structure of a nation is directly *dependent on its economy: Therefore be it*

Resolved, That the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in convention assembled this 21st day of January, 1966, urges the Government of the United States to review its trade policies in the light of national interest, and *to adopt a realistic attitude* in its dealings with the Communist countries who give aid and comfort to North *Vietnam with whom we are engaged in an* actual but undeclared war; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the U.S. Senators from New York.

Submitted by Citizens' Action Committee of Nassau-Suffolk.

Mrs. John Hermsted,
Chairman.
Mrs. George Conway,
President.

Resolution on Recognition of Red China and Its Admission to the U.N.

To the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc.:

Whereas the Communist government of mainland China, commonly known as Red China, is illegally and immorally imposed on the people of China; and

Whereas reliable testimony has proved Red China denies human rights to the people of China, holds them effectively in slavery, and enforces its will by terror, torture, and persecution; and

Whereas Red China holds in prison or has never accounted for an estimated 450 American soldiers taken as prisoners in the Korean conflict, and has since imprisoned without cause, and not released, a number of American citizens: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in convention assembled this 21st day of January 1966, urges that Red China shall not be admitted to, nor seated in, the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the U.S. Senators from New York, the congressional Representatives from Kings, Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk, and the Ambassador to the United Nations.

Submitted by Floral Park Woman's Club.

Mrs. Edsel Lowe,
Legislation Chairman.
Mrs. Harold B. Van Cott,
President.

The Small Business Administration Should Remain Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, among the many expressions of alarm and opposition received by me concerning rumors that the SBA is to be transferred to the Department of Commerce is a letter received from Mr. R. Lee Davis, Lee Davis and Associates, Inc., Nashville, Tenn. Mr. Davis is a financial consultant with many years of prior experience with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He is extremely knowledgeable concerning the financing of small business and Government agencies which have been charged with this responsibility through the years. His letter contains strong and impelling reasons why the SBA should remain an independent agency and should not be transferred to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the letter from Mr. Davis in the Appendix of the Record:

Lee Davis & Associates, Inc.,
February 8, 1966.

Hon. Joe L. Evins,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Joe: I read with much interest and congratulate you on your statement regarding the proposal for merging SBA into the Department of Commerce. My long experience with the RFC convinces me that you are absolutely correct in your objection to such a merger which would eliminate any independence in the agency and leave small business without a sponsor.

It is another indication of the power of the executive bureaus and departments in acquiring more authority to control the Government. I feel very strongly as you do that the balance of power in the three branches must be maintained.

Your Small Business Committee in the House and the Senate committee with the SBA seems to be the last hope to encourage and save the free enterprise system by assisting small businesses to grow.

I have been hoping that the President would appoint a strong, experienced, aggressive, and dedicated man to head the SBA who would do the kind of job you want done.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

R. Lee Davis, *President.*

The Battle of New Orleans as Viewed by a British Consul General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is generally accepted that the British have an unusually keen sense of humor but I do not believe I have ever seen it more delightfully demonstrated than by Her Majesty's consul general to New Orleans, Stafford E. D. Barff.

The occasion was the anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans on January 8, at the dinner of the Louisiana Historical Society, presided over by one of Louisiana's most distinguished citizens and brilliant lawyer, Hugh M. Wilkinson, Sr.

Each year the Battle of New Orleans is observed with appropriate ceremonies. This year Mr. Barff was the principal speaker. It would seem rather odd perhaps that a Britisher would be selected to commemorate the anniversary of the defeat of his country in battle, but Mr. Barff is a most unusual man as you will readily recognize when you read the speech which he delivered.

After reading the speech you will also readily understand why Mr. Barff has endeared himself to the people of New Orleans and has more strongly cemented the friendship of the American and British peoples.

Her Majesty is indeed fortunate to have in her service a man with the stature of her consul general at New Orleans. He has brought to the post a keen intellect, a remarkable understanding, and above all, a personality which has attached and endeared him to the people of New Orleans.

The only regret we have is that we know in the course of time his tour will come to an end and the people of New Orleans will be deprived of his presence. I do hope that day is in the distant future because we of New Orleans love and admire this man so much.

Enough of telling you about Stafford E. D. Barff—let him speak for himself.

Here is undoubtedly a classic in wit and humor, and an important document in depth in evaluating the aftermath of a battle which was fought after a war was over.

Here is the speech:

I am delighted to be here again at this traditional and rightly famed banquet so ably presided over by Mr. Hugh Wilkinson—a historian of real eminence.

And how fortunate you are to have him as your president and toastmaster at this annual event commemorating the great battle of 1815 in which my country was so soundly defeated and routed.

And how lucky I am—as were for many years my predecessors before me—to be honored each year on this anniversary of my country's catastrophic defeat, by being given the honor to celebrate it here in this room, and in such distinguished company, in my capacity as Her Britannic Majesty's representative and to be asked to deliver the principal address.

And earlier in the day I had the privilege—again a time-honored custom—of laying a wreath at the foot of that famous American's statue in the square that bears his name, a statue and square honoring the general, who on this day 151 years ago, defeated General Pakenham at Chalmette with such disastrous consequences for him, poor man, that he did not live to see the end of that day, and to the forces under his command.

There is a file in our office—one of the fattest that we possess—about the wreath. The contents date back many years—the subject matter in essence being whether the cost of the wreath should be borne by public funds, i.e., British Government funds—or by the consul general en poste at New Orleans on January 8 of any given year. The Foreign Office have been typically unimaginative on the subject. Their argument in response to our past requests for sympathetic consideration has always been that if Her Majesty's government were to encourage the provision of wreaths at public expense to their representatives in all the countries where Her Majesty's forces had been defeated at some time or other in the past several hundred years, the cost would be intolerable and quite out of keeping with the Government's constant reminders that economy in the conduct of foreign affairs must be the watchword—and that the Estimates Committee of the House of Commons would frown severely on the inclusion of budgeting expenditure for wreaths and other such manifestations in celebration of past British defeats. It was usually and rather laconically pointed out at the same time that the committee might be disposed to more leniency in approving funds for celebrations commemorating British victories of the past.

However, the general sense of the correspondence seems to always have been that they have no objection to Her Majesty's representative in New Orleans participating in a modest way in helping to celebrate

Britain's defeat—but to be clearly understood that it must be at his own expense.

A typical hidebound viewpoint, I admit—but if my distinguished French colleague will not take it amiss, less rigid than President de Gaulle, who would have no truck officially or personally in joining with us in Britain last year in celebrating the Sesquicentennial of the Battle of Waterloo.

And if I may perhaps pay one more tribute to Mr. Wilkinson—a personal one of thanks and appreciation—it would be for his timely advance notice that I should be expected to say a few appropriate words this evening.

Because I shall always remember among the highlights of my experience on arrival in New Orleans last year, the first banquet I ever attended in this city that care forgot—it was about this time last year 2 or 3 days after we got here—the sesquicentennial dinner at the Roosevelt, in the company of members of the Cabinet, the congressional delegation from Louisiana, descendants of the Pakenham family and of the Andrew Jackson family—a great bevy of distinguished people.

I recollect that I had just enjoyed the first course—oysters, my very favorite indulgence here, and was settling down to enjoy the rest of the meal and listen to the distinguished speeches—when suddenly I heard ominous noises coming from a few places down the table where my wife was sitting next to the Postmaster General of the United States.

She seemed to be frantically drawing my attention to something—apparently the banquet program. I glanced casually down the program until my eye fixed upon my name—and against it the words, "the principal speaker."

No one had remembered to tell me beforehand.

This little incident, and some of the other events that followed during the sesquicentennial week, is always coupled in my memory with your distinguished Congressman, Mr. EDDIE HÉBERT. He seemed to make everything seem easy, and a great deal of fun as well, regardless of the hazards that beset us occasionally during the week's celebrations. I recollect too that he promised to introduce me to red beans and rice, real country style, when we had time to relax. That treat is still to come.

Enough of small talk—and I must bear in mind the admonition of Bacon's words printed in your program, "Let him be sure to leave other men their time to speak."

Indeed, this admonition is reinforced by the quotation from Cato, also on the program, "Speak briefly and to the point"—and we still have the benediction, I notice.

This battle that we celebrate the anniversary of tonight was in a way a blessing in disguise. The outcome in every sense was a redoubtable victory for you and a severe defeat for us. As everyone knows, it should never have taken place. The war was over, the Treaty of Ghent had been signed, and whatever campaigns had been planned should have forthwith been called off—most importantly, General Pakenham's. But, the news of the peace had not reached these shores.

Why, then, a blessing? Should any war or battle with all the attendant cruelty and casualties be thought a good thing? Why could it by any stretch of the imagination, even in retrospect and scores of years later be condoned—unless either it was fought in the cause of freedom and justice and to withstand an unacceptable tyranny or ideology—and there has been no shortage of such challenges in our history since that time?

Or the beneficent results which followed—even if unintended at the time, were such that they perhaps justified the cost in suffering and human lives at this time.

Looking back I doubt there will be many who disagree with me if I say that the War of 1812 was unwarranted and uncalled for, on either side—achieving very little in terms of political or military advantage—and doing little credit to either adversary apart from some notable exceptions of individual courage and initiative and particularly in naval combat on the high seas and on the inland waters of America.

The point I am making is that most historians—and I refer mainly to American historians—think that the war was needless. The causes all derived from the power struggle in Europe, not from any challenge by one side or the other to vital interests of either the United States or Great Britain.

But the Battle of New Orleans was another matter. For America it was a dramatic victory which fired the country's imagination. Its effect upon the people was spontaneous and acted like magic. It was of far greater importance than all the other engagements put together.

It is generally agreed, I think, that if there was one thing the war achieved, in which Jackson's victory here against General Pakenham's veterans was the paramount ingredient, it was the consolidation of national sentiment, the emergence of new found self-confidence and pride in national unity and a strengthening of collective patriotism. It united the Nation as never before.

The Battle of New Orleans, though it occurred after the peace had been declared, was the decisive contest and, of all the forays elsewhere, it perhaps alone produced results of really lasting importance and value to the United States at a point in history when this stimulus was most needed.

For us also it heralded the beginning of an era reaching down to the present time—the results of which have been of incalculable values—not only to ourselves but to you and all free people. The defeat in 1815 marked the last military adventure undertaken by Great Britain in North America. When next Britons and Americans met on a battlefield, more than 100 years later, it was as comrades in arms and in sentiment.

This era which had its origins in 1815, an era of peace, of amity, of friendship and solidarity with the American people—a friendship based on common ideals and principles, the rule of law, of democratic government by the majority but having full respect for the rights of the minority, above all a common belief in and respect for personal liberty, and the recognition that the individual is greater than the State—this era had its beginnings in 1815—in a real sense its birth was here.

It is unnecessary to dwell on what this hs meant historically for the English-speaking peoples, and indeed for the world, in this century alone. But long before the outset of the two World Wars, this unwritten but nevertheless very real alliance of the two great English-speaking nations had begun to manifest itself.

There emerged for instance in the world scene of the last century a period of comparative peace which came to be known as the Pax Britannica.

On this side of the ocean in the Western Hemisphere a direct result was the formulation and practice of an American policy to be known as the Monroe Doctrine. Its origins stem from a ganging up by certain European powers in the early years of the last century, the formation of an axis which became known as the Holy Alliance. This alliance had, amongst other things, its eye on the Americas, particularly South America. One of its proclaimed objects was to quash any further development of what was described in the articles of alliance of this group as "the system of representative government" as practiced in some European countries, and to prevent this system being "introduced in those countries where it is not yet known."

The ultimate danger to America from these avowed objectives of the alliance was obvious, and President Monroe was alarmed and sought advice from Thomas Jefferson, then your greatest living statesman who was living in retirement, on what should be the American reaction.

You may remember what Jefferson said when he replied to President Monroe. His letter in part reads, "The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation, this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us. And never could we embark on it under circumstances more auspicious. * * * One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this pursuit, she now offers to lead, and, accompany us in it. By acceding to her proposition, we detach her from the bands, bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government, and emancipate a continent at one stroke, which might otherwise linger long in doubt and difficulty. Great Britain is the nation which can do us the most harm of anyone, or all on earth; and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her then, we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship, and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more, side by side, in the same cause."

Basically this unwritten alliance between the British and American Navies became the Monroe Doctrine, an important contribution of the Pax Britannica, and for 100 years America was free from any real menace of invasion, and she prospered accordingly.

There were disputes as well in this halcyon period as the 19th century advanced. Most occurred during the Civil War. Some were heated and caused much emotion, but always they were settled as warm disputes between reasonable, law-abiding citizens, and were sensibly settled by negotiation or arbitration. Among such disputes you will remember was the case of the *Alabama*, a man-of-war built in Liverpool and allowed by the British Government to slip out to sea manned by Confederate officers and sailors. America demanded reparation and got it. As a result of arbitration we paid to the tune of $15 million in damages—exactly the same sum as you paid Napoleon for the real estate acquired through the Louisiana Purchase. Values get mixed, don't they?

But the ultimate fulfilment of the unwritten alliance between Britain and America came in the first half of this century, when aggression on the grand scale and playing for the highest stakes ever, was let loose, twice in the lifetime of some of us here. Freedom and liberty were threatened as never before.

It was in these catastrophic years of the 20th century that the full realization of Anglo-American unity and friendship, born of the War of 1812, came to full fruition. There is no need to dwell on our "togetherness" in the last war. The partnership developed in the blood, sweat, and tears of that time, was of a degree unparalleled in history.

The victory we achieved has not brought us universal peace. Today we continue to face together new dangers and threats from many quarters of the world. We are not as powerful as we used to be. The struggle and the cost of two world wars in the cause of freedom has weakened us. A greater share of the burden which was once mainly ours now falls on you. Nevertheless the partnership, the special relationship continues, and we are still able to give you powerful support.

Indeed the immutable guiding light and focus in policies pursued by successive British Governments have been and remain today—above all else to maintain and strengthen the now closely interwoven threads of our alliance and ideals which have brought us together through so many grave dangers in the past.

May I close with Churchill's words, spoken at Harvard University some years ago:

> "If we are together nothing is impossible. If we are divided all will fail. I therefore preach continually the doctrine of the fraternal association of our two peoples, not for any purpose of gaining invidious material advantages for either of them, not for territorial aggrandisement or the vain pomp of earthly domination, but for the sake of service to mankind and for the honour that comes to those who faithfully serve great causes."

General Gavin's Vietnam Strategy Gains Impressive Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the number of distinguished and influential Americans who support the strategy for Vietnam proposed by Gen. James M. Gavin continues to grow. While it is true that one man's view may vary subtly from the next, the basic approach is the same: Remain in Vietnam but avoid escalation; limit the fighting while continuing the effort to transfer the conflict to the negotiating table.

The list now includes: General Gavin; Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U.S. Army, retired; George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia; Walter Lippmann, the distinguished author and columnist; James B. Reston, associate editor of the New York Times; and J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The case against escalation was forcefully presented last week by General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and was summarized as follows in a New York Times editorial of February 11:

> THE CASE AGAINST ESCALATION
>
> Two Americans once deeply involved in top-level planning on the diplomatic and military fronts have now given the Nation strikingly parallel analyses of the dangers of escalating the war in Vietnam in quest of victory.
>
> George F. Kennan doubts that "the most formidable military successes" would bring victory if that term means the end of Vietcong resistance and the realization of all our stated political aims.
>
> Gen. James M. Gavin warns that escalation could impair the capacity of the United States to meet more vital commitments elsewhere in the world at the same time that it created the risk of unlimited war on the mainland of Asia against Communist China.
>
> Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the evaluations by the former chief of the State Department's policy planning staff and the onetime chief of plans and operations for the Army—both delivered to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—is the extent of their concurrence. President Johnson would find it difficult to place either man in his category of "special pleaders who counsel retreat in Vietnam."
>
> For Kennan and Gavin concede that the United States cannot simply pull out of Vietnam. Their plea is for limiting the fighting to the minimum necessary to insure the security of our forces while continuing the effort to transfer the conflict to the negotiating table. And their concept of minimal necessity involves a military commitment significantly smaller than that envisioned by the Pentagon or Marshal Ky.
>
> The Kennan and Gavin testimony clearly challenges many of the things said during and after the conference in Honolulu earlier this week, if not the carefully drawn language of the communique. It recalls certain basics that Americans in this difficult situation need to keep in mind: Powerful as it is, the United States is not omnipotent; wise Americans have long warned of the perils of getting mired in land war on the Asian mainland; and in the nuclear era few things are more delusive in a major conflict than the goal of victory.
>
> If the Senate committee had heard only General Gavin and Mr. Kennan, its inquiry into American policy in Vietnam would have been worth while.

Small Business Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act.

This bill would replace the present revolving loan fund utilized by the Small Business Administration with three separate funds. The first of these funds would finance the business loan program authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act and the loan program established by the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act. The second fund would support the disaster loan program, and the third would finance loans under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, other than the lease guarantee functions.

As you probably know, Mr. Speaker, since October 11 of last year, the Small Business Administration has not only failed to grant any further business loans, with a minor exception during the New York transit strike, but they have also refused to accept any applications for direct financial assistance, regardless of need. The city of Dayton, Ohio, which is in my congressional district, made application for a small business development center but was turned down. I was told by the Small Business Administration that these drastic steps are necessary because of drains on the present loan fund due to several natural disasters.

I strongly feel that this emergency requires another supplemental appropriation as well as a change in the structure of the loan program itself.

Congress created the Small Business Administration in 1953 because independent and vigorous support was needed in the executive branch of Government for the Nation's 4.6 million small businessmen. There is no area where such support is more essential than the granting of small business loans.

Big business often has the flexibility to withstand temporary setbacks simply by shifting resources from another section of the firm or calling upon their ample conventional credit sources. When the same challenge is hurled against a small businessman, he may go under, not for any lack of ability or dedication, but simply because he does not have time to gather money needed to provide a transition to the next opportunity for profits, financial repair, and growth.

Since last October, however, the assistance that Congress has declared should be available from the Small Business Administration has been denied. In effect, we have said to the small businessman, "When disaster strikes elsewhere in the Nation, you must bear a special burden. You must survive without the programs that Congress said you should have." And, Mr. Speaker, this is by no means the first time that regular business loan suspensions have been decreed. And, unless Congress acts, it will not be the last.

The loan program suspension comes upon the heels of another serious blow at small business credit by the Government—the increase in the rediscount rate by the Federal Reserve Board. The consequent rise in the cost of credit is already being felt throughout the Nation. Therefore, small business now faces a two-pronged crisis in credit.

The purpose of this legislation is to insulate the business loan program against drains caused by natural disasters. I recognize that my bill does not solve the problem of stabilizing the disaster loan program so that its proper benefits will always be available. The unpredictable timing and scope of such disasters poses special dilemmas in assuring the full effectiveness of such a program. Possible remedies in this field merits the attention of Congress but I strongly insist that the brunt of such disasters should not be placed upon small businessmen throughout the United States.

The business loan program must be given a permanent and protected status. Appropriations for these loans must be carefully planned, fully evaluated by Congress, and should not be permitted to rise and fall on the whim of nature.

Congress has wisely recognized the crucial value of small business to our free enterprise economy, therefore, I come before you today, Mr. Speaker, to plead for the reform and reinvigoration of the small business loan program and recomend this bill as a most important measure to translate congressional promise into permanent performance for the small businessmen of America.

Several of my colleagues have introduced similar bills and I am happy to join with them in this legislation.

Scouting Commemorates Federal Charter

SPEECH

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Wednesday morning, February 9, to attend the charter year breakfast of the Boy Scouts of America, which was held at the International Inn in Washington, D.C. Purpose of the meeting was to observe the 50th anniversary of the Federal charter granted by the 64th Congress to the Boy Scouts of America and to celebrate the 56th birthday of the organization which was incorporated February 8, 1910.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, was scheduled to deliver an address, but was unable to be present because of a special assignment by the President to represent him at conferences in Vietnam.

Congressman Clarence J. Brown, Jr., of Ohio, who on that day was the newest Member of Congress to take office, was called by Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, retired, the master of ceremonies, to speak instead of the Vice President. He gave a very fine speech which contained some significant facts about the involvement of Members of Congress in Scouting. His cogent remarks were as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., CONGRESSMAN FROM OHIO, AT THE CHARTER YEAR BREAKFAST, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 9, 1966

General Clarke, Mr. Brunton, Senator Hayden, report to the Nation Scouts, my colleagues in Congress, fellow Scouts and Scouters, see how fast you can rise in the world in Washington. Just a couple of days ago I was the youngest Member of Congress, or the newest Member of Congress, and now I am substituting for the Vice President.

As a tenderfoot in this distinguished body to which I belong, I was a little bit strained to know what I could say about Scouting that would not already have been said by this time in this program and that some of my fellow colleagues and those of you here did not know. So I decided to lean on the newest device of people with problems, and that was research. I made a little survey of the membership of the U.S. Congress to try to answer the question of what Scouting has done for the Congress in view of the fact that we would be discussing this morning what Congress had done for Scouting 50 years ago. I was surprised, as I think you will be.

As a result of my effort to gather some statistics on Scouting in the Congress I found out that 249 of the 535 Members of the Congress of the United States today have been Scouts or Scouters. Now, as a member of one of the minorities in this country—the Republican Party—that impressive total in Congress is very encouraging to me. I know the Republicans would like to have that many Members in Congress. I will tell you a little bit about that later.

Two hundred and one Members of Congress have been Boy Scouts. One hundred and twenty-nine of them have been and are, and many of them still are—and this is a message for those of you who talk to people who say they are too busy. Many of them are still Scout leaders. Eighty-one Members of Congress have been Scouts and are Scout leaders today, and 48 of them have been leaders only. One hundred and twenty of them have been Scouts and have not continued their Scouting as volunteer Scouters. One hundred and thirty-four of the responses I got indicated that they had been neither Scouts nor were they Scout leaders and I hasten to point out to you, as was pointed out to me on a couple of these sheets that I got back, they were not Scouts because, in some instances, they were too old.

In other words, Scouting was not available when they were growing up and in a number of instances they were not Scouts because in their area, geographically, or because they came from what now is being called disadvantaged areas, there was no Scout troop. I trust that we will cure that in the next 50 years as we have made great strides in curing it in the past 50 years.

The reason I could not get a total of 535 responses is because there are, or were when I took the survey, 3 vacancies in Congress and also because 12 of the seats in Congress are held by women. Two of these women, Catherine May, of Washington, and Florence Dwyer, of New Jersey, ought to be in this survey, although I just could not bring myself to include them because Mrs. May, last year became an honorary Boy Scout through a council in her district and has confused her daughter, or at least made her daughter something unusual in school, because she goes to school now and tells people that she has the only mother in the country who is a Boy Scout. Florence Dwyer, of New Jersey, says that she was not a Boy Scout but she sure worked like the dickens being a den mother.

To be a little more serious, I would like to give you just a moment of my background. I moved to Washington with my predecessor in this seat in Congress when I was 12 years old and soon after that joined Boy Scout Troop 5 at St. Alban's church, up near the Cathedral. In that troop I became a senior patrol leader and an Eagle Scout, and later out in Ohio served as an assistant scoutmaster and just this past summer have been involved in some work in Tecumseh Council in southwestern Ohio to encourage boys to respond to the motto, "Follow the Rugged Road." I would not have been a Scout, however, and I am sure I would not have been an Eagle Scout, and I am sure perhaps, too, that I would not be here today as a Member of Congress if it were not for the man who made my Scout troop and my Scouting experience possible, and he is here this morning and I would like for you to meet him. He is John Ballas. John, will you stand?

John was my Scoutmaster and was active in Scouting in the National Capital Area Council and in troop 5 for about 35 years. He is retired from Scouting now to devote his full time to trying to make a living and to make a cathedral. He is curator of the Washington National Cathedral up on the Hill. To him and to the other Scout leaders and to the Boy Scouts who are here representing the Scouts of the Nation, as a Member of Congress I would say that you have kept the trust expressed in you some 50 years ago by Senator Hayden and others very well. Congress presented you a charter and perhaps in many respects, you have given us back a Congress.

I would like to read for you the names of the Eagle Scouts in Congress and also to give you the names of some of the top Scouters in the U.S. Congress. The Eagles include Representatives George F. Senner, Jr., of Arizona; Burt Talcott, of California; Charles Bennett, of Florida; Charles Weltner, of Georgia; Donald Rumsfeld, of Illinois; John Culver, of Iowa; Hervey Machen, of Maryland; Gerald Ford, of Michigan; Thomas Curtis and Durward Hall, of Missouri; Barber Conable and Richard Ottinger, of New York; Horace Kornegay, of North Carolina; Mark Andrews, of North Dakota, and myself and Bill Stanton, of Ohio; Tom Steed, of Oklahoma; Daniel Flood and Richard Schweiker, of Pennsylvania; J. J. Pickle, of Texas; John Marsh, of Virginia; Henry Reuss, of Wisconsin, and Senator Frank Moss, of Utah. I don't trust myself to comment on the fact that there is only one Senator on the list.

The adult Scout leaders with special honors are Senators Carl Hayden, of Arizona and George Murphy, of California, both Silver Buffalo; Representative from Missouri, Durward Hall, Silver Antelope, and Silver Beaver, and Senators Clinton Anderson, of New Mexico, Everett Jordan, of North Carolina, and Representatives Tom Curtis, of Missouri and Del Clawson, of California, Silver Beavers.

Gentlemen, thank you very much for what you have done with your charter.

Mr. Speaker, special guest of honor at the charter year breakfast was Senator Carl Hayden, of Arizona, President pro tempore of the Senate and only living Member of the 64th Congress which granted the charter to the Boy Scouts of America. Chief Scout Executive J. A. Brunton, Jr., presented to Senator Hayden a beatiful plaque containing a mosaic tile inlay of the original charter and a statement of "affection, esteem, and gratitude" for the great contributions Senator Hayden has made to scouting as a Member of Congress.

Senator Hayden's response was contained in a letter which he had prepared and framed for the occasion:

Senator Hayden's letter follows:

February 9, 1966.

To the Boy Scouts of America:

Fifty years ago, a bill H.R. 755 was introduced in the 64th Congress of the United States. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives on March 6, and the Senate on May 31, 1916. It was duly signed by the then Speaker of the House, Hon. Champ Clark, and by the Honorable John H. Bankhead, the President pro tempore of the Senate. The bill became law upon approval of President Woodrow Wilson on June 15, 1916. Section 3 of the act states:

"The purpose of this corporation shall be to promote, through organization, and cooperation with other agencies, the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in scoutcraft, and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues, using the methods which are now in common use by Boy Scouts."

As a Member of the 89th Congress, who was also a Member of the 64th Congress, I greet and commend you, the members of the Boy Scouts of America and leaders of your 95,000 local chartered institutions, on this 1966 Boy Scout Week, which features and recognizes the golden anniversary of the charter.

The magnificent accomplishments of the Boy Scouts of America over the years, under the Federal charter have fully justified the confidence of the Congress and the people of our Nation. As a further evidence of national appreciation several of my colleagues joined with me in introducing Senate Concurrent Resolution S. 68, on January 14, 1966, which states in part:

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress hereby pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the Charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's youth."

I have every hope that the Senate will adopt and the House of Representatives will concur in this resolution.

The need for the Boy Scouts of America is as timely today as it was in 1916. I would remind you that the purpose for which the charter was granted remains, and urge you to continue to pursue diligently your objectives to make Scouting available to all boys in every community throughout our beloved America.

Yours very sincerely,

Carl Hayden,
U.S. Senator from Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, also honored at the charter year breakfast were 14 Scouts and Explorers chosen by merit to represent 5,732,708 members of the Boy Scouts of America at report to the Nation activities during 1966. These fine young men were later to have the high privilege of a visit with the President of the United States at the White House and reported to him concerning the progress, achievements, and activities of Scouting. Eagle Scout James C. Smith, 17, of Columbia, Tenn., spoke for the Scouts; and National American Legion Commander L. Eldon James, of Hampton, Va., responded in behalf of the 95,000 local institutions who sponsor Scouting units.

Some historical highlights of the Boy Scouts of America were presented on stage in a visual and in the printed program. Since these highlights reflect the tremendous role that Scouting has played in the strengthening of America through its program of character building, citizenship training, and physcial fitness, I wish to incorporate them in my remarks:

Boy Scouts of America incorporated February 8, 1910, under the laws of the District of Columbia.

Sea Scouting for older boys started. Boys' Life became the official magazine 1912.

Federal charter granted to the Boy Scouts of America, June 15, 1916. Number of chartered institutions at the close of the year was 9,500. Membership totaled 245,183.

Unprecedented service rendered by 418,984 Boy Scouts to World War I effort. Scouts sold over $200 million in Liberty Loan bonds and war savings stamps, 1919.

First World Jamboree held in England attended by 301 Scouts from United States, 1920.

Outstanding good turns rendered in forest conservation throughout the country. Membership reached 513,015, 1921.

First National Training School for Scout Executives opened, 1925.

The Cub Scout program formally launched, 1930.

The Mortimer L. Schiff Scout Reservation dedicated, 1933.

Membership passed the million mark and the 5 millionth copy of Boys' Life was published. Sea Scouting was implemented by adoption of Explorer program for older boys, 1935.

First National Jamboree held in Washington, D.C. Attended by 27,232, 1937.

National rededication to Constitution of the United States and Declaration of Independence. Philmont Scout Ranch, Cimarron, N. Mex., given by Waite Phillips to the National Council, 1938.

Total resources of the Boy Scouts of America placed at the disposal of U.S. Government for duration of the war. Services included distribution of defense bonds and stamp posters, collection of aluminum and wastepaper, cooperation with American Red Cross and Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, 1941.

Boy Scout war service continued. More than 500,000 Scout victory gardens grown—20,000 earned the Gen. Douglas MacArthur medal for growing food, 1945.

Forty thousand Scouts and leaders attended the Second National Jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa. First Boy Scout stamp issued by U.S. Post Office Department, 1950.

Thirty-three percent gain in membership announced as result of the "Strengthen the Arm of Liberty" program launched in 1948. Boy membership at the close of the year was 2,579,515, 1951.

The National Council office moved to its new location near New Brunswick, N.J. Boys' Life circulation passed 1 million mark. Unprecedented membership growth continued to alltime high of 3,774,015, 1954.

Thirty-six million Liberty Bell doorknob hangers placed by Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, and Explorers in get-out-the-vote campaign, 1956.

Fifteen millionth copy of Handbook for Boys presented at White House ceremony. Over 50,000 Scouts and leaders attended Fourth National Jamboree, 1957.

The new Explorer program launched, 1958.

Scouting's golden jubilee year celebrated. Membership total over 5 million. Highlight was Fifth National Jamboree at Colorado Springs, Colo. Johnston Historical Museum dedicated at New Brunswick, N.J., 1960.

In Greece, 621 Scouts and leaders from the United States attended the 11th World Jamboree, 1963.

Strengthen America's Heritage program launched in cooperation with Freedom's Foundation. Sixth National Jamboree held at Valley Forge, Pa., 1964.

The program of emphasis breakthrough for youth inaugurated. Total Boys' Life subscriptions, 2.4 million. Five hundred thousandth Eagle Badge awarded. Membership at close of year was 5,732,708. Cumulative membership 1910–65 exceeded 40 million. Over 21 million Boy Scout Handbooks distributed since 1910, 1965.

Fiftieth aniversary of Federal charter from Congress. At the beginning of the charter year, the total number of chartered institutions exceeded 95,000—which is 10 times greater than the total chartered institutions in 1916. Number of units is 144,538, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the charter year breakfast launched a nationwide emphasis on the partnership with cooperating agencies as defined in the charter. Key leaders in the field of religion, education, civic and community life in every local council of the Boy Scouts of America will be invited to a special meeting of the executive board to consider ways and means of working together in bringing the Scouting program to more boys, especially in the congested inner-city and deprived rural areas. This will be followed by relationships conferences in every one of the 2,750 districts with heads of institutions that are present or prospective sponsors of Scout units.

In closing may I reiterate a conviction which is shared by all of us that Scouting is a vital force in strengthening the foundations of freedom in our beloved country and throughout the free world. For the boys themselves it is fun, adventure and activity that helps them to grow in personal and social development, gives them a sense of moral values, and motivates them to do their duty to God and country.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, New York Post Correspondent Pete Hamill, in his fifth article in the series from Vietnam observes:

The hard truth of the situation in this country is that most of the peasantry (that is, most of the people) support the Vietcong. The guerrillas simply could not have grown so large without them. And the Vietcong propagandists work hard at holding that support.

I urge my colleagues to read the article published in the New York Post on February 11, which describes the political strength of the Vietcong.

It follows:

VIETNAM: THE ENDLESS WAR—ARTICLE V: THE POLITICS OF WAR

(By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—The most relentless adversary we face in the war in Vietnam is the mind of Vo Nguyen Giap. This round-faced, 54-year-old lawyer is the only man to have won a war in Indochina in this century. He attended no West Point, no St. Cyr. "His school," a friend once said, "was the bush." In that bitter school, Giap painfully, carefully, put together his theory of war. He destroyed the French with the great Vietminh army he constructed. And today in South Vietnam his admirers in the Vietcong are using his theories to fight the mightiest military power on earth to a frustrating, expensive, and bloody standstill.

The core of Giap's theory—derived from the writings of Mao Tse-tung—is that no modern revolution can be won unless the military arm is attached to a political body. If a concrete political base has been constructed, Giap says, defeat is impossible.

Giap himself is a Communist and much of his writing—which on military matters has a hard precision—is damaged by a kind of mindless Marxism. But Giap, and the political commissars who roam the countryside preaching on behalf of the Vietcong, are not naive enough to believe they can sell something as abstract as communism. They concentrate on more mundane matters.

"They go into a village the way we should," said one American political officer in the Mekong Delta. "They come in and search around and ask people about their gripes. When they find out what the people feel is unjust, they remedy the injustice. If the hamlet chief is corrupt, they shoot him. If a landlord is charging exhorbitant rents, they kill him and burn down his house and make much ceremony of turning the land over to the peasants."

These so-called armed propaganda teams are the vanguard of the Vietcong. Following Giap's rules, they are like the rest of the Vietcong. They never enter a house without asking permission. They pay for everything they eat, and if there are food shortages, they go without. When they have convinced the majority of people of their honesty, integrity, and sense of justice, the terror begins.

Open dissenters are murdered. Those suspected of being lukewarm disappear. Graphic examples are made: leaders are beheaded and their heads left to dry on poles in the sun. Women are openly butchered. Those peasants who are not held by admiration for the Vietcong are held by terror. Most are held by admiration. And without those people in the countryside, Giap's theories about revolutionary war could never succeed.

"Without the support of the population," Giap has written, "we shall have no information. We shall be able neither to preserve secrecy, nor carry out rapid movements * * * The people suggests stratagems and acts as guide. It finds liaison officers, hides us, protects our activities, feeds us and tends our wounded." (This is a variation, of course, of Mao's theory that a guerrilla should move among the people "like a fish through water.")

In South Vietnam, this first stage in the Giap theory has been working well for years. The hard truth of the situation in this country is that most of the peasantry (that is, most of the people) support the Vietcong. The guerrillas simply could not have grown so large without them. And the Vietcong propagandists work hard at holding that support.)

In the province of Kien Hoa in the Mekong Delta, the Vietcong were telling the peasants that American Negro soldiers were really cannibals from Africa, with a taste for small children. They said that the armored personnel carriers—a kind of roofed LST—contained machinery which ground prisoners into gruel. In one small town I visited, Army engineers were building a fluoridated water system to replace the centuries-old practice of drinking river muck. The Vietcong told the villagers that the fluoridated water was all an American plot—which should surprise some of the homefront commandos who have been shouting for years now that fluoridated water is all some kind of Communist plot.

The more serious—and more effective—propaganda is that which attempts to make the Americans a mere extension of the French, and our involvement in this country just another kind of colonial war.

"They tell the people that we're coming to get the country back for the French," one American AID representative told me. "They tell them that we will make them pay back rent, back taxes, fines. And we have no way of saying that is not true. With the present government in Saigon, it is true."

The Americans are trying almost desperately to convince their Vietnamese allies here (the Vietcong call them "American valets") to really make an effort to enlist the people's support. "But they're just not interested," the AID representative told me. "They build an 'Open Arms' center for returning Vietcong, and they leave it a filthy mess. We've requested 17 times for the Saigon authorities to send us some small amenities: a typewriter, some tables, perhaps a phonograph. They don't even answer the letters. They fly over one day dropping tons of leaflets explaining how glorious their government is, and the next day they send over defoliation teams to poison the crops. It doesn't make any sense."

When Giap stresses that guerrillas should be scrupulously honest in dealings with villagers, it is because as a Vietnamese, he knows what a foul reputation soldiers have in his country. The French troops would take food and women the way some people pluck strawberries. Today, the ARVN soldiers enter a town and proceed to plunder it for such paltry items as chickens, pottery, and water. Gen. William C. Westmoreland is determined that American troops will not do such things and was even moved to prepare a leaflet explaining manners to the footsoldiers.

One of the unfortunate things we have going against us is our color. It might be difficult to convince people that Marx, Engles, and Lenin are the keys to earthy salvation. It is not difficult to explain that the Vietcong are only fighting to get the foreigners out of the country. For some of the more politically conscious young men in Vietnam, it is as natural to join the Vietcong as it was for an Irish kid to join the IRA after 1916.

Until last year this was not a crucial problem. But there are over 200,000 American soldiers here now, and more coming, and their presence is highly visible. In Saigon alone there are 23,000 Americans and they dominate the face of the city. I can't believe that a Vietnamese youth will sing the praises of the Americans when any night of the week he can see GI's buying his women.

Giap's work constantly repeats the need for a well-defined enemy, and the Vietnamese Government is doing its best to help him. If the South Vietnamese were a revolutionary movement, instead of a group of spokesmen for personal interests, they would rob the Vietcong of their only reason for existence: revolution.

"Why do the Communists have to have the patent on revolution?" that AID representative told me. "Why is our country always on the side of the antis: the anti-Communists, the antirevolutionaries? We seem to think that no revolution in this century can be non-Communist. And yet the great strength of the Vietcong, and of the old Vietminh, was the great masses of people who were stirred by nationalism and revolution. Not by communism."

In South Vietnam there was never much difficulty for the Vietcong in lining up the inhabitants of the countryside, specifically because all the necessary conditions for revolt were there. Giap's political base is there, as hard, and stubborn as he could desire. With that established, the Vietcong were free to act in more daring military fashion.

Giap breaks down the revolutionary army into three classes, and defines them this way: "The task of the regulars is to carry a war of movement over a wide theater of operation, in order to wipe out the enemy's main forces. The regional troops operate in their own localities and insure the coordination of tasks between the regulars and the guerrillas.

"The guerrillas defend their own villages, take a hand in production and join the regular and regional forces to prepare for and then engage in battle."

The army never attacks until it is sure of victory. When faced wtih overwhelming opposition, it flees to fight another day. When the American troops pile into deserted villages by the thousands, the Vietcong are usually gone. They are not fools.

Giap's theory also calls for a three-phase war, with no time limits. The first phase in South Vietnam is over. This is a defensive war, during which the population is split from the government, the roads are destroyed, and the enemy is isolated in large cities. The second phase is swift, mobile guerrilla warfare, which forces the enemy to divide and disperse his forces. The third phase is a general counteroffensive, destroying the enemy's main units, as the Vietminh did to the French at Dienbienphu. Most experts, American, French, and Vietnamese, say that the Vietcong are now in phase 2.

It is Giap's belief that no democracy can fight the kind of long, brutal, frustrating war that the Vietcong are now waging.

Giap knows that governments of democracies must answer to the people. In a war like this, if it lasts long enough, someone will begin shouting about bringing the boys home for Christmas. Someone will recognize that the war will mean endless casualties, loss of treasure, and a growing national disgust. At that point, Giap is known to believe, the Americans will sue for peace. This is why neither Hanoi nor the Vietcong are very interested in negotiations. They think they can win.

Giap is fortunate in that his admirers in the Vietcong have the perfect enemy to oppose. That awful 20th century phrase—the minds and hearts of the people—is really what this war is about, and the Saigon authorities really don't care very much about them.

But Giap, like most Communist theoreticians, reminds one of poor Ivan Karamazov who loved humanity and hated people. Giap was prepared, in the war against the French, to take as many casualties as were necessary.

"Hundreds of thousands of men die every minute on the earth," he once wrote. "Even if they are Vietnamese, the deaths of a hundred, a thousand, or tens of thousands of men amount to very little."

Th Vietcong believe the same, and there will be a lot of dead here in the next few years to underline it.

Textile Industry Supports Clean Water Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the textile industry is playing a leading role in the campaign to clean up our rivers and streams. Mr. Louis L. Jones, Jr., president of Canton Cotton Mills, Canton, Ga., recently delivered an outstanding address to the National Technical Task Committee on Industrial Waste.

I commend Mr. Jones' great and timely address to the attention of the Congress and to the people of the United States.

Water Pollution; Challenge to Industrial Leadership

We in the textile industry like to think that we started it all—the industrial revolution which swept first England and then this Nation. We like to hark back to our early beginning during the infancy of the United States. In 1790, Samuel Slater built the first textile mill to use mechanical methods successfully in Pawtucket, R.I. The mill still stands, now a museum. In 1793, Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin to make available for the first time an adequate supply of cheap lint cotton for use in the mass production of yarns and fabrics.

We of the textile industry like to think we have been a part of this Nation's progress and have kept pace with the needs of our country and our people. We call attention to the fact that a Georgia textile mill wove the duck for the covered wagons of our pioneer forefathers who pushed the Nation's frontier westward. That same company today manufactures the material which houses the tracking stations for Telstar. And the textile industry is a major contributor to the fabric of the space suits which protect our astronauts as they invade the vast new frontier of outer space.

We in the textile industry like to think we have always played an active role in the challenge of the times from those earliest days of our Nation's beginnings to the present.

During World War II the textile industry joined with many of our industrial brethren in a massive production effort which led ultimately to defeat of the Axis powers. To this day those men we fought against insist that it was not military force alone which overwhelmed them, but the fantastic capacity of the United States to produce the materials of war and supporting equipment used by our forces and our Allies.

It can be truly said that our great United States and its industries have walked hand in hand through peace and war. The Nation could not exist without industry, even as industry could not exist without Government.

It is difficult to imagine now how the first primitive industries, with their water-turned wheels, thrived in our young country. What did they face? What did they see—these hardy ancestors of ours who forged the path from the Atlantic to the Pacific? If only our children today might see a little of the great natural beauty of our Nation as it was in those days. If only we had been privileged to see it. But along with industry and progress came tragedy and waste. The forests were exploited and the land's topsoil treasury was washed down the rivers into the sea. The passenger pigeon was so ruthlessly slain for commercial use that the bird became extinct. The buffalo, once numbering 40 million, was hunted so relentlessly that fewer than 300 survived by 1900.

These are but examples of the tragedies that accompanied the civilizing of this great Nation—tragedies of wastefulness, thoughtlessness, exploitation. But today there is an even sadder story to tell, because the very air we breathe is now jeopardized. Our once pure streams, rivers and national waters are a national disgrace. The pollution of our river basins and natural waters has reached such a serious stage that even an all-out effort now may not be enough to stem the tide of corruption with which 20th century man in the United States seems intent upon poisoning himself.

A famous philosopher once said, "No man steps into the same river twice." Today's thinking man might say judiciously, "In most of our rivers he would do better not to step at all." Potent fumes which rise from some of our Nation's polluted rivers have peeled paint from the walls of nearby buildings. The Public Health Service has isolated live polio, infectious hepatitis and more than 30 other viruses which may carry disease from treated sewage effluent. Because we must repeatedly reuse our water, the chances are 4 out of 10 that the water we drink was flushed out of someone's household plumbing or out of an industrial plant sewer.

National health experts tell us it is only because our water treatment plants are the best in the world that we have safe drinking water. Because chlorine and other chemicals kill bacteria we can take "safe" drinking water from some of the world's worst polluted streams. It may not taste or smell good, but it is safe.

However, the experts are now wondering how safe is safe. Even with the chlorine cocktail treatment, there are foreign, sometimes exotic substances which come into our drinking water supply. There are only traces, it is true, but scientists are concerned about their long-range effect upon man. Some of the complex wastes now entering our streams are difficult or impossible to detect in water.

As the Nation grows and increases its demands upon industry and upon sewage systems, the pollution problem could easily outgrow us. Our industries, which use some 160 billion gallons of water each day, will be using more than twice that amount by 1980, according to present estimates. This means that by 1980 industry will use 394 billion gallons of water a day—two-thirds of the water used by the Nation.

Although our problem is staggering, we know that pollution control can be achieved. In the densely populated, heavily industrial Ruhr Valley of Western Germany, pollution control is so effective that the river remains safe for swimming and recreation activities.

But what is the outlook for our country and the terrible problem which faces us? Some trends are definite and inescapable. The public is alarmed.

More and more the newspapers, television and radio stations around us are spreading the concern about pollution. There have been national alarms over hepatitis-bearing oysters taken from sewage-polluted waters. Increasingly we see signs on beaches which say "Unsafe for Swimming." Fishermen and wildlife authorities from most States have angrily denounced fish kills and caused widespread publicity about them. The public outcry and concern about pollution rivals even civil rights and Vietnam news for top billing by the Nation's press.

In the put-up-or-shut-up category, New Yorkers lead the national parade, having recently voted passage of a $1 billion bond issue to begin an earnest pollution cleanup in that State.

The Federal Government is in the picture bigger than life with the signing into law of recent pollution control legislation. Our Nation, because of public opinion, its most forceful mover, is ready to move. It takes no great prophet to foretell that. Every one of you here, by your very presence, indicates your feeling that something must be done. The question is—how much? The answer from this minor prophet is—a lot. And soon. The time is long past for saying, "Let's wait and see how much we'll be made to do." For industry and for growing cities which have too long put off treatment of their pollution problems, it is already late.

In my home State of Georgia, the textile industry has pledged its support to the aims of the Georgia Water Quality Control Board. It is only a step in the right direction. Estimates have it that total industry expenditure in the State over the next 10 years will cost $100 million for waste control installations and pilot treatment plants. Communities and cities have an even greater responsibility. Forty communities with 300,000 people have no sewage treatment at all. One hundred Georgia towns and cities, among them Atlanta, must expand existing sewage treatment facilities to meet the needs of 1,300,000 people. The total costs of these city and community sewage projects will amount to more than $150 million.

The Georgia textile industry's pledge "to obey the spirit as well as the letter of the State's water quality control law" is not an idle one. Nor is it a publicity seeking statement, although the industry has received wide attention and acclaim for taking the position. Our industry leaders have planned seminars to discuss some revolutionary textile processing projects now underway at Georgia Tech. These projects hold great promise for drastic reduction of waste effluents for some textile plants. Moreover, we feel that many of our industrial members can profit from discussing pollution cleanup problems which they face and which have already been met by others. Above all, we hope to convince all our fellow members that pollution control is an obligation of the good corporate citizen.

In 1960 our plant in Canton began operation of a pollution control system which included sewage waste from part of the city. We hope to expand our system soon, taking in even more municipal waste, which, incidentally, augments our own waste control problem. We hope that by taking the lead in solving a pollution control problem which became acute for our plant and for the city when a Federal dam was built downstream about 1950, we have provided a good example for the city to follow. The city has now scheduled the building of a waste treatment plant which will cost half a million dollars and should adequately control all municipal wastes.

Although I mention the efforts of the textile industry to clean up pollution in Georgia, I would like to point out that the textile industries in North and South Carolina have made significant inroads on the problem there. A lot still must be done in all our States. And while I speak for the textile industry, I know there are many other industries which have impressive waste control programs underway.

Finally, I would hope that all of us—brothers in industry—could join hands in leading the national water pollution fight. Let us begin by acknowledging our obligation to pass on to others water that is as clean as the water we received. If those upstream are polluters, let us pass on water that is cleaner than the water we receive. Let us begin by conquering our own problems in waste treatment. Then let us lend support wherever it is needed—to fellow industrialists, to our communities, to our Nation. Let us put forth that concerted effort, the unstinting, unselfish effort of which American industry is capable. Let us commit ourselves unfailingly as industry always does in time of crisis.

For I submit to you that we are in a crisis. The crisis involves the strength of the Nation. It involves the well-being of the Nation, the health of the Nation, the beauty of the Nation. It involves our self-respect.

We in industry must lead the fight to return to our children their natural heritage in its pristine form.

General Westmoreland's Typical Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been in Vietnam realize the magnitude of the job Gen. William C. Westmoreland is doing there. He exemplifies the finest traditions of the U.S. military, serving his country with courage, skill, and devotion.

I was most impressed by the Associated Press story Thomas Reedy wrote in yesterday's Sunday Star. In the event that it may have been missed by some of my colleagues, I have permission to insert it in the body of the Record:

A Typical Day in the Life of General Westmoreland

(By Thomas A. Reedy)

Saigon.—The general used everything but a canoe, and he'd have used that too, if necessary.

Armed helicopters, a fixed-wing light airplane, sedans, and jeeps and plain old-fashioned footslogging carried the general around part of his theater of command on one normal, action-packed day.

Matching strides with Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the 51-year-old commander of U.S. forces in the Vietnam war, calls for a giant. Pygmies need not apply.

This day opened as usual with light calisthenics and breakfast at 6:30 a.m., a quick check of reports, into combat fatigues, and the general was off to the teeming Tan Son Nhut Airbase for a look-see in the field. By 8 o'clock the blades of the armed helicopter were whirling, a gunner at each wide-open door in a frozen attitude of alert.

PRISONER OF CLOCK

Aboard came Westmoreland's aide, Capt. Tom Sherburne, of Pensacola, Fla., and the man who would stenograph whatever reports should be transmitted to the top channels of the Military Assistance Command Vietnam. He was Capt. Ken Kleypas, of Hobbs, N. Mex.

"I'm a captive of schedules," said the general, a lean 6-footer with a lantern jaw, the energy of a tank and the hands of a pianist. "I've got to be a prisoner of the clock or I would never get my work done."

The clock required landing at Phuoc Vinh, where the 1st Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, was deployed. At 5 minutes to 9, on schedule, the helicopter sat down. The jeep convoy moved into the artillery perimeter, crews at attention behind their sandbags.

Westmoreland fired questions at the men who fire the guns and they fired back the answers. He seemed more interested in how they answered, their state of mind, than in which words they were using.

FAVORITE THEMES

He addressed the men by their names, here and there recognized soldiers who served with him in Korea, asked sometimes their hometowns, how long they had been in the field, or in the Army how they were feeling.

By the time he got through with the outfit and headed in huge strides for the mess tent, he was able to say:

"Sergeant, I congratulate you. The men say the chow is good and when they say that, it must be so. So I won't bother to inspect."

Further into the woods the interrogation proceeded. How was the road opening work going? And then the general got on two of his favorite themes: What are the relationships with the South Vietnamese militia in the neighborhood, and what is the division doing in the way of civic actions—linking up to help the populace, cement friendship and with success and time be able to leave behind a lasting image?

An officer said the milita's "popular force" in the sector was wary at first. One man spoke only Vietnamese the first day and then on the second day spoke rather good English. His distrust had been broken down that quickly.

Another dart toward the dispensary tent, a spic and span layout which won a compliment for Capt. Albert Maggioli of Buffalo, N.Y. Westmoreland warned him to keep after the men's feet—the oldest advice in the infantry—and while he was on the subject turned to other officers and urged them to have plentiful supplies of socks.

"In the monsoon season these men are going to have wet feet for many hours," Westmoreland said.

KNOW ABOUT FEET

He knows about feet, at Kasserine Pass, the Remagen Bridge over the Rhine, and Korea.

A quick glance at the watch and the schedule and the helicopter was off again for a 40-minute ride to Xuan Loc and the 10th Army of the Republic of Vietnam Division.

Gen. Lu Lan, smiling and courteous, along with his top American adviser, Col. Charles Reiderbaugh, of Carlisle, Pa., did the honors. With a pointer and a map, General Lan told of some considerable success at clearing the Vietcong out of the "rice bowl." He said his division had secured the area with a population of 30,000 people loyal to the Government.

Westmoreland wanted to know something deeper: How do his troops get along with the countrymen? What are they doing to raise the prestige of the village and hamlet chiefs and elders?

At the time of Tet, the sacred lunar New Year holiday, did the people as well as the soldiers have all the food they needed for a happy celebration?

Lu Lan beamed as though he was on certain ground.

"Yes, we had everything for Tet," he said.

"And our men are getting along fine with the people. I have three fundamental orders to the troops when they go into populated places. They are: First, smile; second, salute the people, and third, when you see a chance to help somebody clear up his place or trying to do a chore too big for him, help him."

MAKING HISTORY

The American commander commended General Lan, knowing he was in fact making history. Armies in this part of the world have traditionally been overbearing, often cruel and the suffering populace has had little faith in the soldier.

The inexorable clock beckoned and it was off again by chopper due south to the South China seacoast hamlet of Ham Tan. It's a remote spot, Vietcong to the left, Vietcong to the right, Vietcong controlling the main highway whenever they choose to stop traffic and exact taxes. They had just blown a bridge and it could be seen from the air. That bridge had been rebuilt by Lan's men five times.

What would it take to control that highway, the American commander inquired.

The group of American advisers as well as the Vietnamese officers at Ham Tan broke into big smiles. They knew the general was half serious, half jesting. Colonel Reiderbaugh said, "give me four or five choppers and when they start their tax collecting we can do them in, but this way we can't get there quickly enough."

NEVER ENOUGH

The colonel knew that asking for that many choppers was asking for the moon. The whole theater is so enormous there never seems enough to go around—the plaint of the American soldier ever since Valley Forge.

Westmoreland wished them all a happy Tet and then, addressing the province chief and the Vietnamese officer, told them he knew the past Year of the Snake was an unhappy one for them.

"But this is the Year of the Horse," he declared. "You know the horse is a strong animal. He can gallop down the road and he can hurdle obstacles. I am confident this horse will gallop and will hurdle these obstacles and we can proceed to success. My country has reaffirmed our determination to stand behind you and help you bring peace to your land. I feel our American troops will be effective in your fight for your country."

"Never in all history have military men to two countries worked so closely together," he said. "We are making history. And after we succeed in helping you win peace in your land, then and only then, shall we return to our homeland."

It was after 1 o'clock and a brief hop to a forward air control field nearby enabled Westmoreland to chat with the pilots. Then he shifted from the helicopter, thanked the crew and got aboard his four-seater Beechcraft. It headed due north to Bao Loc, the capital of Lam Dong Province. Out came sandwiches and cold tea for lunch, taken literally on the fly.

BRIEFED IN ENGLISH

The twin-engine craft sat down on the dirt strip on the tea plantation with a bounce which elicited from the general the dry comment: "Not much margin there." And from his aide: "You've got to use every inch of this strip."

Lt. Col. Ngo Nhu Bich, the province chief, and his American military advisers were ready with a limousine bearing four stars. The briefing by the chief, in excellent English, was an uncomplaining recital of a province plagued with both the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese at times, and too little equipment for too big a job.

Colonel Bich responded to the general's best wishes for Tet, saying:

"Tet is the time of pardon, of friendship, and of gratitude. Even the worst enemies (except Communists) are forgiven.

"One year has passed, through bad and good days. Some valiant soldiers have fallen, obscure heroes of freedom and democracy."

MEETS FAMILY

He referred to "we" in his message and then said: "This term includes, for sure, American pilots working day and night, American officers and NCO's crisscrossing the jungle with their Vietnamese friends, American civilian officials performing their job with nothing else but a desire to help. You are those valiant Americans. May our foreign friends who share our difficulties and fight our own fight know that they are in a part of our heart."

From there the group proceeded to the colonel's house where Westmoreland presented the colonel's wife with a spray of flowers and met the couple's seven children.

The demanding timepiece intruded again. Westmoreland had to be back in Saigon to see Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge by 4 p.m. And it was already after 3 o'clock.

The Beechcraft took off and the pilot really gunned it. At Tan Son Nhut there was the usual stackup. Four fighter-bombers were taking off. Two big cargo and troop-carrier planes were arriving. A half dozen helicopters were in the stream. On the ground the general's plane taxied carefully among a swirl of propellers. Westmoreland said goodbye before the wheels had stopped and leaped out to a waiting car and hurried off to his meeting with Lodge.

HUMAN COMPUTER

After the meeting with the Ambassador, Westmoreland visited his opposite numbers in the Vietnamese high command to wish them a happy New Year.

This was pushing the day into the night. What was he doing that night:

"I'm tired," said his aide, "but the general relieves me mostly of social functions. He goes generally alone. Then he works at home."

That's quite a day.

It would be quite a day even for a mechanical computer which lacked all emotion.

Come to think of it, the commanding general was doing a lot of computing for one human being in every one of the multiple roles he had played.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, the New York Post published the last of six articles written from Saigon by Reporter Pete Hamill. The articles have been informative as well as provocative. Pete Hamill has realistically appraised the situation and in the final article discusses the hard choices in Vietnam which confront us.

The author says:

> The truth is that it is absurd to think of negotiating a solution to the war without making the Vietcong, and their political arm, the National Liberation Front, a party to the proceedings. They made the revolution—with the support of North Vietnam and China, to be sure—and they will have a say in how it ends.

I urge my colleagues to read the following:

VIETNAM: THE ENDLESS WAR—ARTICLE VI: THE CHINESE PUZZLE

(By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—There is no way to discuss the bitter choices we face in Vietnam without considering the size, power, history, and ambitions of China.

China is there; it will not go away; and there has not been so much as a single sentence from Peiping in the years since 1949 to indicate that as a nation China is anything other than our enemy. Its 700 million inhabitants are ruled by hardfisted old men whose language is violent and inflexible. With its fledging atomic weapons and huge land army, it stands unchallenged as the most powerful nation in Asia. Its variety of communism is single minded and ruthless, and its history as a nation is one marked by repeated attempts at territorial expansion.

"There is no doubt in my mind that you Americans are making a stand in Vietnam against China," one British military man here said to me. "If you want to call this fight something else that is your privilege. But basically you are resisting the Chinese thrust for complete dominance of Asia, and I commend you for it. You are the only nation in the world with the guts and vigor to do it."

Both hawks and doves agree that China is one of the central issues of the war, and that the Vietcong versus Vietnamese Governments struggle is—relatively—a side issue. The hawks are pressing for a direct confrontation with China, some of them even hoping for an excluse to bomb out the Chinese nuclear facilities. The doves feel that no matter what we do, China in the year 2000 will clearly be the dominant power in Asia, as we are in the Western Hemisphere, and it is a waste of money and lives to fight such a useless fight.

The terrible thing is that both arguments are valid, and a choice between them is not simple. A direct challenge to the Chinese would not be a simple matter of bombing atomic facilities. One would have to send in a land army to fight across China, and as Mao Tse-tung has pointed out, it would be almost impossible for us to field an army large enough for victory. We are, after all, almost completely alone in our current Asian policy.

The assumption that China is interested only in consolidating its power in Asia assumes that a dedicated Communist revolutionary has a point at which he becomes sated. It is inconceivable that the Chinese will launch a fleet of junks across the Pacific to storm ashore at San Diego.

But the military strategists are also aware that in a few years the Chinese will have the missiles required to launch their atomic weapons, and when that day dawns, the United States will be faced with an adversary far more dangerous than Nikita Khrushchev ever was. There is no indication that the younger generation of Chinese Communists, whose character was not formed in the long, bloody civil war with Chiang Kai-shek, are less hard, or less Chinese than the aging guerrillas head by Mao Tse-tung.

"It took the Russians 40 years to face the responsibilities of their power," one American political officer said. "The Chinese are just starting to flex their musclies. It's like a street fight. The most dangerous kid on the block is usually the strong young kid who thinks he's unbeatable."

No one understands the Chinese thirst for expansion better than the Vietnamese, north and south. They fought the Chinese for almost 1,000 years. In his way, Ho Chi Minh has done an astute job of holding them back even now.

"Ho has played it very cagey," one Saigon political observer said. "He took all the help he needed from the Chinese during the fight against the French, and used China as a sanctuary. But he never allowed North Vietnam to become the kind of outright satellite that say, Rumania, was. The Vietcong are taking the weapons from China, and the political support. They know that most Asians fear China, and they make that fear work for them. But they also tell you that they will not have fought the Japanese, the French and the Americans for 30 years just to let the Chinese march in."

In some ways, the Vietcong in the south do not even trust Ho Chi Minh. On at least three separate occasions the north has sold out the southern revolution: in March 1946, when Ho made an agreement with the French that created a free state within the French Union, but left Cochin China (South Vietnam) under absolute French rule; in Geneva, in 1954, when Ho accepted the cutoff at the 17th parallel; and again in 1956 when North Vietnam made only feeble protests about the cancellation of the elections which were supposed to reunite the country.

"Everyone thinks the war can be solved if the United States just sits down with the North Vietnamese," one Saigon official said. "Suppose the Vietcong say to both 'get lost'? What happens then?"

The truth is that it is absurd to think of negotiating a solution to the war without making the Vietcong, and their political arm, the National Liberation Front, a party to the proceedings. They made the revolution—with the support of North Vietnam and China, to be sure—and they will have a say in how it ends.

Unfortunately, the best we can expect from a negotiated settlement is a coalition government, and there is little doubt that such a government would become Communist in a matter of a few years. With China breathing hard upon all of them, there is little hope for any nation in southeast Asia to be truly independent. They might be sovereign, but no more independent than, say, Guatemala. And our own chances at trying to transform Ho Chi Minh into a kind of southeast Asian Tito withered in the cold war, and the missionary evangelism of John Foster Dulles. The history of our involvement in Vietnam, like that of China and Cuba, is a history of lost chances.

So the hard choices in Vietnam are staring us in the face. We can negotiate a settlement, if the other side agrees finally to talk, and be prepared eventually to lose South Vietnam to a Communist government. We can save face doing this by agreeing to phase out our troops over a 3-year period while the coalition government tries to govern the country. As a nation, we can then pull back to a more sensible commitment in the world. We can concentrate on South America, on our own domestic running sores like slums and poverty. We can give up the role of playing policemen to the world.

But if we do that we must recognize it as a kind of victory for China. The Chinese themselves are making this war into a war of Asians against white men. We must be very clear on that if we decide to negotiate. China is holding up the Vietnamese example to the rest of the world. One more decade of incompetent, hopeless rule, and India could go to the Communists. If Africa continues on its erratic path, the Communists could take most of it. The one thing communism does offer, after all, is stability. It is the stability of the graveyard, but if you are searching for peace and quiet, Albania is the place to go.

Those who have studied the situation do not believe much in the domino theory, but they do feel that the Chinese Communists see the world power struggle as an extension of guerrilla warfare. In guerrilla warfare you isolate the enemy in the cities by taking over the countryside. By extension, the continental United States becomes the city, the underdeveloped world the countryside. In those terms the Chinese threat, especially when it achieves the means of delivering atomic weapons, is a real one.

So the second choice is to fight. If we decide the fight is worthwhile and that we can contain Chinese expanionism by making that fight in South Vietnam, then we must immediately make the terms of the fight clear. We must stop the pious rhetoric and the murky generalities. We must tell the people of this country that young men will die in the next 5 or 6 years as they have never died before. One military man in Saigon told me that we must be prepared to take 300,000 casualties, and possibly more. We can hope that in the interim Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung will die; the Vietcong cause will lose popularity with the death of Ho; and the Chinese might become more tractable without Mao.

Every military man I spoke to is agreed that the war will be bloody and long. The popularity-of-the-war polls are running in favor of keeping the war going. But most experts suspect that this is only because the war and its bloody possibilities have never been fully explained.

The various plans for solving the war, including the so-called Gavin plan, are all based on an American pullout. One can sit in enclaves and leave the rest of South Vietnam to the Vietcong until a peace of sorts can be negotiated. Other plans call for fighting until the rebellion is crushed, as was done in Malaya, the Philippines, and Greece. Each is based on the belief that there are simple solutions to complex problems.

As a reporter, I discovered in South Vietnam that the world is never as simple as it seems when sitting at a typewriter in New York. I don't like young men dying. I don't like the idea that my country is fighting to keep a corrupt, selfish, feudal society in power in a country whose citizens demand revolution. I wish for once we had joined a revolution instead of fighting against it.

But I would hate to have to explain to young men in 1980 that the reason we are about to engage the Chinese in a contest to destroy the world with nuclear arms was because we walked away from a fight in 1966. I do wish the cant and the lying would be removed from the discussion and that we would be told some concrete truths about the war. Perhaps if our Government would do that we could all decide clearly what we think should be done. I don't really know. I do know that as you read this young men are dying.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before the present Congress is adjourned, we will be called upon to consider and act on a number of pieces of legislation affecting labor and industry. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a copy of a letter written by a small independent businessman. Names and figures have been deleted, but the thoughts in the letter are worthwhile in light of the pending legislation:

JANUARY 14, 1966.

I have just returned from New York, where, for a period of 10 days, I was forced to experience the inconvenience and discomfort in connection with what was probably the costliest and most unnecessary strike in the history of the city of New York. If there had not already been a critical need for such a letter as this, going through the subway strike would certainly have provoked one.

First of all, may I express my appreciation for the fact that you are our Congressman at large, and I find myself seldom if ever in disagreement with the stand you have taken on legislation.

We are now in a new session of Congress, and if one would be influenced by President Johnson's message to Congress, it would seem that a considerable portion of the legislation under consideration will be of a character, which, if enacted, would have a devastating effect on smaller towns and smaller retailers, so disastrous, in fact that there is no question but that it will wipe out many of both. I feel, therefore, that you will welcome the information and facts contained in this letter.

Small, independent businesses, in my judgment, are an important element in the economy of the United States, characteristic of the democratic way of life, in which a man is free to make choices and achieve security through his own efforts. Historically, ours has been a nation of independent businessmen who are proud of their self-reliance, and in my judgment, our legislators will make no mistake if they strive to enact laws which will provide for the successful future for such folk. Particularly those in the smaller towns and operating smaller businesses.

Apparently we are in an era where the end result of a great deal of the legislation which becomes law, turns out to be a breeder of bigness, of mergers, of consolidations. And these, in turn, seem to develop an economy daily becoming more regimented, and this, unfortunately, tends to develop a sort of uniformity, a dull level of mediocrity on the part of the worker, rather than an ambition to make a name for oneself and achieve security through one's own efforts.

The J. C. Penney Co. is one example of what I am thinking about. In recent years, this company has closed stores in two of our towns, and are now in process of closing one in a third, and it is my understanding they plan to continue this procedure in the smaller towns; whereas, here in Dallas, they have recently opened what has been advertised as the largest Penney store in the world.

Our firm, ———, is a small company, and our stores are all located in smaller towns. However, because of increased expenses, primarily a result of the wage and hour law, we have found it necessary to close our store in ———, as the volume of business we are able to do there is not sufficient to cover our cost of doing business, which, incidentally, is largely made up of payroll. Frankly, if some legislation is not enacted which is favorable to the small towns and small stores, it is only a matter of time, in my judgment, until there will be none, and I feel the contribution such towns and businesses have made to the American way of life is of sufficient importance that legislation should be enacted to protect them and provide an incentive for them to survive and make a modest profit.

Our company now has ——— stores, ——— of which are covered by the present wage and hour law, and ——— of which, because their volume is less than $250,000 per year, are not covered. Since you as a legislator, I am sure, are interested in facts, I have asked our controller to prepare figures on two of our stores, one of them being a smaller store not now covered by the wage and hour law, and the other a larger one which is. Following these, are figures setting out how the wage and hour law would affect our entire company.

Frankly, confidential figures such as these are usually not revealed, and they are being submitted, in confidence, to acquaint you with the seriousness of the situation that faces our company. Further, may I add that there are tens of thousands of small and medium size stores throughout the Nation that will face conditions similar to ours. What I want to emphasize is, that the conditions we face at ——— is not unique. Instead, it is typical.

First, may I submit the figures of the smaller store, showing the results of its operation in the 1964 fiscal year ending January 31, 1965, and directly beside these are figures showing how this store would be affected in 1969 if it came under the wage and hour law and the proposed amendments now under consideration:

	1964		1969	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Sales		100.00		100.00
Gross profit		33.52		33.52
Other income, discounts, etc		3.07		3.07
Expenses:				
Salaries		14.17		23.67
All other [1]		17.42		17.94
Total expenses		31.59		41.61
Net profit		5.00		(5.02)

[1] Tax increase included in "All other."

The above figures reveal that in 1964, the store made a modest profit of 5 percent on the volume of business done, which is certainly not excessive. In 1969, if the store is able to maintain the same volume as it did in 1964, the position would be reversed from a profit of 5 percent to a net loss of 5.02 percent, or from a profit of $——— to an actual loss of $———.

You will observe that the salaries increased from 14.17 percent, or $———, to 23.67 percent, or $———. This reveals that almost the entire difference in expenses is in salaries. Actually, our payroll would increase 67.4 percent. No business can stand such an increase, and, this store would even operate at a loss with salaries of $1.25 an hour.

Unfortunately, the volume in this store, and most of our other stores, has shrunk in recent years, and there is little reason to feel that volume can be increased in these smaller towns and smaller stores in this era of bigness, and with the possible enactment of legislation which might only be absorbed by giant corporations having a tremendous volume of business.

I would now like to submit the figures of our largest store, which, because of the fact that it is and has been covered by the wage and hour law, we are submitting in a slightly different manner, showing the gradual increase in expenses and decreases in profits each year from a profit of 4.94 percent to a loss of 1.19 percent in 1969. The figures used for the 1964-65 period cover our fiscal year, which began on February 1, 1964, and ended on January 31, 1965. However, we used the calendar year for the others, inasmuch as the tax changes covered by them are figured on the calendar year basis. And while the loss in 1969 is not as great as the one in the smaller store, it, nevertheless, a loss.

	Actual, 1964-65 ($1.15 and $1.20)	1966 ($1.25)	1967 ($1.50)	1968 ($1.60)	1969 ($1.75)
Sales					
Gross profit					
Other income					
Expenses:					
Salaries (percent of sales)	11.82	13.52	15.21	15.92	17.02
Taxes (percent of sales)	.43	.92	1.14	1.19	1.36
Other (percent of sales)	15.69	15.69	15.69	15.69	15.69
Total (percent of sales)	27.94	30.13	32.04	32.80	34.07
Profit (loss) (percent of sales)	4.94	2.75	.84	.08	(1.19)

These two examples illustrate what would happen if only those employees now under the minimum were advanced, whereas all of our more efficient employees now receiving higher salaries would also expect increases, as they are aware that they have greater skill and value than those less efficient who are now receiving less. If the less skilled, less efficient employees received an increase of 50 cents per hour, those with greater skill, in all probability, would expect no less than an increase of 75 cents per hour, which would result in an even greater loss.

In submitting these two examples, I have taken one of our smallest stores and our largest store, the larger one now covered by the wage and hour law, as I am anxious that the comparisons provided be fair. However, in the final analysis, since we have ——— stores that are not now covered by the wage and hour law, and since, if the proposed amendments under consideration become law, all of our stores would be covered, it will be apparent that the position of our company as a whole would be more truly reflected by the figures of the smaller store than those of the larger one. I believe the following figures for our company as a whole will validate this statement.

These figures illustrate how the payroll of our entire company would be affected if brought under the wage and hour law as it now stands at $1.25 per hour, and then what would happen if this wage rate were advanced to $1.50, to $1.60, and finally to $1.75 an hour.

Rate	Dollar increase	Percentage increase
$1.25 per hour		29.19
$1.50 per hour		52.10
$1.60 per hour		59.17
$1.75 per hour		69.69

Frankly, no company our size can live under such circumstances. Undoubtedly we would have to liquidate, which is a distressing situation indeed, to confront a solvent company, after having operated profitably for a period of over 60 years.

In addition, this would create and increase unemployment in every town where we have a store. I might add that in ———, where we have just closed our store, this situation has already obtained, as those who were working for us are now unemployed, and this will leave both business and residential property vacant, to say nothing of the tremendous loss our company has suffered through this liquidation.

Right here I should add that the 1961 amendments and the 1964 increases in minimum wage have already had an adverse effect on retail employment, as we are using more part-timers and fewer full-timers in order to minimize increases in payroll expenses. Employment opportunities for students have been reduced, and will be virtually eliminated by the proposed increases now under consideration.

I have always supported essential and basic social legislation, but I believe that such legislation should be used only to maintain basic standards, rather than to stimulate artificially the natural development of economic levels. These new proposed regulations, if adopted, instead of simply guaranteeing a basic minimum wage, would, in effect, artificially increase wage rates, disturb the interrelationships among wages, productivity and prices, and contribute to inflationary pressures, at a time when such pressures are already near the danger level. I have heard the argument advanced by some labor leaders that no employer should be in business who cannot pay the legal minimum. Such a stand merely amounts to putting the existence of a business at the mercy of the Government. This is a fallacious argument. I believe that right now, our legislators should give thought to the question of whether it is better for society to allow these less efficient workers, or workers unwilling to move from rural areas where they live and earn as much as they can, to continue to do so if they so desire, or should they be put out of work with an excessive legal minimum wage so that they earn nothing.

Perhaps the most questionable of all is the argument that an increase in the minimum wage would help business by enlarging consumer buying power. If this were a valid argument, I would be writing and asking you to increase wages. But why stop at $1.75, when $10 or $20 an hour would really enlarge purchasing power * * * or would it?

I am aware that this letter may already be a bit tiresome, but with us, it represents survival itself. I am, therefore, anxious for you to have the necessary facts, and because of the seriousness of this situation, I would like to know just how you stand on this legislation, and I would appreciate having your assurance that you will vote against any increases in the wage and hour law which would affect businesses of our size.

So much for the wage and hour law and its effect on our company.

Now, may I cite some statistics as to how the new unemployment compensation proposal would affect us. While this increase, dollarwise, pales into insignificance when compared to increases in the wage and hour regulation, if the new unemployment compensation bill, H.R. 8282, is enacted, our cost under this would be increased 71.44 percent. This is excessively high, particularly for smaller retailers. The profits of our company have been meager indeed in recent years, and the increase which would be brought about by H.R. 8282 alone, might wipe out our profits.

Our President has recently commented about the threat of overheating the economy through price and wage increases. He observed that 1966 would be another record year for the American economy, if there is price-wage restraint.

Treasury Secretary Fowler, speaking before the National Association of Manufacturers, said, "In the price factor, some disturbing signs have appeared." He added that "industrial wholesale prices have risen by 1.3 percent in the 12 months ending this October, after 6 years of comparative flatness."

It would seem to me that both our President and our Treasury Secretary are saying that the threat of inflation is growing. Certainly the growing shadow of the Vietnam war and our other military commitments around the world can no longer be ignored. All of which adds to the growing threat of inflation. It seems to me, therefore, that this is no time even for consideration of increases in either wages or unemployment compensation.

Finally, because I am a small merchant, with small stores, I have, quite naturally, directed my remarks to smaller towns, smaller stores, and our own stores specifically. However, after having said that, I question seriously if any store can live under the burden of these proposed increases. Frankly speaking, I believe these two issues, the wage and hour proposals and the increases in Federal employment taxes, coupled with the already passed social security increase, could wreck the retail industry. Therefore, because it represents survival itself to us, I would like to know the stand you will take on each of these proposals.

Again I apologize for the length of my letter, which, however, under the circumstances, I feel it fully justified, and I will look forward to hearing from you.

Thanking you for your support of our position, and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

—— ——,
President.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Tribute to Albert Thomas: A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the flag of our country flies at halfmast today and the hearts of our people are saddened because of the death of Albert Thomas—our colleague—one of the great men of our time.

Permit me to take this means of paying a brief but sincere tribute to his memory and to his life of selfless and dedicated service to our country.

We are indeed saddened by the realization that Albert Thomas is gone—never to return to the House—never to be with us again in the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations or in the Congress.

It is my firm conviction that there has never been a greater chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee than Albert Thomas.

He worked long.

He worked hard.

He was dedicated to the Congress—to his district—to his beloved State of Texas—and to this great Nation. America will bear the imprint of the creativity and imagination of Albert Thomas for generations to come as the work he did here continues to unfold in growth and progress. Our children and our children's children will live in a better America because of the foresight and wisdom of Albert Thomas.

His grasp of complex and difficult problems was remarkable and his judgment was sound. He will long be remembered for his vision and initiative in the fields of space and science and technology—and in other areas of growth and progress.

Albert Thomas was one of the first to visualize the importance of space exploration and the technological byproducts that such exploration has developed—and will continue to develop. He was a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and played a crucial role in the development of atomic energy.

He was a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and took a consistent and strong position for a powerful defense posture for our country—for great national strength—for an America more powerful than any nation in history.

The unselfish dedication of Albert Thomas to the national interest will echo down the corridors of history as the United States meets the challenges at home and abroad which he anticipated.

It was my great honor to serve with Albert Thomas on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations for some 14 years. I sat at his side and learned great lessons from this great man and this great teacher.

Albert Thomas saw this committee as an instrument of service and progress—an instrument that touched the lives of almost every American through the independent agencies our committee funded. Albert Thomas realized this and it gave him vision and dedication—and a will to create a greater America.

But—in addition to his great record of public service and his devotion to the national interest—Albert Thomas was a warm human being. He had a great capacity for friendship—I was his close friend. Working with him, I came to know him well. He was not only a great man but a good man—a man of concern and compassion.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we are saddened by his passing. We are shocked and shaken by the departure of this wonderful man, good friend, and statesman.

Although Albert Thomas would have wanted the Independent Offices Subcommittee to continue its work, in deference to his memory, hearings were suspended this morning.

This Congress and the Nation mourn the passing of this great man from Texas. I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomas, to his two lovely daughters, and to the other members of his family in their bereavement.

Strong Resolve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. HANSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it took a long while before the Marshall plan was appreciated and it may even be awhile before this administration's plan for southeast Asia is appreciated as fully as it should be.

Commenting on the declaration of Honolulu and our strong resolve to help Vietnam, Columnist David Lawrence said:

> The war in Vietnam has turned out to be one of the most unselfish and generous expressions of a nation's purpose which has been witnessed in this century.

He believes that ultimately "the American crusade to secure self-determination for the people of Vietnam will be recognized as a manifestation of a great principle and ideal."

I found this column, with its review of the purposes of the Honolulu declaration and indeed, the role of the United States in southeast Asia, to be most informative, and I offer it to the Record for insertion:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 11, 1966]

Declaration of Honolulu: A Strong Resolve on Viet

(By David Lawrence)

Washington.—It looks like a long, grueling war ahead in Vietnam. All the talk about escalation or unlimited bombing or mobilizing a vast army of Americans to fight the war has been superseded by a planned determination to build up steadily the economic and military strength of South Vietnam, even if it takes years and years to do the job.

The chances are that no big battles will be fought and that no spectacular military measures will be taken, but that the United States will continue to exercise an increasing pressure that will eventually drive out the Communist guerrillas.

If on any occasion in the meantime the North Vietnamese Government wishes to talk peace, the United States will be ready. But there will have to be some evidence from the enemy that there is a genuine desire to end the war.

President Johnson's trip to Hawaii was intended to strengthen the morale of the Vietnamese Government and at the same time proclaim to the world America's intention to carry on the fight for the ideals that have been set forth again and again in the past.

The Declaration of Honolulu is significant, not because any new principles are enumciated but because the purposes of the Untied States are defined in even more resolute terms than before. It says, in part:

"The United States of America is joined with the people and Government of Vietnam to pervent aggression. This is the purpose of the determined effort of the American armed forces now engaged in Vietnam. The United States seeks no bases. It seeks no colonial presence. It seeks to impose no alliance or alinement. It seeks only to prevent aggression, and its pledge to that purpose is firm. It aims simply to help a people and government who are determined to help themselves.

"The United States is pledged to the principles of the self-determination of peoples, and of government by the consent of the governed * * *.

"Just as the United States is pledged to play its full part in the worldwide attack upon hungar, ignorance, and disease, so in Vietnam it will give special support to the work of the people of that country to build even while they fight * * *.

"The purpose of the United States remains a purpose of peace. The U.S. Government and the Government of Vietnam will continue in the future, as they have in the past, to press the quest for a peaceful settlement in every forum."

It is interesting to compare what President Johnson affirmed at Honolulu with what he said in a speech on August 12, 1964, just after Congress had authorized him to use the Armed Forces of the United States in Vietnam. He said at that time:

"For 10 years through the Eisenhower administration, the Kennedy administration, and this administration, we have had one consistent aim—observance of the 1954 agreements which guaranteed the independence of South Vietnam. That independence has been the consistent target of aggression and terror. For 10 years our respond to these attacks has followed a consistent pattern. First, that the South Vietnamese have the basic responsibility for the defense of their own freedom.

"Second, we would engage our strength and our resources to whatever extent needed to help others repeal aggression * * *.

"Some say we should withdraw from South Vietnam * * *. But the United States cannot and must not and will not turn aside and allow the freedom of a brave people to be handed over to Communist tyranny. This alternative is strategically unwise, we think, and it is morally unthinkable."

Although some Americans may think there is a magic way to bring the Vietnam war to a early end, they will find that, while the policy decided upon now does not call for hasty or impulsive action, it means a steady pressure designed to convince the North Vietnamese Government that its aggression in South Vietnam has to be abandoned.

The war in Vietnam has turned out to be one of the most unselfish and generous expressions of a nation's purpose which has been witnessed in this century. Ultimately, the American crusade to secure self-determination for the people of Vietnam will be recognized as a manifestation of a great principle and ideal. It took a long while for the Marshall plan to be appreciated in the decade after World War II was ended, and it will probably take an equally long time before the disinterested and unselfish service rendered to the people of Vietnam by the United States is truly understood by the world.

Time for Renewed Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during these trying moments when pressure from all sides is upon us to back down from our commitment in Vietnam I found the enclosed San Diego Union editorial of January 31 to be most enlightening and helpful in sustaining our convictions. It is entitled "Marine Sounds the Call—Time for Renewed Dedication," and was based on the brief comments made by a most able Marine in the Pacific, Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak.

Under unanimous consent, I include this as a portion of my remarks:

MARINE SOUNDS THE CALL—TIME FOR RENEWED DEDICATION

It took only a few short sentences, but Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, commander of the Pacific Fleet Marine Force, answered with firmness and his authority gained over 31 years in the corps just why the United States of America is fighting atheistic communism in South Vietnam.

"If the United States should abandon its commitment to South Vietnam, we will face more Vietnams in Thailand, Cambodia, Malaysia, Australia, and New Zealand," the veteran Marine Corps combat officer declared.

"We are in Vietnam to protect freedom. The freedom of others, which we respect, and our own freedom, which we cherish," General Krulak said, adding there is also a subjective side to our being committed to battle.

"Our own freedom is a direct issue. If we back away now we will tell our friends and enemies that we can't be trusted and we will lose our stake in Asia."

Although General Krulak restricted his remarks to southeast Asia and the present war there, they hold true equally well and also apply to our global commitments to West Germany, Latin America, Japan, and all free nations around the globe to which we are bound either by treaty or moral obligations.

The general left no doubt as to his thoughts on the outcome of the war in Vietnam as he predicted victory for the U.S. forces "because the kids we have over there are doing their job."

Calling for renewed dedication on the part of all Americans, he declared:

"Our young people in Vietnam are doing their job. It has always been the young people of our country who have carried the burden of war * * * [but] the issue is not up to them—it is up to us."

His prediction of victory is based on a belief that the country is coming "more and more to recognize the problem faced in Vietnam."

On draft-card burners, General Krulak recalled how a young wounded marine told him: "They don't count * * * I'll bet they never burned their social security cards or their unemployment checks."

Another boy in a hospital told the general, regarding the college campus demonstrators:

"I don't really mind this within reason. It doesn't amount to much, but I think that any university that would permit signs on its campus which call us butchers doesn't deserve to be called a university."

With the great majority of Americans backing our troops with renewed dedication, the words of the two hospitalized boys gain strength and perhaps even greater purpose than they intended.

"They," indeed, "don't count."

Grain Research Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER L. MIZE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital points out an instance where the new budget may be "penny wise and pound foolish." This is in reference to the proposed cuts in Federal research funds. Kansas State University and other land-grant colleges and universities will be seriously hampered in carrying out vital research if these funds are cut back. The timing is especially bad because the cuts are proposed at a time when we are talking about solving world food problems.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. I am sure they will find the words of Dr. Glenn Beck, quoted in the editorial, worthy of note as he exposes the inconsistency in these recommendations. The editorial follows:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital, Feb. 4, 1966]

GRAIN RESEARCH VITAL

There was bad news on the Kansas farm front this week as Dr. Glenn H. Beck, vice president for agriculture at Kansas State University, told the annual Agricultural Experiment Station Conference at Manhattan that Kansas stands to lose $222,352 in Federal research funds effective July 1 this year.

If President Johnson's proposed budget is adopted, said Dr. Beck, $122,000 would be unavailable for studies dealing with wheat and sorghum. The remainder of the slash would affect the Kansas Agriculture Experiment Station and the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service.

The proposed reduction, Dr. Beck contended, is not realistic for obvious reasons.

"Much of this reduction is directed toward studies dealing with wheat and sorghum," he said. "This comes at a time when two-thirds of the countries in the world face disastrous famine. And, paradoxically, it comes at a time when it is our proclaimed policy to extend our help in trying to solve the world food problem."

Similar reductions, he said, have not been made in research on such commodities as tobacco, cotton, and peanuts.

As the No. 1 producer of wheat among the States, Kansas raised 250 million bushels of grain in 1965 worth $350 million. But the State must depend on quality as well as quantity, said Dr. Beck, and loss of Federal research support will be costly in that it will hinder wheat quality programs.

Pest control research may also be cut back to the extent that it would mean crop losses equivalent to $25 to $50 million annually.

"Harvest sorghum grain, alone, has a cash value of at least $135 million," Dr. Beck pointed out. "More important, it serves as a principal source of energy needed to produce meat animals worth a half billion dollars."

Dr. Beck's objections to the proposed cutbacks in Federal support are based on sound reasoning. With a huge food-producing task ahead, Kansas farmers will need to keep up the continual improvement of quality and production methods as they have in the past.

Now is the time for all good Kansans to take time to write to their congressional delegation. It's hard to believe that the administration wants to take steps to lessen food production when our grain reserves continue to dwindle and the demand is increasing.

Washington promises other nations that help in the way of food is coming. It doesn't make sense to cancel productive programs. In the light of appropriations these days, the amount involved is relatively small for the benefits it will bring. Surely our representatives in Congress will do their best to maintain present research programs.

Our New War—Anti-Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1966, the Los Angeles Times contained an outstanding editorial on the problem of inflation.

It very properly and forcefully points out that to check inflationary tendencies requires not only restraint by labor and management, but by the Federal Government itself. As inflation, which has frequently been defined as a hidden tax, affects all of our people, I recommend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

OUR NEW WAR—ANTI-INFLATION

Only a few short weeks ago, spokesmen for the Johnson administration were busily denying that inflation constitutes a real danger to the booming U.S. economy.

The President sang a different and more realistic tune in his annual economic report to Congress Thursday. He warned that inflation could eat up the fruits of the American economic miracle and served notice that he will seek higher taxes if necessary to keep it under control.

Nobody likes to pay taxes. But, as Mr. Johnson observed, inflation reduces the purchasing power of our paychecks just as surely as a tax increase. And it bears more heavily on those in lower income brackets, who are least able to pay.

Any increase in individual and corporate income taxes should be held off, however, until other less drastic anti-inflationary weapons have been tried.

Certainly the Federal Government should exercise the same kind of economic restraint which President Johnson is asking from business and organized labor.

In preparing to fight inflation, it helps to understand how our economy arrived at its present healthy but overheating state.

Five years ago, unemployment was high and the Nation's factories were operating well under capacity. To promote prosperity and put more people to work, Washington cut taxes and spent freely.

Whether in response to this medicine or from its own native vigor, the U.S. economy has surged to unprecedented levels of prosperity.

Unemployment is approaching the lowest level in 13 years. Profits and wages are up, and our gross national product is growing faster than that of any major industrial country in the world.

Now the problem has become one of restraint rather than growth. Labor shortages are cropping up in certain skills, and manufacturers are operating at or near capacity.

Under these pressures, prices are going up—sharply so in the last few weeks.

As the President noted, these are problems of prosperity which other countries may well envy. Nevertheless, if we are to keep our society strong and growing, and avoid a return to wartime controls on wages and prices, the inflationary threat must be dealt with.

Mr. Johnson has already asked Congress to pass legislation speeding collection of present income taxes, and reimposing certain excise taxes which expired only recently.

Beyond that, his spokesmen are telling both business and labor that it is more important than ever for them to keep wages and prices within the suggested Federal guidelines.

That is, wage increases should be held to 3.2 percent per year, and employers should absorb payroll increases of this size without raising prices.

Both business and labor must strive to stay within these guidelines, if stronger medicine is to be avoided. However, the country has a right to expect some restraint and purposeful action on the Government's part, too.

First, the President should employ his persuasive powers just as strongly against excessive union demands as against unwarranted price increases. He has not done so to date.

Demands for higher Federal spending must be resisted, except for defense purposes.

A further tightening of credit and the money supply should be considered by monetary authorities. The average citizen should spend less and save more.

If serious inflation nevertheless develops, income tax increases may be necessary. But they should be levied on a temporary basis, with the understanding that the revenue will not be used to generate more inflation through more Government spending. The money, instead, should be used to hold down the deficit or perhaps even reduce the national debt.

National Park in the Cascades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying to discover an editorial in last Sunday's New York Times recognizing the unique and as yet unspoiled natural landscape values of the North Cascades Mountains of Washington State.

In a timely editorial this great newspaper pays just tribute to those who have been crusading for years to preserve this region from commercial exploitation by establishment of a new national park—a project which in principle I have favored.

Right now conflicting pressures are being exerted in connection with implementation of the recent Agriculture and Interior Departments' study of mass recreation needs in this area. In this regard, I must concur with the hope expressed by the Times that something closer to perfection than the recommendations of the new study will be achieved.

One aspect of the current controversy which must be resolved is overlooked by the Times; namely, a related proposal to adjust the boundaries of the Olympic National Park. Special care, it seems to me, should be exercised to assure that in any compromise with commercial interests, existing conservation achievements not be jeopardized.

Meanwhile, I am happy indeed that progress toward new legislation is being made. It is highly desirable that the administration make its proposals known and that Congress give them expeditious consideration.

Following is the text of the New York Times editorial referred to which deserves to be read by all Members of Congress:

NATIONAL PARK IN THE CASCADES

After 2½ years of careful inquiry and tense bureaucratic negotiations, the Agriculture and Interior Departments have joined in recommending the creation of a new national park in the North Cascade Mountains in the State of Washington. But the agreement is fragile and incomplete, and some of the compromises at the heart of the report are damaging.

The area under consideration, more than a million acres east of Seattle and stretching north to the Canadian border, is an incomparably beautiful part of the Nation's landscape. Sometimes called the American Alps, this region has rugged, towering peaks, glaciers, snow and ice fields, Alpine meadows, brilliant lakes, and fast-running rivers. If ever there was a region of the country deserving of full protection as a national park, the North Cascades is that region.

Controversy arises because the area is rich in timber, much of it in national forests under the administration of the Agriculture Department's Forest Service. Since the Forest Service's multiple-use policy permits profitable logging operations, the private lumber companies have long opposed a park. And since a park would be under the control of the Department of the Interior, the Agriculture Department is reluctant to yield jurisdiction. These two interests have been joined by a third—local business groups who want the area more intensively developed for mass recreation. The compromises in the report reflect these conflicting pressures.

The report recommends a national park of 698,000 acres, only half the size originally envisaged by the National Park Service, and leaving the other half—the spectacular Glacier Peak Wilderness—under Forest Service control. But Glacier Peak is the most superb section of the Cascades; it can be kept as a wilderness area and still be given park protection.

Unfortunately, the study team proposes to draw the boundaries to include dams within the park. Generating plants have rarely if ever been permitted within the confines of a national park; and their inclusion here would set a wretched precedent.

In deference to the local tourist industry, the report proposes helicopter service and chairlift lines as well as many new roads into the higher mountain country. The former would be innovations in a national park—and uniformly bad ones—entirely contrary to the whole idea of parks as natural preserves.

As recently as 5 years ago prospects for getting a park seemed poor. That the proposal has advanced this far is a tribute to the tireless crusading of the Sierra Club and the North Cascades Conservation Council and to the mediating efforts of Edward C. Crafts, chairman of the study team. But the unique value of the North Cascades commands effort to bring this proposal still closer to perfection.

"Why" We're There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post says quite plainly that we should keep our attention on the central reason of "why" we are in Vietnam, and it adds that Senator GALE McGEE is right in calling a "rambling debate over Vietnam a potential danger to our understanding of the conflict."

The Post noted that a discursive argument is one that digresses, and it adds that:

> Such debates—over what a general really meant or what Hanoi radio really is trying to say (beneath the surface)—should not be allowed to obscure more relevant discussion.

Because I find the guidelines offered here very helpful, I ask permission of my colleagues that the article be made a part of the RECORD:

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 9, 1966]

SOME GUIDELINES ON VIETNAM DEBATE

Senator GALE McGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, is right in calling the rambling debate over Vietnam a potential danger to our understanding of the conflict. He says, "specifically, that the question of why we are in Vietnam is the important one"—and that we shouldn't get bogged down in a series of "discursive" arguments.

A discursive argument is one that digresses. We're sure that McGEE, a former university professor, has seen enough discursive student essays to be at home with the word.

A student, conceivably, may digress in the hope he will confuse his teacher into believing he knows the answer. Possibly the same motivation is involved in some of the criticism of President Johnson.

The problem, as Senator McGEE sees it, is that hundreds of minor things are brought into major debate. And sometimes major issues are twisted into questionable directions.

An example of the latter is the reaction to Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin's now famous letter to Harper's magazine last month. Gavin expressed some disagreement with the administration's Asia policy. He was supposed to favor retreating to coastal enclaves.

But the result was that Gavin was so widely misunderstood—and so widely hailed as an opponent of President Johnson's policies—that Gavin said last week he's sorry he committed the ideas to paper.

Gavin explained: "I did not suggest we withdraw to the enclaves; I said that where we are now, we have these enclaves, and if we stay with what we have * * * we can either hold on or consolidate in several large areas or one large area."

This is not necessarily bad military logic—as some Johnson supporters say it is—nor is it proof that Gavin is unalterably opposed to Johnson's Asia policy. He told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Tuesday, for example, that he approved the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam.

So what finally emerges is a warning by an experienced military man that we cannot fight a land war with China all over southeast Asia. That's good advice—if the administration is planning such a course.

And it's worth discussing. But we wonder if there isn't a lot of ideological hysteria—masquerading as a search for logic—involved in the Vietnam policy discussions at the civilian level.

Such debates—over what a general really meant or what Hanoi radio really is trying to say (beneath the surface)—should not be allowed to obscure more relevant discussion. Such discussion, Senator McGEE says, should include a background realization of why we are in Vietnam and how our involvement there fits into "the full screen of global politics." His point is worth considering.

World Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in his humane and wise efforts to relieve world hunger, President Johnson is being hailed as a statesman in the highest sense of the word.

His policies in this field came in for high praise from columnist James Reston who, in the New York Times, declared that when the history of this postwar generation is written the quiet and generous policies of the American Government will stand out above its other exploits.

Reston stated:

> Nothing illustrates the point better than President Johnson's new efforts to relieve world hunger.
>
> He is no longer thinking of the Nation's food surpluses as a problem but as an opportunity. He is not talking now about taking more acreage out of production but of putting some of the 60 million land bank acres back into production, and in the process, he is likely to prove that this is not only good agricultural policy, but good foreign policy and social policy at the same time.

Reston is convinced that the war to relieve world hunger appeals greatly to President Johnson. He has a feeling for the land and the poor—having come from both—that comes through in his food and poverty messages more clearly than any others; and in emphasizing them, both at home and abroad, he is establishing a record that may in the end be the symbol of his administration.

The column by James Reston follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1966]

WASHINGTON: FIGHT 'EM OR FEED 'EM?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—There is a kind of Gresham's law of journalism in which the bad news drives out the good, the negative overwhelms the positive, and the warmakers drown out the peacemakers.

Yet when the history of this postwar generation is written, the quiet and generous policies of the American Government are likely to stand out even above its military exploits, and nothing illustrates the point better than President Johnson's new efforts to relieve world hunger.

He is no longer thinking of the Nation's food surpluses as a problem but as an opportunity. He is not talking now about taking more acreage out of production but of putting some of the 60 million land bank acres back into production, and in the process, he is likely to prove that this is not only good agricultural policy, but good foreign policy and social policy at the same time.

ROOSEVELT'S FORESIGHT

Here is a field in which the United States has dealt consistently and generously with the causes of war—from the Marshall plan to the Johnson plan. It is just over 20 years ago that Franklin Roosevelt's Atlantic Charter pledge of "Freedom From Want" was given substance in the formation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Since that time, the net total of U.S. economic aid to other countries was over $65 billion, and in the last decade U.S. aid programs have provided over 140 million tons of food for needy nations.

THREAT OF FAMINE

Nevertheless, world food shortages are greater than ever. With the human population increasing by 63 million every year, and food production not keeping up, there is a serious threat of famine in India and other developing countries, and the United Nations estimates are that in these countries total food supplies will have to increase by 103 percent by 1980 and by 261 percent by the end of the century to maintain even a minimum standard of nutrition.

President Johnson's food message this week combined a new sense of urgency and realism about his problem. He knows that peace and starvation do not go well together, but he is also emphasizing that this staggering problem cannot be met for long by the surpluses of the advanced nations but must be faced by modern agriculture in the land of the hungry nations.

Therefore, he is proposing expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing, and self-help efforts are underway; increased capital and technical assistance; expanded food production in this country; increased emphasis on high protein foods to combat malnutrition, and provision for adequate reserves to meet any world emergency.

Aside from the humanitarian aspects, the social and political considerations of this program at home and abroad are likely to be considerable. Even a much larger production of food in the United States will not stop the steady flow of people into the cities, but it may slow it up. Farm income is likely to increase encouraging people to stay on the land and in the small agricultural towns, and if Mr. Jefferson was right about the character of the American farmer and the wickedness of urban societies, this will be all to the good.

Overseas, the most striking advantage of the United States in its competition with the Communist countries is on the land. The Russians have got to the moon but somehow they cannot get out of the hole on the earth. Before the war, the Soviet Union, the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and even continental China were exporters of food; now they are all importers.

The United States is now producing its vast agricultural surpluses with less than 10 percent of its people on the land while the Soviet Union cannot feed itself with over 50 percent of its people on the farm. Yield per acre has increased by 109 percent in North America in the last 25 years; by only 7 percent in Asia; and these are factors in the world agricultural and political revolution that are not likely to be overlooked by the leaders of the new and hungry nations.

THE PARADOX

All this appeals greatly to President Johnson. He has a feeling for the land and the poor—having come from both—that comes through in his food and poverty messages more clearly than any others; and in emphasizing them, both at home and abroad, he is establishing a record that may in the end be the symbol of his administration.

This in a way is one of the tragedies of Vietnam. Sometimes we give the impression that we are determined to save those people from communism if we have to kill them in the process, and the controversy over this gets in the way of the larger interests and nobler concerns of the American people.

Kansas High School Press Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on December 23 it was my high honor to hold a press conference with high school journalism students from the Third Congressional District of Kansas. The conference was sponsored by the Kansas City, Kans., Area Chamber of Commerce. The questions were outstanding and challenging, and I believe it was a most worthwhile experience for all of us. A prize was offered by the Kansas City Kansan to the high school student turning in the best story on the conference, judged by a special committee of experts in the field of journalism. Sandy Stines, of Washington High School, of Bethel, Kans., won first place, and Sharon Wohlford, of Argentine High School, of Kansas City, Kans., won honorable mention. I commend these articles to the Congress as proof that the world of journalism has a rich future, and include them herewith:

FIRST PLACE AWARD

(By Sandy Stines, Washington High School, Bethel, Kans.)

Representing Washington, Senior Sherry King, coeditor of the Washingtonian, attended a press conference with Congressman ROBERT ELLSWORTH, December 21.

Journalism students accompanying Sherry as observers included Seniors Phyllis Kinder, Janice Murray, Sharyn Ballard, Linda Koop, Sandy Millsap, and Jim Cordonier, coeditor of the Washingtonian; and Juniors Geneva Cline, Greg Green, Marianne Moll, Genelle Richards, Ralph Bridges, and Sandy Stines.

Mrs. Sandra Benson, journalism instructor, sponsored the trip to the Town House Hotel.

Official delegates attended from Argentine, Wyandotte, Ward, Piper, Sumner, Bonner Springs, and Washington High Schools, as well as Kansas City Junior College.

Opening remarks by the Congressman concerned population explosion, communications growth, and the move from the country to the city in the United States.

First questions asked by the delegates covered the Vietnam situation. When questioned about recent draft-card burnings, the Congressman expressed sympathy for the attitude of the objectors and cited war as "a terrible thing," but he stated that those who are fighting for peace are the ones who deserve attention.

ELLSWORTH feels that the American people are being told more about the situation in Vietnam than in any of the other conflicts, but noted that everything cannot be told the public for security reasons.

He stated three ways of helping bring the war to a quicker close as (1) cutting supply lines through Laos and Cambodia; (2) destroying railroad lines from Red China; and (3) blockading Haiphong Harbor, the last of these being the Congressman's choice as most effective.

When asked about a rumor that food shortages among our troops in Vietnam are occurring, ELLSWORTH dismissed the subject as coming from an "unreliable source."

Query by the Argentine delegate revealed that ELLSWORTH does not favor intervention into another country's internal affairs, but advocated helping countries that have been disturbed by other countries.

Turning to the recent national elections in France, ELLSWORTH stated the belief that De Gaulle will move cautiously since the so-called humiliation of a runoff election; and that though he may ask NATO to pull their headquarters out of France, great consideration would be given it first.

He feels that had De Gaulle's Communist-backed opponent been elected, a move for a united Europe would be in the making.

The Congressman would not "tip his hand" on the issue of tax increases, but promised to give it his careful consideration.

In regard to the war on poverty, ELLSWORTH called the program a national scandal because it had become a "giant fiasco of political patronage." When asked what he would do to clean up the program, the Congressman urged inquests of former activities and reorganization under local government.

Other subjects touched upon include the possibility of Kansas as the site of the Government's atom smasher, the focus on foreign affairs as coming election issues, barge traffic on the Kaw River, the national debt, a possible review of the executive branch of the Government, and the substantiality of the social security program.

Questions were submitted by the audience in written form, but time would not permit their coverage.

Members of professional communication media were present but could not ask questions or participate in any way.

HONORABLE MENTION AWARD

(By Sharon Wohlford, Argentine High School, Kansas City, Kans.)

ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, U.S. Congressman from the Third District of Kansas, held a press conference at the Town House Hotel for Wyandotte County High School students and students from the Kansas City Community Junior College on Tuesday, December 21, 1965.

The press conference first focused on questions concerning the war in Vietnam. Congressman ELLSWORTH generally agrees with President Johnson's present policy in Vietnam, and stated that he felt the main cause for the war is that the Vietnamese Government is not satisfied with the division of the country into north and south. Mr. ELLSWORTH feels that the main objective of the United States is to convince the Vietcong that they are fighting a losing battle. "Vietnam is a confrontation between two people: those who want to run the world in peace and those who want to run it with violence."

ELLSWORTH said that, in his opinion, the best way to stop the North Vietnamese support is for the United States to cut supply lines from Cambodia and Laos, from Red China, and interdict and quarantine the port of Haiphong.

Regarding the present news coverage of the war, he feels that we will never receive all the true facts about the war in Vietnam. He says if we know the facts, our enemy will know them also. He does feel that we should be getting better and more accurate news than we are at this time, however.

Many questions were asked on international, national, and domestic affairs.

Discussing national affairs Congressman ELLSWORTH observed three major changes taking place in the United States at this time. We are experiencing a population explosion which will be even greater in the future, a communications explosion with communications satellites in orbit, the Gemini flights exploring space and relaying messages back to us, and an urban implosion, where many people are moving into the city.

About the war on poverty, he remarked that many feel this bill is a national scandal and just another fad of the American people. He said it was designed to help those people who had fallen into despair and were living in bad conditions, but that it was hurriedly drawn up and is being poorly administered. He feels that if more time were taken and the bill revised, it would be of great benefit to mankind.

Mr. ELLSWORTH explained that the chances for the Kansas City area being the site of the proposed atom smasher are good. "We seem to be in the right part of the country, for a change," he said, "and the survey team was favorably impressed with this area for various reasons."

If we succeed in getting the atom smasher, he said, it will create a sizable increase in population for the greater Kansas City area. Many new job opportunities and stronger physics and mathematics departments will be created in area schools enlarging our universities to an even greater extent. He pointed out that if the Kansas City area does not qualify it will profit greatly because of the work that has already been done to evaluate the city.

Commenting about recent draft card burnings, Congressman ELLSWORTH explained that it is a Federal offense to do this. He said he can sympathize with boys being drafted, however.

In reference to intervention, he said that he felt that we should intervene in a nation's problems if there is a good chance that they might cause some external problems.

ELLSWORTH remarked that there is a feasibility study now being made on whether or not it would be economical to dredge the Kaw River from the mouth of the river in Kansas City upstream for about 15 miles. He feels this would benefit the Kansas City area greatly because Kansas could transfer items quickly from Kansas City down the Missouri River to New Orleans, and this could develop a worldwide market for Kansas City, Kans., products.

There were students and teachers present at the press conference; however, only the elected school representatives were allowed to direct questions to Congressman ELLSWORTH. Others attending the press conference were allowed to write out their questions and send them up to their school representative. The schools attending the press conference were: Argentine, Bonner Springs, Junior College, Piper, Rosedale, Sumner, Turner, Ward, Washington, and Wyandotte.

After the wide variety of questions had been answered, Congressman ELLSWORTH concluded the press conference with a personal word to the audience saying that he was sincerely glad to see the youth of America so interested in world affairs and so eager to gain knowledge and help in influencing the idea of peace on earth.

The Professor and Picking Pickles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the recent report of Secretary Wirtz' blue ribbon panel on Michigan's experience with migratory labor last year has amazed most everyone who is at all familiar with what happened.

The alert editor of the Farwell, Mich. News very ably reflects the concern of cucumbergrowers about the future of the cucumber crop in what has been the Nation's No. 1 pickle producing State.

His editorial follows:

[From the Farwell (Mich.) News, Jan. 6, 1966]

THE PROFESSOR AND PICKING PICKLES

We were somewhat aghast, as you probably were, when it was announced last week that a committee, headed by a college professor, advised Secretary Wirtz that Michigan picklegrowers didn't need any help from Mexican bracero labor.

Now, we would suggest that before this professor be recognized as an authority on the subject, that he be required to work 1 full week as a pickle picker on a Michigan farm that grows the cucumbers for this tasty side dish on almost every American table.

Like so many college professors, when you get him out of his little narrow field, he appears to be even more ignorant than the ordinary fellow.

Without exception all of the farmers who have grown pickles commercially for many years, say they will not plant them next year. This is the time of year when they sign contracts for acreage. With the prospect of another year like the 1965 season, when at least a third of their crop went unharvested, they are just not signing up.

Instead of helping a lot of unwilling students and others, who Secretary Wirtz said were being cheated out of jobs, the Secretary has in effect ended any chance for them to get jobs, and taken an important farm income away from hundreds of Michigan farmers. Michigan is one of the largest pickle growing States, that is, we were, but it looks like we might go to the bottom of the pile next year. When you get a college professor and an impractical politican working together you can be sure they will come up with something, not good for the economy.

Income Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to provide for a Federal income tax credit for payments for State and local income taxes.

This legislation will help produce the answer to New York State's fiscal problems. Under the legislation I propose, New York State will be able to raise its taxes, and the Federal Government—and not the taxpayers of New York State—will pick up the tab. My bill would also provide a credit for any city income tax.

Under my legislation, New York State and New York City will be able to get the extra revenues they will need in years to come, although I believe that New York's needs will also be reduced by the great financial success of the lottery about to be established in New York.

Under the Fino tax credit bill, our States and cities will be able to institute or raise income taxes to get more money without this money coming out of the pockets of the people. The Federal Government will be surrendering some of its revenues back to the States so that the States will be able to conduct programs without running to Washington for money. The dollars that are spent in the States will go further than the dollars spent by the Federal Government, hopefully, because they will not have to pay for a round trip to Washington, and resultant shrinkage.

This is a measure in support of waning federalism. Today, when the Federal Government is seeking to saddle our cities and States with Federal coordinators or commissars to supervise Federal programs, I think it is important to provide the financial wherewithal for the return of these programs to the States without Federal control.

Federal tax credits for payments of State income taxes would have several advantages. It would encourage all States to resort to State income taxes, aiming for much greater tax uniformity. It would also mean, as I have said, that the States and not the Federal Government would decide just what should be done with the revenues they raise. Nor would there be any danger that revenues would be cut off in a recession, which means that States could be in a position to maintain their expenditures.

This idea is not a panacea. I would worry that some States might institute excessive income taxes so as to get vast slush funds. They might be able to get away with this because the people of the State would not be hurt, just the Federal Government. Obviously, there has to be some kind of limit on the credit that can be given.

As a start, I propose that the Federal income tax credit for State income tax be limited to an amount which shall not exceed 20 percent of the Federal income tax paid. This will give real meaning to the idea of creative federalism.

Statement on National Committee for a Nonsubsidized Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, critical decisions are about to be made regarding the future financing of the St. Lawrence Seaway. The Seaway Corporation and its Canadian counterparts are obligated to submit to the Secretary of Commerce, by July 1, 1966, recommendations on the toll structure.

Originally, these recommendations were to have been submitted and acted on by July 1, 1964, but a 2-year extension was given to further observe performance of the new waterway system.

The past 2 years have, we believe, strengthened the position consistently taken by this committee that adjustments in the tolls should now be made aimed at reaching the self-supporting level decreed by law.

When approved by the Congress of the United States, the seaway project was conceived as a taxpayer-supported investment which would repay its heavy debt through revenues collected from tolls. The original toll tariff was, in the opinion of many observers, much too low to accomplish this purpose. The failure of the seaway to live up to original traffic projections further diminished the probability of establishing a self-supporting basis.

Advocates of the seaway have claimed that the toll structure was too high and was one of the factors limiting the use of the ports along the waterway system. As recently as last year, seaway interests suggested that moves be made to either, first, reduce tolls on the seaway; second, hold them at their present low levels; or third, eliminate them entirely. While any of these courses would seem inconceivable in view of the vast money commitments of both governments and the performance of the seaway to date, pressures are mounting from seaway interests to attempt to attract additional business through lowering or elimination of tolls.

This thinking was evident in some testimony which was submitted to a special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee during 1965 by seaway advocates. There was a strong feeling that the Federal Government should support, through direct in indirect subsidies, seaway operations, particularly promotion of seaway ports and solicitation of cargo for these ports. Despite the fact that North Atlantic ports and others protested strongly before hearings of this same special Senate Commerce Subcommittee, none of these protests found their way into the report of the committee which was released in September 1965.

The report itself was so slanted in favor of the seaway that the North Atlantic Ports Association and many of its individual members filed strong exceptions with Senate and Department of Commerce officials.

The essential problem in dealing with the St. Lawrence Seaway has been the insistence on the part of its advocates and some officials and agencies of the U.S. Government that the taxpayers, having made a huge financial commitment to the seaway, should be forced to further subsidize this quasi-government operation in order to increase its usage. This is a flagrant violation of the spirit and the letter of the law upon which seaway development was founded. It also has a very severe impact on competing ports on North, South Atlantic and Gulf coast ranges, which ports have historically and are now presently supporting their own port development and promotion activities.

Because the seaway was nationally financed, it is a matter of national concern. This is one of the reasons why the National Committee for a Nonsubsidized Seaway was formed. This committee now feels that the whole matter of seaway tolls should be given a very thorough and public airing.

It is prepared to join others in presenting reasons why the tolls should be raised to assure sufficient revenue to pay out the capital investment in the seaway. This would not only assure a fair and equitable program as far as the taxpayers and the North Atlantic ports are concerned, but would follow the course set out by law and legislation of the U.S. Congress.

Evidence mounts that seaway interests are dedicated to spending more of the taxpayers' money while not willing to pay the costs of additional investments. Indeed, the Senate subcommittee found that the seaway proponents would ask that the Corps of Engineers deepen and clear Great Lakes channels and harbors to 27-foot depths and that they would like a concerted effort, including Government participation, to ininterest American-flag vessels in utilizing the seaway to a greater extent than at present. There are also requests that lock facilities be improved and expanded, because, according to those who testified on behalf of the seaway before the Senate subcommittee, this waterway system may be overtaxed within the next 10 years.

Of great significance is the fact that seaway proponents have suggested several alternate refinancing methods. Inevitably, these methods recommend the extension of amortization periods or the lessening or elimination of financial commitments on behalf of the seaway itself.

Obviously, if the seaway is to be as successful as these proponents say it will be, then there should be no need for lowering tolls nor even maintaining them at the present level. Instead, they should be raised to more fully repay the American taxpayer for his investment in this waterway system. However, more specific evidence of why seaway tolls should be brought into a more realistic level will be submitted by this committee at such time as it is called before proper bodies to present its opinion on the seaway toll structure.

At this time, the committee wishes to state that it feels the upcoming review of seaway revenues and tariffs to be of vital importance to the whole Nation, and that it should be conducted in public; and that every segment of transportation, shipping, port, and civic interests be given the opportunity to appear before the appropriate bodies.

The actions of the Federal Government in attempting to divert cargo, through promotion and other means, to the seaway away from ports which are more self-reliant and which have historically done their own port promotion and developing, is shocking. The committee feels that more should be said on this subject, and that definite guidelines should be established to make certain that the Government does not unfairly use its resources to promote seaway ports to the disadvantage of other ports in the United States with whom the seaway competes.

At this time, the committee prefers to call attention to the requirement that the toll program of the seaway be reviewed and recommendations made by July 1, 1966, and to ask that this review be made part of a public dialog considering the tremendous investment the taxpayers of this country have made in the St. Lawrence Seaway, and the potential impact of further tax subsidy upon the non-federally-supported ports in the North, South Atlantic, and gulf.

National Eye Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to introduce a companion bill to one introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRED B. ROONEY, to establish a National Eye Institute as part of the National Institutes of Health.

It is time for us to wake up to the tragic waste in human resources that takes its toll each year in eye diseases.

With over 11 million people in the United States either partially or totally blind, we need to face this problem with more than a hope of better days.

In Iowa we have one of the finest programs for rehabilitation of the blind in the entire country. Under the exceptional direction of Mr. Kenneth Jernigan, this program has been able to revitalize lives that were doomed to despair and discouragement. Along with this rehabilitation work, the fine Lions Club eye bank project has restored sight to a number of fortunate individuals.

It does not in any way detract from the excellent work of these organizations to say that we are failing in our efforts. We fail, because so little is known, and the problems are multiplying faster than we can provide answers. In 1963, the cost of caring for those already blind amounted to more than $1 billion. At the same time, public and private sources spent only $9 million on research. It is easy to see that much work is needed in this area.

With more than 80 percent of all loss of vision in our Nation due to diseases whose causes are unknown to science, we have an urgent responsibility to press forward in this area.

The emotional, psychological, and physical disturbances that arise from blindness are well known. We now have to bring the poser of our scientific age to bear upon this major health problem.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, so that the fear that stalks our land in the form of blindness may be put aside.

Hon. Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Director Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation, I request unanimous consent that a tribute to the memory of the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, our beloved colleague, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The tribute, in the form of a letter, follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1966.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: In common with all who knew him, we at the National Science Foundation are saddened today to learn of the passing of ALBERT THOMAS. His loss will be felt deeply by the scientific community and by the people of the United States for whom he worked so devotedly.

I personally came to know, admire, and respect Mr. THOMAS as a great public servant and as a warm and considerate personality through my relations with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which he was a member, and later with the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which he chaired. He demanded the highest standards of public servants, while meeting these standards himself in every way. He was rigorous in his demands, but he was always fair, and he was always receptive to new ideas that might make the Government more responsive to the needs of the people it serves.

The high esteem in which he was held by the Foundation is attested to by the fact that upon the 15th anniversary of the Foundation and the 100th meeting of the National Science Board last May, the Board presented him with a certificate in grateful acknowledgment of the indebtedness of the Foundation and the American people to him for his vision and his help in making the Foundation a more effective instrument to serve the national purpose.

Today we honor his memory. His State, his Nation, and his countrymen are the better for his great accomplishments on their behalf.

Sincerely,

LELAND J. HAWORTH,
Director.

Marine Fighting for All of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the San Diego Union recently ran a most enlightening letter to the editor from Marine Corps Sgt. Jimmie L. Harris in Vietnam. Sergeant Harris is a native of San Diego and his feelings about the "get out of Vietnam" demonstrations are set forth in clear language that every American can easily comprehend.

Under unanimous consent I include this as a portion of my remarks:

READERS' VIEWPOINT: MARINE FIGHTING FOR ALL OF US

EDITOR, THE UNION:

I am a Marine sergeant presently stationed in Vietnam, and a native of San Diego. It has been several years since I have lived there. However, my parents, Mr. and Mrs. T. P. Callas, live at 1610 Union Street.

I receive the San Diego Union here and I continue to read of the many "Get out of Vietnam" and anti-U.S. policy demonstrations.

I cannot understand how, supposedly, mature, and educated people can so openly defy a decision made by our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

A decision was made by our Government to help the determined South Vietnamese people to win their war against a Communist aggressor so they may have a government of their own choosing.

Have the demonstrators ever stopped to realize the damaging amount of fuel they are giving to the Communist regime to be used as propaganda against us? We here in Vietnam are having enough problems fighting a very effective enemy without our own people's adding to them.

I, for one, wish it was possible to get these individuals over here to see the agony, hurt, heartaches, and grief that is suffered every day so that they may continue to enjoy the freedom and rights they now exercise. We are paying a very high price here to stop Communist aggression so we will not have to fight our next battle on our own soil.

I am aware that this is but a small minority group demonstrating and tearing up draft cards. However, this minority is being heard loudly all over the world. My personal opinion is that they are cowards and they do not have enough guts to stand up and protect their rights. I only hope I will never come into direct contact with these demonstrators or see them wave Vietcong flags, because I will be, with much pleasure, facing charges of assault and battery.

We have received so very many packages and cards from American citizens, unknown to us, who are behind us all of the way. These are the true Americans who should be heard above all others and commended for their interest and support for an unknown serviceman in a war so very many miles from home.

I am an American fighting man serving my country the best I know how and I am proud of being here doing what I know must be done. I have a wonderful wife and three lovely children that I love and miss very much. However, I am willing to live in mud, dust, a foxhole, tent, rain, and heat so they may continue to be safe and warm in the land of the free.

Sgt. Jimmie L. Harris, USMC.

Great American Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the Dubuque, Iowa, Country Club, on the occasion of the dedication of the new Coca-Cola bottling plant in Dubuque on February 3, 1966. I am also including an interesting editorial from the New York *Daily News of February 4, 1966*, and an article from the Des Moines Register of the same date:

Great American Presidents

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the dinner on the occasion of the dedication of the new Coca-Cola bottling plant, Dubuque, Iowa, February 3, 1966, Dubuque Country Club)

I am not one to contradict Shakespeare but I think I can prove that comparisons are not always odious. I take nothing away from President Andrew Jackson when I say that Franklin D. Roosevelt was a great President; and I take nothing away from Presidents Jackson or Franklin D. Roosevelt or Truman when I say that President Lyndon B. Johnson has already proven that he is of the same mold.

I am mindful that these Presidents all were Democrats. It is not, however, why I picked them, though I am willing to concede that being Democrats didn't count against them either.

All four Presidents measured their problems with only one yardstick: "What's best for the American people" and, that answered, they immediately activated their decisions. President Jackson urged low interest rates for the common people—so does President Johnson. President Jackson was understanding, as President Johnson is, of the fact that the inflationary fears of the financial market aren't nearly as close to the common people as the deflationary fears of unemployment and farm foreclosure.

When I first came to Iowa, 35 years ago, in the depths of the depression, a farmer couldn't buy a package of cigarettes for a bushel of corn. The farm country was at the point of rebellion. Armed farmers prevented foreclosures; and when the legislature met they sustained the farmers.

Franklin D. Roosevelt wanted neither foreclosures nor rebellion. What he wanted was a New Deal for all and he got it in the form of 100 basic pieces of legislation passed in 100 days—a feat unparalleled in American history until President Johnson's programs were enacted by the 89th Congress. Of those 100 basic acts of Congress, as the late great Speaker Sam Rayburn pointed out, none have been repealed, all have been expanded and all are now part of the platforms of both major parties.

And, of course, the same thing will be true of the Great Society measures which President Johnson is now enacting into law. I predict that in another 35 years from now the Great Society will be flourishing, and further the principal question will not be why it was enacted by President Johnson but why it was delayed until he alone had to accomplish it.

I understand that these are expansive declarations but I am prepared to prove them.

President Lyndon Johnson is the direct spiritual heir of a number of the great American Presidents. The first is President Jefferson. President Johnson has done something more than merely adopt President Jefferson's theory of government. He has elaborated it into the most effective method of party responsibility in the history of our country.

It annoys me, to be frank, to see his consummate skill criticized as that of mere clever manipulation. Actually, it represents a new and fundamental approach.

More particularly, President Jefferson insisted that the party assume full responsibility before the American people. In order to give the American people an honest choice of its policies President Jefferson believed that the congressional leadership and the Chief Executive should be in constant conference before the legislation was offered. President Jefferson himself attended such caucuses and when he could not go he sent Albert Gallatin, his Secretary of the Treasury.

President Johnson has furthered the same system. Had Presidents Jackson, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt employed the Johnson-Jefferson approach they would have saved the country many a crisis, and would have avoided many headaches for themselves in their wars with Capitol Hill.

Franklin D. Roosevelt did employ this method for his first term. There was complete party responsibility and there was complete cooperation on Capitol Hill.

As President Jefferson employed Albert Gallatin to maintain such liaison, the President delegated that duty to me as Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Vice President Garner, Senators Joseph T. Robinson, Pat Harrison, and James T. Byrnes, and Congressmen Henry Rainey, Joseph Byrne, and Sam Rayburn, certainly as astute as any men who trod Capitol Hill, were prime factors in moving that massive legislation to completion. It was the Jefferson pattern in full and effective sway. Everyone who is familiar with what has happened in the Congress for over 30 years knows full well that President Johnson was a protege of Speaker Sam Rayburn. Every bit of legislative know-how he possessed was made known to the young Congressman, and I think it is fair to say that the pupil has at least equaled the master now.

President Roosevelt was prevailed upon by a certain group to abandon this procedure and the disastrous policy of attacking the Supreme Court was embarked upon, even as the congressional liaison was abandoned. In fact, the Congress was not even consulted before the plan was made public—and neither was I. The result was a paralysis of Government for a full year. President Johnson would never have made this mistake.

Unfortunately, those who did not believe in the Jefferson approach lost more by their bad manners than they could possibly have gained for the country by their good policies.

The New Deal bogged down, not because its aims were less exalted but because its bright young men had no concept of working with the Congress. President Johnson makes no such mistakes. He assumes that election to public office carries a presumption that the officeholder is also a gentleman. His unexampled good manners with the Congress have resulted in unexampled good legislation for the country. The net effect is that the country is more united under President Lyndon B. Johnson than any time since the era of good feeling under President Monroe. But it annoys me, I repeat, to see a great constitutional function initiated by the most effective President in American history with the Congress and have it passed off, or even criticized, as mere political cleverness. So much for that; President Johnson has placed the Government nearer the people and the Congress than any man since Jefferson. If continued, it will result in orderly, democratic government without the paralysis of a continued duel between Capitol Hill and the White House, for generations to come. Therefore, in this alone President Johnson is, in my opinion, the greatest constitutionalist of the American Presidents.

And now let us examine the Great Society. President Jefferson was bitterly criticized for paying $15 million—$15 million, not billion—for all of the territory between New Orleans and Montana. On it now stand dozens of cities where one city block is worth more than that.

Secretary Seward was called a *fool for* paying some $7½ million for Alaska. The fish catch alone now exceeds the purchase price every single year.

Yet there are those who do not see that President Johnson has discovered a whole new country—1,200 miles long and 250 miles wide, within our own country. I mean Ap*palachia, and I predict that this Johnsonland* will blossom forth with vast new cities on the western slopes of the Alleghanies in the next century as the eastern slopes of the Rockies brought forth their great cities in the last.

There are those who deride but there are those who decide. I can only say that one of the gateways to Appalachia, Atlanta, is leading the country in expansion. Atlanta will be to Appalachia what St. Louis is to the Missouri Valley. Mail volume alone went up even 25 percent last year.

Private industry has glimpsed the vision of President Johnson—and is translating it into reality. Therefore, I count the opening of Appalachia on a par with Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase. Accordingly, what has been sneered at as a poverty program will develop by the year 2000 into one of the country's great assets. And for this, too, history will call President Johnson great.

Now let me again remind you, if I may, of my first visit to Iowa in 1931. Millions and millions of people were out of work. In that terrible hour it is my proud statement that President Franklin D. Roosevelt rescued the country from civil disorder and even rebellion. He saved the farms, the banks, the insurance companies, our industrial empire and he saved the homes of the people. And he did it in the pattern of President Andrew Jackson—and in the pattern now being elaborated by President Johnson. I can state it in one sentence. The Federal Reserve, pursuant to its duty is charged with guarding the currency from inflation; but President Lyndon B. Johnson, by a much higher order of oath, is charged with guarding the American people from the infinitely greater disaster of deflation. I can understand the alarm of a financial community which fears we are expanding too fast. But, again, I can more readily sympathize with a President who is determined that the expanding economy shall not contract at all.

For those who tell you that you share of the national debt is increasing I strongly urge that you ask if your share of the national assets is increasing more rapidly to say nothing of your share of the national income. You will find that the American Republic is so overwhelmingly solvent that any talk of the American dollar being unsound is pure nonsense. As a matter of fact, it is not told which is holding up the value of the dollar. It is the value of the dollar which is holding up the gold standard. President Johnson is perfectly aware that the American dollar is backed by the greatest production machine, the most skilled labor force, and the most advanced scientific groups in the history of man. To keep this combination in the forefront he has brought every possible assistance at the command of the Presidency.

There are many facets to the expanding Great Society that it is impossible to even begin to enumerate, must less to treat each one. But, at random, let us consider the case of the aged. When Franklin D. Roosevelt first promulgated social security it started more than a great debate. It started the great abuse. It was declared that the President was undermining the American character. It was further stated that he slandered the ability of the average American to take care of himself in his old age. But we called upon the actual statistics. They proved that 90 percent of all American workers over 60 were dependent upon their relatives for support. When I was a boy, many married children could not support their parents and they had to go to the Alms House, in my home county called the poorhouse.

In the face of the most unfair kind of attacks, I take pride in the fact that under President Franklin D. Roosevelt I helped guide the legislation which not only wiped the Alms House off the map but blasted the undignified word of poorhouse out of the language.

And now, President Johnson has gone far beyond even our hopes of those days. He will pilot through legislation which will put two schools in every place where there used to be a poorhouse and by doing so he will triple the already huge assets of the Nation. And, I am not talking in the abstract. I am talking in the concrete. In the first place, our expansion as a country cannot continue without an expanding school system. In the second place, for every dollar invested in the education of the young $35 will be returned to the young citizen in increased earnings. The taxes he will pay as an educated man will return at least 110 percent to the Government itself as an investment.

So the issue of whether or not we can afford the Great Society is not only spurious but idiotic. The fact is that we cannot afford not to follow the President forward. In 1933, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt brought the country out of a depression because he banked on the great character of the American people in the past. President Johnson, in these happier times, is leading the American people to new heights by banking on that same American character in the future. To him will come one of the greatest satisfactions known to man. Thomas Jefferson thought so much of his contribution in this field that he omitted mentioning that he was President of the United States, but mentioned that he was founder of the University of Virginia in his will. President Johnson's Great Society has as its cornerstone the founding of a great many schools and colleges to give every American child a chance to develop his talent. Once a political party in this country could stand for election on a platform merely of a full dinner pail. Then it advanced to a chicken in every pot. Then a car in every garage.

Now President Johnson has abandoned this material approach. He stands on a platform of an education for every child and the necessary books and schools and scholarships to develop its talents. In my opinion, as Thomas Jefferson wrote the Bill of Rights for all American men and women President Lyndon B. Johnson has written a bill of rights for every American child. And for this alone he will go down as one of the greatest of Presidents. Thus, Thomas Jefferson's greatest monument, in his own opinion, was his name on the cornerstone of the University of Virginia. Hence, President Johnson's greatest monument will be his name in the hundreds of schools and colleges and universities he is already founding.

I am proud of the fact that I knew him when he was a yearling—when only the eyes of Texas were upon him. But I have seen him grow until the eyes of the Nation were upon him as majority leader—and no man was more wholeheartedly dedicated to the Nation than Democratic Majority Leader Johnson when he supported Republican President Eisenhower during the Berlin crisis. Ex-President Eisenhower could testify to that. I urge that President Lyndon B. Johnson is entitled to the same support as President that he gave as majority leader.

For some time there has been much controversy pro and con on the situation in Vietnam. The President has no real option in Vietnam. The real option rests with the Communists, for they are the aggressors and have been since 1945. For a month now, the President has sought some sort of an accommodation by which killing would stop. Since the Reds have not responded it must be assumed that they wish to continue the war.

But Vietnam is not an isolated spot. It is merely the one on which the Communists are exerting full pressure at this time. As Al Smith said, "Let's look at the record."

The Communists first succeeded in getting a coalition government in China. They were then given the Japanese war arsenal in Manchuria. With the superior arms they threw out the Nationalists.

When Moscow put Berlin under pressure, Red China seized Korea. When we forced them back to the 38th parallel and they saw they were going to be defeated, only then and then only did they seek an armistice. They prolonged this for months and months—while they moved their forces down to the south. Then they demanded Quemoy and Matsu. When they found we would not yield they conquered Tibet and, incidentally, put thousands and thousands of innocent people to death.

When that was accomplished, they put pressure on Vietnam and threw out the French. When an agreement was reached in 1954, on Vietnam, they at once transferred pressure to Laos. They succeeded in getting a coalition government in Laos, and threw that country into chaos. Now they are using Laos as part of their line of supply to South Vietnam.

Obviously, if we vacated South Vietnam they would continue the pressure throughout southeast Asia.

Thus, President Johnson did not adopt a war policy. He had war thrust upon him. Our position in South Vietnam is not like a Normandy beachhead. It is more like a Dunkirk. The President is in the same position as Winston Churchill in 1940. He is a receiver in bankruptcy of the policy of appeasement. Appeasement has brought our affairs in Asia to this sad state. Continued appeasement will not only lose Vietnam, it will lose us our Asiatic allies and greatly impair our Atlantic Alliance.

The President, like Churchill, can only offer us blood, sweat, and tears; but if we attempt to run away the pressure will increase every time. The fact is that had the policy of the President been adopted in 1946, instead of 1966, there would be peace in the Pacific right now.

Much has been said, and rightly, of the necessity of the United States honoring its commitment to its allies. I go one step further. Thirty-one thousand Americans died and one hundred thousand were wounded in Korea. We would shame ourselves and belie their sacrifice if we gave away in the jungles of Vietnam what they died for in the snows of Korea.

The great tragedy is that the Communists always mistake humanity for weakness. The strong effort the President has been making for peace has been derided by them as his fear of American public opinion. Nothing could be further from the truth. He has done all that he could and the American public knows it. Accordingly, when hostilities resume on a full scale every American will know without being told exactly what President Roosevelt reported to the Nation on Pearl Harbor Day: "They asked for it."

I am sure the American people approve the position taken by President Johnson in his statement to the Nation on Monday of the resumption of all activities in North Vietnam. The reason for his course of action was explained in greater detail by Secretary of State Dean Rusk immediately afterward at a press conference. This should settle any prolonged debate and we should back the President to a man in the position he has taken which in his judgment is in the best interests of our country and the free world as well.

As President of the United States the eyes of not only the Nation but of the world are on Lyndon B. Johnson. And if the Biblical phrase "By their fruits ye know them" continues to be as true in the future as it has been in the past the future generations of our country will as gratefully remember President Lyndon Baines Johnson as they now revere the names of Thomas Jefferson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman. I think a man has seen much if he once sees greatness in his lifetime. *I congratulate myself that I have seen* it four times—in Presidents Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Truman. And, make no mistake, Lyndon Baines Johnson is destined to be one of the greatest Presidents in American history.

[From the New York Daily News, Feb. 4, 1966]

Guest Editorial by Former Postmaster General James A. Farley, Speaking Thursday at a Big Coca-Cola Do in Dubuque, Iowa

President Johnson did not adopt a war policy. He had war thrust upon him. Our position in South Vietnam is not like a Normandy beachhead. It is more like a Dunkirk. The President is in the same position as Winston Churchill in 1940. He is a receiver in bankruptcy of the policy of appeasement. Appeasement has brought our affairs in Asia to this sad state. Continued appeasement will not only lose Vietnam, it will lose us our Asiatic allies and greatly impair our Atlantic Alliance.

The President, like Churchill, can only offer us blood, sweat, and tears; but if we attempt to run away the pressure will increase every time. The fact is that had the policy of the President been adopted in 1946, instead of 1966, there would be peace in the Pacific right now.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Feb. 4, 1966]

Wise Eating Tied to Health

Dubuque, Iowa.—A 77-year-old former U.S. Postmaster General told 20 persons at a press conference at Loras College Thursday that the way he stayed in good health was pushing himself away from the dinner table.

James A. Farley served as national Democratic chairman before he was appointed Postmaster General by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Farley said his robust health was because "I lead a busy and disciplined life."

Farley, in Dubuque to dedicate a new bottling plant for the Coca-Cola Bottling Co. here, is now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

He said he tries to be in bed at 11:30 p.m. 5 nights each week and sleeps well "unless I eat unwisely." He indicated that some banquet meals were among the unwise meals.

He also said that he was "blessed with a good constitution due to my rugged forebears," and he watches his diet.

He also commented on:

President Johnson: "The best qualified man ever nominated in the history of the Democratic Party."

The national economy: "Steadily increasing, good during the last 5 years."

Vietnam: "The President has no real option. The option lies with the Communists, the aggressors."

Civil rights: "The solution to the problems of the Negroes and Puerto Ricans is education for them."

Successor to President Johnson: "Hubert Humphrey. He would make a great president."

The war on poverty: "Will develop by the year 2000 as one of the Nation's greatest assets."

Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, once again we pause to note the passing of a beloved colleague. Too often the stalwarts of the Congress, who have written so much of the history of their times, are suddenly gone from the scene. In awe of God's inscrutable ways we meet today to register our sincere thoughts of Albert Thomas, what he meant and how we will miss him.

To know Albert was to love and respect him. During the years he so ably served the Eighth Congressional District of Texas, I learned to appreciate what a fine, outstanding job he did in carrying out his responsibilities to his people. Loved and respected for his fairness, sound judgment, deep courage and devotion to America, his rare capacity for leadership will be sorely missed in the years to come.

He was quiet and soft spoken, and as he went about his daily tasks, he had a kind greeting for everyone.

In thinking of Albert, I am reminded of the words penned by the late Sir William Osler, the noted Canadian physician:

> I have three personal ideals. One, to do the day's work well and not to bother about tomorrow. The second ideal has been to act the Golden Rule, as far as in me lay, toward my professional brethren and toward those committed to my care. And the third has been to cultivate such a measure of equanimity as would enable me to bear success with humility, the affection of my friends without pride, and to be ready when the day of sorrow and grief came to meet it with the courage befitting a man.

Albert Thomas fully measured up to such ideals. We shall miss him, but he has left forever with us countless memories of a wonderful person.

Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the February 5, 1966, issue of the New York Times contained an interesting article on Woodrow Wilson by Author-Journalist James T. Farrell, and in reading this editorial, I felt that others will also want to see the appraisal made by this writer, and with this in mind, I would commend this article to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. It follows:

TOPICS: WOODROW WILSON REMEMBERED

(By James T. Farrell)

Forty-two years ago this week Woodrow Wilson died at his house in Washington. He had always liked Thomas Gray's "Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard." When "the paths of glory" led him to his "inevitable hour," Wilson is supposed to have said to his wife:

"Edith, I'm a broken machine, but I'm ready."

As I look back, I can summon from my imagination and memory and from my reading several different images of this man who became President when I was 9 years old, and a War President when I was 13, and who, when I was 14, was the Hero of the World, as though he were a savior of mankind, and then lost and crumbled. Repudiated politically, paralyzed physically, he left office at the end of his second term, and the exponent of "normalcy" succeeded him.

FOCUS OF TRAGEDY

When I was passing through adolescence and young manhood in the 1920's, Wilson then seemed to me to focus the tragedy of the world into which my contemporaries and I were growing up. With the years, he becomes one of the many characters of that tragedy, not the sole protagonist. I cannot think of him with sadness.

Even in my first hot moments of postwar disillusionment, with the anger of a young man's feeling of betrayal, and the expectation that my generation and I, myself, would pay the price of Wilson's historic failure as a peacemaker at Versailles, I did not lose my underlying sense of sadness. For it was not the failure of a man, but of human hope for a better and much different kind of world, which imbues the story of Wilson with the somber tones of tragedy.

A BOY'S TRUST

But those were not my first impressions of Wilson. As an Irish boy in Chicago I grew up thinking that he was a great man, the greatest President since Abraham Lincoln. My father had voted for him. He was brainy, a scholar; he had a big vocabulary. I was a trusting boy. My trust extended to the President, and I wanted him to do right and to be right.

With the succession of days from 1914 to 1917, the First World War slowly penetrated my consciousness, as it did that of most Americans. The war meant death and suffering, the death of countless thousands; it meant soldiers going over the top on bayonet charges and being mowed down by machineguns. But President Wilson knew what to do. I didn't even have to tell myself such a thought; I knew it and believed it as I believed that the sun would shine in the morning that must follow the night. President Wilson was a hero of mine.

Wilson at one point early in the war proclaimed that the United States was "too proud to fight." I later perceived that this famous statement reflected one of Wilson's outstanding traits. He was a phrasemaker who, too frequently, substituted words for the deeds of decision. Such a statement was a phrasemaker's remark. Americans have never to my knowledge been "too proud to fight," but they were reluctant to fight at that time because they didn't quite know what the fighting was all about.

Wilson understood intellectually that the Presidency is, first of all, a place where power has to be exercised and action taken. As he said shortly after his election in 1912: "This is an office in which a man must put on his war paint. Fortunately, I am not of such a visage as to mind marring it."

But Wilson, a minister's son, a scholar, and a man of words, who came to the practice of politics late in his career, was not by nature at ease with himself when he had his "war paint" on. H. L. Mencken described him as "the perfect model of the Christian cad." That was once a fashionable judgment which I largely shared, though I never wholly lost my compassion for him. At times, Wilson may have acted in a way that justified Mencken's description.

At the climax of his life, however, Wilson died bravely for his conduct, his actions, his signature. Beaten, with the people turning against him, he went out to face them to try to persuade them. Self-deluded as he was at Versailles and as J. M. Keynes so graphically described for us in "The Economic Consequences of the Peace," Wilson faced the people in defense of his conduct. Vanity, in part, appears to have been a source of his courage; but how many of the vain have courage?

His conduct suggests that if his health had not failed he would have convinced the people or would have walked in loneliness to his grave. "For nothing less depends upon this decision (whether or not to ratify his signing of the Versailles Treaty), nothing less than the liberation of the world, * * *" he declared.

DEATH OF AN IDEAL

But when Wilson became no more, the hopes which he had lifted out of the mud and blood and agony into a dreamlike euphoria of faith—those hopes had died. He had outlived his oratorical idealism.

Our world, our tragic century, had truly begun.

Support Given

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's policy in South Vietnam has the firm support of the Denver Post, which asserts that the President has asked for—"and deserves to get—the support of the American people in his broad-based program for South Vietnam."

In a February 10 editorial, the Post declared:

> The time is late and the opposition of the Communist enemy is great. But the President's goals are, we believe, sincere, and should be given every chance to succeed.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this clearly stated editorial in the Appendix of the Record.

L.B.J. MAINTAINS POSITIVE VIET STANCE

President Johnson has asked for—and deserves to get—the support of the American people in his broad-based program for South Vietnam. The time is late and the opposition of the Communist enemy is great. But the President's goals are, we believe, sincere and should be given every chance to succeed.

In seeking strength to carry on the war, joined by a renewed effort to build social and economic progress into South Vietnamese institutions, the President admittedly is undertaking a monumental task.

Our enemy in Vietnam, the Vietcong, hold only about 25 percent of the country. Nevertheless, Vietcong units are capable of striking widely to destroy peaceful programs instituted by United States and Saigon forces.

This has happened repeatedly. It will happen again. To overcome such a pattern will require tremendous effort and manpower.

Such a policy, however, is the price of standing firm in Vietnam.

The President's new stance already is being vilified by many prominent Americans who see the Declaration of Honolulu either as a crude attempt to justify a "wrong" war or as a prelude to vast escalation of American fighting power in Vietnam.

Discussion is fine but all too often the President is attacked by people who shoot from the hip. Among the criticisms: "the war is going badly; let's get out while we can." Or: "we shouldn't have gone there in the first place."

The validity of such statements must be measured against the broader issues of this Nation's commitments, not simply in South Vietnam but in Thailand and elsewhere.

There is criticism from other people who refuse to believe the statement of the enemy.

The search for peace must be maintained. But this should not include calling the President deaf every time a new rumor floats from Hanoi. Here is what Hanoi has said about peace (and we think it is the current view): "The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled in accordance with the program" of the Vietcong.

Such a statement leaves little room for American initiative in mediation. We cannot surrender hundreds of thousands of loyal Vietnamese to the whims of the Vietcong. Nor can we agree to the implicit view of Hanoi: that the Vietcong is the "legal" government of South Vietnam.

Given the benefit of hindsight, many Americans would not choose involvement in a war such as that which exists in South Vietnam. To other Americans, it is a war in which—once committed—we should have have made our force felt in overwhelming fashion.

But the confrontation for President Johnson is that which exists today. We think the announcements following his meeting in Honolulu with South Vietnamese leaders indicate he is seeking to salvage more than honor from this war.

He is seeking positive things: helping an embattled ally militarily and, at the same time, trying to advance the social reforms which South Vietnam needs for survival. The President's critics should keep those things in mind in their search for answers that are, admittedly, difficult.

Message From the Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in another example of his excellent service to the public, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has discussed the attempt by the Communist Party to gain new inroads through working on college campuses.

Writing in the February 1966 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, Director Hoover states that the college student of today is being subjected to a "bewildering and dangerous conspiracy perhaps unlike any social challenge ever before encountered by our youth."

He says that the Communist cause is being promoted primarily through a two-pronged offensive, a college speaking program and campus-oriented Communist W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit Mr. Hoover's article for inclusion in the RECORD:

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

The American college student today is being subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy perhaps unlike any social challenge ever before encountered by our youth. On many campuses he faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order. This movement, commonly referred to as the "new left," is complex in its deceitful absurdity and characterized by its lack of commonsense.

Fortunately, a high percentage of the more than 3 million full-time college students are dedicated, hardworking, and serious-minded young people; however, their good deeds and achievements are greatly overshadowed by those who are doing a tremendous amount of talking but very little thinking.

Much of this turmoil has been connected with a feigned concern for the vital rights of free speech, dissent, and petition. Hardcore fanatics have used these basic rights of our democratic society to distort the issues and betray the public. However, millions of Americans, who know from experience that freedom and rights also mean duties and responsibilities, are becoming alarmed over the anarchistic and seditious ring of these campus disturbances. They know liberty and justice are not possible without law and order.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., as well as other subversive groups, is jubilant over these new rebellious activities. The unvarnished truth is that the Communist conspiracy is seizing this insurrectionary climate to captivate the thinking of rebellious-minded youth and coax them into the Communist movement itself or at least agitate them into serving the Communist cáuse. This is being accomplished primarily by a two-pronged offensive—a much-publicized college speaking program and the campus-oriented Communist W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America. Therefore, the Communist influence is cleverly injected into civil disobedience and reprisals against our economic, political, and social system.

There are those who scoff at the significance of these student flareups, but let us make no mistake: the Communist Party does not consider them insignificant. The participants of the new left are part of the 100,000 "state-of-mind" members Gus Hall, the party's general secretary, refers to when he talks of party strength. He recently stated the party is experiencing the greatest upsurge in its history with a "one to two thousand" increase in membership in the last year.

For the first time since 1959, the party plans a national convention this spring. We can be sure that high on the agenda will be strategy and plans to win the new left and other new members. A Communist student, writing in an official party organ, recently stated, "There is no question but that the new left will be won."

Thus, the Communists' intentions are abundantly clear. We have already seen the effects of some of their stepped-up activities, and I firmly believe a vast majority of the American public is disgusted and sickened by such social orgies. One recourse is to support and encourage the millions of youth who refuse to swallow the Communist bait. Another is to let it be known far and wide that we do not intend to stand idly by and let demagoges make a mockery of our laws and demolish the foundation of our Republic.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Reforms Proposed for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed major reforms in the foreign aid program. The new program is directed toward those countries ready and willing to help themselves.

The New Orleans Times-Picayune commented on these proposals in a very timely and thought-provoking editorial entitled "Reforms Proposed for Foreign Aid." The editorial pointed out that emphasis "will be placed on self-help projects in education, health, agriculture, and population control designed to assist underdeveloped nations in developing the human resources upon which economic development depends."

Because the editorial is timely, I have permission to include it in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REFORMS PROPOSED FOR FOREIGN AID

A bold step toward bringing order and efficiency to the foreign aid program, proposed in the Senate last year and then killed, has been urged again by President Johnson in the foreign aid bill for 1967 presented to the Congress this week.

In essence, what the President has proposed is a 5-year authorization (instead of 1 year) to enable long-range planning of major projects, principally in the areas of education, health, and agriculture where quick solutions to age-old problems are simply not possible. The President also has advocated the separation of economic and military assistance, as advocated last year by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas. This may complicate the task of moving the bill through Congress, but it should also explain the philosophy and policy goals underlying the massive assistance programs.

The administration's conviction in the wisdom of these reforms is indicated by the reduced money request: $3.38 billion was asked for 1967, $236 million less than for the current year, in the belief that lower prices, transportation costs, and other efficiencies will actually increase the volume of commodities to be shipped abroad.

Opposition to similar reforms last year centered in the House of Representatives and in maverick corners of the Senate, most notably in Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon. A Senate amendment embracing a 2-year authorization, separation of military and economic aid, and a commission to recommend policy goals was discarded in the House-Senate conference committee, but with stipulations that the proposals would again be considered this year.

Basis for the opposition is an understandable reluctance in Congress to relinquish annual review of foreign aid operations.

However, the shifting focus of foreign aid, outlined by Mr. Johnson, seems to minimize these objections. Emphasis under the programs proposed will be placed on self-help projects in education, health, agriculture, and population control designed to assist underdeveloped nations in developing the human resources upon which economic development depends.

These are undertakings that cannot be planned year by year, and, if successful, promise significant foreign policy gains for the United States. Congress, furthermore, will still have an opportunity for annual review of the program before making the final appropriations.

Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce Commends Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, throughout America, there has been a great deal of concern and discussion over the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The recently concluded debate in the Senate was, I believe, indicative of the widespread public concern over this issue.

I recently noted a news release put out by the Fairfax Chamber of Commerce, of Fairfax, Va., commending Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR., for his stand in opposition to the proposed repeal. Senator BYRD, who has served in the Senate just a short time, has strongly favored our State right-to-work laws and has effectively presented his views in this connection. Having served in the State Senate of Virginia for 18 years and having a wide background both in public life and in business, he is most familiar with this overall issue.

It is my pleasure to have the text of the news release published by the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce and the accompanying resolution printed at this place in the RECORD.

FAIRFAX COUNTY CHAMBER COMMENDS SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

"Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, JR., was officially commended today by the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, board of directors for his firm stand in support of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act," announced Chamber President R. Brandon Marsh.

"Our directors voted unanimously to congratulate Senator BYRD," said Marsh, "and for the restatement of the Fairfax County Chamber's continued opposition to the repeal of this measure." The following is the official statement of the directors:

"Together with Senator BYRD, the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce unalterably opposes repeal of section 14(b). Members of the chamber admire their Senator's defense of this law which permits States to forbid unions and employers to force a man to join the union or be fired.

"We believed in the rights granted under 14(b), which 19 States exercised to pass laws prohibiting so-called union shop clauses in labor agreements; when the union shop makes union membership a condition of holding a job. We join Senator BYRD in his dedication to the principle that a person has the right to work with the freedom of choice to join or not to join a labor union.

"We believe the worker's freedom of choice should not be taken away from him and sold to the highest bidder in the market place of the bargaining table.

"Accordingly, the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce adopts the following resolution commending Senator BYRD for his courageous opposition to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act:

"Whereas Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, JR., has eloquently defended and supported section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act before the U.S. Senate on behalf of his Virginia constituents; and,

"Whereas the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce desires to join Senator BYRD and the majority of Virginia's citizens in unalterably opposing repeal of section 14(b); and,

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States legislation which attempts to void the right-to-work laws of Virginia and 18 other States; and

"Whereas these State laws preserve the decision to join or not to join a labor union as an individual right left to the exercise of one's own conscience; and,

"Whereas Virginians admire their Senator's stanch defense of this law which permits Virginia and her sister States to prohibit unions and employers from forcing a person to join a union or be fired: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the board of directors of the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, in a meeting assembled at Evans Farm Inn, Fairfax County, Va., on February 8, 1966, That we hereby congratulate Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, JR., for his defense of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; and declares the chamber's continued unalterable opposition to its repeal; be it further

"*Resolved,* That all Representatives of Virginia serving in the Congress of the United States are urged to continue their support of this position."

La Porte, Ind., Herald-Argus, Praises Appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver, as First Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the La Porte, Ind., Herald-Argus, of January 19, 1966, praising the appointment of the distinguished Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Dr. Robert C. Weaver.

The tribute and much deserved one to Dr. Weaver follows:

NEW CABINET POST

When the U.S. Senate confirmed without a dissenting voice appointment of Robert C. Weaver, as the first Negro in American history to sit in the President's Cabinet, a vital breakthrough for integration was achieved. It was an isolated example of the movement toward equality for the minority race. It was also recognition again that quality appointments rarely encounter roadblocks in the Senate. Weaver's abilities and qualifications are beyond question.

More important than Weaver's becoming the first of his race to occupy a Cabinet position is the fact of the new Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development which he heads. When the issue of whether such a department should be created was before Congress there was doubt that such a Department was needed or desirable. Now there is more important evidence than ever that the American city typically is sick even while more people than ever flock within its gates.

It has been demonstrated too that the immense problems which create and multiply the illness cannot be met and solved by the municipalities alone, unaided and uncoordinated. There must be assistance, fiscal, technical, legal, from State and Federal Governments.

Seventy percent of us now live in urban areas, in cities and towns and suburbs. And the percentage grows higher with every passing day. As population increases the decay of the inner cores of our municipalities becomes more marked. The poor and underprivileged move in as the well to do leave. Tax base is lost. Slums and ghettos become worse. The automobile is choking the life out of the inner city as traffic multiplies much faster than ways to deal with it. Crime becomes a graver problem as the housing blight worsens. Downtown business areas shrink and suffer.

This urban malaise afflicts communities of all sizes and locations. The general problems are common all over the Nation. And they seem to grow more serious from year to year.

This brandnew Department has as its purpose the coordinating under Federal laws the rehabilitation and development of urban areas everywhere. It will be the agency devoted to helping cities and towns overcome the decay and the complex matters of transport, housing, beautification, health, safety, cultural growth. Every community will have to do much on its own, but the Federal agency should be the assisting means to great renewal and development in the teeming areas where by far most Americans live today.

The Serbian Fight for Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we join the Serbians throughout the world in commemorating the revolt for independence from the Turks which was led by the famed Karageorge. Unfortunately, the Serbian people are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is forbidden in their homeland by their present dictator, Tito.

On this historic day we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave people of Serbia and all the other captives of communism.

The great Serbian leader Karageorge offered his life and fortune to rid Serbia of the oppressive rule of the Turks and the Serbians were victorious in their fight for independence and freedom. Serbia achieved international recognition when the Treaty of Bucharest was signed in 1812 and secured a limited autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, we must not only observe historic events such as the Serbian fight for independence in words, but in deeds as well. I urge, therefore, that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be established to study the present conditions of oppression under which the Serbians and other captive peoples are suffering.

Furthermore, the Voice of America should provide more effective and lengthier broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the brave people of Serbia. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America has been reducing both its hours of broadcast in the Serbian language and in the natuer of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives only straight news and under present administration policy, is fearful of offending the Soviet Union. However, the brave Serbian people deserve the truth, and the Voice of America should give it to them in order that their resistance to communism be strengthened.

The Job Corps in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Members of this body who have unjustly criticized the Job Corps, singling out Idaho for their attacks, may be enlightened on learning of the reaction in Idaho to their attempts to undermine the Nation's antipoverty program. I believe Lewiston Morning Tribune editorial writer Bill Hall has expressed very well the indignation of the average Idaho citizen.

The editorial, published on February 10, follows:

CONGRESSMEN, KIDS AND LAW OF THE JUNGLE

Young men being given the first opportunity of their lives to learn to read and write, to acquire the social graces and to become responsible citizens have enough of a burden without being poleaxed by politically motivated Congressmen in a sweeping and unfair generalization.

Representatives ALBERT H. QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota, and CHARLES E. GOODELL, Republican, of New York, have landed on an isolated incident at an Idaho Job Corps Center and pictured it as somehow typical of a program with which they disagree.

They have questioned the handling by Job Corps officials of a stabbing at the Mountain Home Center, saying it has encouraged corpsmen to believe that "the law of the jungle prevails" in the camp.

To assume one incident is somehow typical of the young men in the Job Corps makes about as much sense as assuming that all Congressmen are as irresponsible in their wild generalizations as Representatives QUIE and GOODELL.

Critics of the program have always been quick to jump to the inaccurate conclusions that Job Corps centers are populated only by young toughs from the big city. There are such types at the centers, but they are not in the majority, and they usually accept rehabilitation or wash out.

The Job Corps and its remarkable parent, the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, were never intended as Boy Scout camps. Most Boy Scouts don't require rehabilitation. They already know how to read and write, and they stand an excellent chance of learning a trade or going to college once they complete high school.

The bulk of the Job Corps men have little if any high school, they are largely unskilled and virtually unemployable. They were future candidates for the relief rolls and the Nation's prisons until the Job Corps provided them with an alternative.

It is commendable that this Nation is willing—over the objections of QUIE and GOODELL—to try to reclaim the few young toughs from the big cities who are enrolled. But the bulk of those enrolled in the Job Corps are from every section of the Nation. They are the children of southern sharecroppers, of Idaho indigents, and California fieldworkers. Some are orphans, the children of no one.

Anyone who believes the corps is a Government-sponsored gang of hoodlums should visit the Cottonwood Job Corps Center just outside of the town of Cottonwood. He will discover eager youngsters with a remarkable esprit de corps. And many of them do not take kindly to suggestions their camp is filled with incorrigibles. A reporter from this newspaper interviewed several Cottonwood corpsmen on that point last summer.

"That's a bunch of bunk," said one of them in what is probably an accurate appraisal of the comments this week by the two Congressmen.

Of course, some politicians out to shoot down a Federal program are not above using the material they have, whether it is representative or not.

Talk about law of the jungle.

Foreign Commercial Fishing Is Damaging Our Sports Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, most of our citizens are unaware that the excellent sports fishing long available in the coastal waters bounding the North American Continent is being subjected to severe injury. This injury results chiefly from the entry of foreign fishing vessels into waters close to our coasts and the use by these vessels of commercial fishing techniques which take many tons of sports fish from the seas immediately off our shores. The consequence is that a major source of recreation for many thousands of persons is being damaged severely and the livelihood of the many persons who provide equipment and services to sports fishermen is affected adversely. The problem, as well as the difficulty of finding a good solution, is explained clearly in an article by Martin Kane in the January 31, 1966, issue of Sports Illustrated. This article was inserted in the RECORD for February 14, 1966, at page A713, by the distinguished Congressman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and the public.

Mr. Speaker, I would support efforts which can legally be taken by appropriate authorities of our National Government to provide relief from this depredation. Such efforts should extend to negotiation of new international agreements if necessary.

Gains Noted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, having tried energetic and farflung efforts to negotiate a peace, this administration has now met with South Vietnamese leaders to establish better means of resisting aggression and meanwhile, to carry out extensive economic and social reforms.

What the Honolulu conference accomplished, according to the Washington Post, was "to bring together officials who are going to have to work together if the war is to be skillfully conducted and if the restoration of the country is to go forward." It was a good thing to bring them together.

I feel that the editorial makes a clear and honest summary of what was accomplished at the Honolulu conference, and with the conviction that others may want to see this article, I offer it for publication in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 10, 1966]

HONOLULU

The Honolulu conference did not produce any dramatic decisions to expand the war or any miracles to terminate it. There is no evidence that officials of either participating country expected it to do so, but apparently some of the spectators did. They are disappointed.

What the conference did do, and what it obviously was intended to do from the beginning, was to bring together officials who are going to have to work together if the war is to be skillfully conducted and if the restoration of the country is to go forward. It was a good thing to bring them together.

The statements by the two delegations and the communique issued Wednesday were notable for two declarations. One was the common declaration that the countries are in accord upon continued diplomatic efforts for peace. The other was the very evident reemphasis of joint objectives in favor of the reconstruction of the country and the achievement of political, social, and economic reforms.

The clarification of the positions of the two countries on these points alone would justify the conference. It certainly can be pointed out that General Ky's comments later indicate a continuing unwillingness to negotiate with the Vietcong that is not wholly in accord with American attitudes on the National Liberation Front. There is still work to be done on the joint bargaining position, but the Honolulu declarations make it clear that we are further along than we were when Secretary Rusk last visited Saigon.

The increased emphasis on social and economic programs is still on paper, and it needs urgently to be transferred into acts. The unfortunate people of South Vietnam are bearing the brunt of a disastrous and destructive war that is not in their interests alone, if our own declared objectives are to be believed. To them we have an obligation of conscience. The people of this country will support a vast expansion of expenditures for the care and rehabilitation and rescue of thousands of homeless people who have found themselves, through no fault of their own, in the midst of military operations.

More than 20 years of experience with the sponsor-client relationships between great and small powers have not solved all of the problems involved in such difficult diplomatic relationships. Honolulu did not solve them either. They may be in large part insoluble. But if thy are soluble at all it is by such efforts to arrive at a common understanding on objectives and means of reaching them. Misgivings have been expressed about the tendency of such high-level conferences to bind us more inseparably to the fate of a South Vietnam Government in which there are signs of instability. But the very act of waging a common war is an endeavor in which the participants cannot avoid a degree of intimacy or escape a certain identification with each other. It is a little late to do anything about that, much as it may worry us.

The administration made an energetic, if so far unsuccessful, effort to negotiate a peace. That having failed, it has set about trying to perfect better means of resisting aggression and reforming the economic and social conditions of South Vietnam. There does not seem to be any alternative.

Purpose Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. EVANS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker—

> The war in Vietnam is long, hard, and costly. But it is a war for a worthy people's freedom. We applaud President Johnson's recognition of that fact.

These are the words of the Christian Science Monitor, which commends—in the strongest possible way—the firm stand taken by this administration to fight the war against Communist aggression, and to insist on measures which will give the people of that war-torn land an opportunity for a good and decent life.

The newspaper points out that the President's trip to Hawaii was vastly important because, for one reason, it brought the problems into sharper focus.

Its editorial quotes the President:

> Our stand must be as firm as ever, * * * aggression must be stopped * * * those who counsel retreat * * * belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope.

As the Monitor says, these are very strong words, but they reestablish the fundamental and justifiable reason for American efforts and sacrifices in Vietnam.

In the firm belief that the Monitor's "Restatement of Purpose" editorial will be read by others with interest and enlightment, I would like to make it available to them, and therefore ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 9, 1966]

RESTATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Now that President Johnson has gone to Hawaii, it suddenly becomes clear just how badly such a step had been needed. Although the visit has solved no problems, it has helped bring many of them back into sharper focus. After nearly a month and a half of doubts, debates, peace efforts, disappointed hopes, and renewed bombings, it was apparent that some fudamental restatement of Washington's aims was necessary.

The President dealt bluntly with one of these aims when he said that "our stand must be as firm as ever," that aggression must be stopped, and that those who "counsel retreat * * * belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope." These are very strong words. But they are words which, so far as they go, reestablish the fundamental and justifiable reason for American efforts and sacrifices in Vietnam.

They must be and are accompanied by other words. These latter are a reiteration of Washington's determination to continue unflaggingly seeking peace while repelling imperialism. Simultaneously, we welcome the assurance that America will press forward far more strongly with the effort to reach and win over the uncommitted Vietnamese peasantry without whose sympathy the long-range outlook may well be hopeless.

We believe that the peasantry can be reached. Like people everywhere, the average Vietnamese wishes primarily to be left alone, to live in dignity, security, and moderate well-being. We believe that with a strong enough military effort, a sufficiently large portion of the countryside can be pacified to enable Saigon to put new and better conceived rural programs into effect. But this effort can never be made if Washington hesitates to commit the manpower, firepower, and machinepower necessary.

Regardless of what many say, we find it hard to believe that, at bottom, the Communist leaders in North Vietnam and within the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) are not realists. If Moscow has recognized (and there is reason to believe that it has) that the chance of a Communist military victory has gone, we see no reason to believe that Hanoi will not eventually become as perceptive.

Furthermore, the Communists have a graceful—and democratic—way out. They can still seek to win Vietnam in the only morally permissible way. This is through the ballot box and under a constitution which guarantees the freedom of all political points of view, a guarantee, incidentally, conspicuously inoperative in North Vietnam.

The war in Vietnam is long, hard, and costly. But it is a war for a worthy people's freedom. We applaud President Johnson's recognition of that fact.

How Do You Win?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there has been much confusion over the question of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

Some critics charge that the Johnson administration has a no-win policy and is not doing enough with its military might.

Some light is thrown on this question by an editorial by Bob Gerhart in a recent issue of the New Era. The New Era is a weekly AFL–CIO paper published in Reading, Pa.

With permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial with my remarks:

How do you win in South Vietnam? That question, in my humble opinion, is the basic one which must be resolved before you can cast your vote for either the hawks (resume bombing) or the doves (don't resume bombing) in the increasingly costly and confusing tangle in Asia.

If you go back a few years when all we had in Saigon were so-called advisers, the big problem facing the South Vietnam regime was survival. Communists from the north had infiltrated villages, assumed community control, and developed a guerrilla operation that defied opposition. Presumably, the days were numbered for Saigon and fall of the nation's independence appeared to be imminent.

As a nation we were committed to help South Vietnam stay alive. Our advisers were increased, along with arms. A few provocations such as the Bay of Tonkin episode congealed the Nation's emotions and suddenly Uncle Sam had planted both feet in the land of rice. Then a theory emerged that if South Vietnam could hold off the northern raiders during the monsoon season it would be a simple matter for the United States to clean house and restore independence. Unfortunately that's not how the script evolved.

American forces, now numbering about 200,000 and still rising, established beachheads and patrols and began to move into the jungles and tall grass with the ubiquitous helicopters, ferreting out the elusive Cong. As GI Joes came face to face with the Communist warriors of the north, people here at home started talking tough and demanding the bombing of North Vietnam. That would knock the Vietcong out of the box, we were told.

But it didn't. If anything, the bombing hardened the determination and tenacity of the Communists to continue the battle, and they poured more men and weapons down the Ho Chi Minh trail in Laos. More American planes entered the fray, firing on foot soldiers, bombing ammunition and oil supplies, and generally harassing the Reds.

Meanwhile, here at home, the marchers walked for peace until President Johnson waged his global peace offensive and the North Vietnamese thumbed their nose at L.B.J.'s diplomatic overtures to every capital in the world. This peace offensive began during a Christmas truce and with the halting of bombing the north. President Johnson, a beleagured man who faced one of the gravest decisions any human being could face, has resumed bombing.

It is in this context that the hawks screamed for resumption of bombing and the doves cooed that the bombing did no good when conducted previously and if resumed can only invite Communist retaliation against Saigon and other South Vietnam targets. The hawks make it sound as though bombing of the north will win the war. When you ask, "But what if the Chinese enter the fray?" the hawks fearlessly cry, "Then bomb China with nuclear weapons if necessary. But win we must." How do you win?

And suppose our nuclear bombing brings Russia in as an enemy, what then? "Bomb Russia, too," the hawks arrogantly cry. And what if we do bomb Russia and the Russians touch off intercontinental ballistic missiles which deliver nuclear warheads into Times Square in New York—or Detroit, Michigan—or Cape Kennedy and the rocket center at Houston? Who wins then?

You think it can't happen? Don't kid yourself. Once the trigger is pulled and world war III begins, we've reached the point of no return. This is what the doves in Washington are trying to say. They believe that Americans and South Vietnam forces can consolidate their position in the south and gradually clean out pockets of resistance without raining bombs on North Vietnam and without leaving the South Vietnamese people defenseless. During such an interlude our economic and educational aid to the starving and injured people might bear fruit. And in the forum of world opinion we undoubtedly could reap goodwill in such large quantities that mankind would really respect us as a peace-loving nation commanding the respect of everyone. The doves do not propose withdrawal from the south leaving the people at the mercy of the ravaging Communists. But they do recognize that a stalemate, much like the one in Korea, is in the best interests of the American people and the human race. Standing firm on a line drawn by us is not appeasement. Hawks constantly need new prey to feed on. President Johnson should remember that his predecessor learned it the hard way, too—at the Bay of Pigs in Cuba.

VFW Commander Urges North Vietnam Ship Blockade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, recently the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Andy Borg, issued a statement calling for the establishment of a blockade against shipping into North Vietnam. Because of the deep concern of many in Congress and throughout the country about the continued assistance being rendered by free world ships especially, I believe that the views of the spokesman for one of our leading veterans' organizations clearly deserve wide circulation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the release entitled "VFW Commander Urges North Vietnam Ship Blockade":

VFW COMMANDER URGES NORTH VIETNAM SHIP BLOCKADE

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 8.—National commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Andy Borg, of Superior, Wis., today urged the immediate establishment of a blockade against shipping into North Vietnam.

Explaining the VFW position, Commander Borg said, "with the continuing intensification and growth of the war in South Vietnam the time has come to face up to the steady procession of ships delivering material to North Vietnam. These ships bring the weapons, bullets, and war material used to kill American troops and those of our allies."

"The way to stop this overseas support of the Communist aggression is to impose a quarantine type of blockade to prevent the warmaking cargoes from reaching North Vietnamese ports."

Continuing, Commander Borg said, "what is required is the kind of blockade or quarantine such as the late President Kennedy established around Communist Cuba during the missile crisis. Such a quarantine is not an act of war. It is essentially a means of preventing warmaking and war-supporting material from reaching the aggressor. Thus, an effective blockade would reduce the Communist warmaking ability and would be a step toward ending the war. Such a quarantine—or Pacific blockade—is well recognized under international law. It could become an act of war only if the nations whose ships are blockaded decide to so consider it and attempt to shoot their way through."

"It is important to keep in mind," the VFW commander said, "that ships of the Soviet Union, when confronted by the quarantine in the missile crisis in Cuba, turned back and did not try to force their way through the blockade."

Commander Borg, who visited combat areas in South Vietnam recently, said that supply is a serious problem for the Communists in Vietnam. "It is extremely doubtful that the Communists could keep up organized aggression without the cargoes being brought into North Vietnam by ships."

"It is not generally appreciated," he said, "how much cargo is shipped into North Vietnam. For instance, in 1965 it's a reasonable estimate that there were well over 100 free world ships and probably an equal or larger amount of Soviet Union and other Communist-bloc ships making North Vietnamese ports. One of the most effective ways of reducing the Communist aggression is to cut off this seaborne flow of supplies. This will save lives and shorten the war."

Commenting on free world shipping into North Vietnam, the VFW commander said, "we would have no apologies to make to any free world nation for blockading their ships headed for Hanoi. Such trafficking with our enemy by ships flying free world flags is a betrayal of our friendship and a disservice to the cause of freedom throughout the world."

Concluding, Commander Borg said, "we have seapower superiority over communism in the Pacific and southeast Asia. There is no reason why we should not, therefore, exploit our advantage."

"If the United States could establish a quarantine blockade around Cuba, at a time when American troops were not getting killed, there is no reason why we shouldn't impose a similar quarantine against a vicious, aggressive enemy in North Vietnam who is killing American and allied fighting men."

Commander Borg emphasized that his recommendation for a blockade against North Vietnam was based upon a resolution unanimously adopted by the delegates representing the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans who are members of the VFW at their 1965 convention in Chicago.

Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the death of ALBERT THOMAS, Representative from Houston, is a particularly great loss to the Texas delegation, of which he was a senior member. An alumnus of two fine Texas institutes of higher learning—Rice University and the University of Texas, he was also a veteran of World War I and a distinguished attorney at law. He came to Washington some 30 years ago to distinguish himself further, this time as a U.S. Congressman. As the years passed, he became an important member of the House Committee on Appropriations, heading several key subcommittees, and serving on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

But it is not just for his great public service that I shall remember ALBERT THOMAS. I shall first and foremost forever cherish my remembrance of him as a fine human being and as my friend. When I first came to Congress in 1963, Mr. THOMAS was a great help to me in learning the fine details of the legislative process. Always considerate and gracious, he was what I think a true gentleman must be. A Democrat who contributed greatly to his party, he was liked and admired by Democrats and Republicans alike. He was my friend, and I shall truly miss him. But even more important to note here today is that the loss of this fine Member of Congress will be felt by the Nation for many years to come. The place of such a fine gentleman as ALBERT THOMAS is not easily filled in the world today.

Can Vietnam War Be Won?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the more one reads of the incredible obstacles that confront those who are trying to save Vietnam, the more serious becomes the question of whether the government of that country will permit it to be saved.

The odyssey of Mr. H. G. Beck, master of the SS *Louise Lykes*, as related to his employers from Saigon, is almost impossible to believe. It is a story of incompetence at its worst. It is a story of waste of the American taxpayers' money that ought to make every citizen of this country shudder.

Here was a vessel, carrying a combined cargo of rice and military supplies, the master of which almost had to fight a war to deliver free to a nation which claims to be fighting a war.

But read the report. It follows:

SS "LOUISE LYKES,"
Saigon, Vietnam, December 28, 1965.

MR. R. T. RECKLING,
Assistant Vice President, Operations, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.

DEAR SIR: Following is a report on the delays encountered at Da Nang, Vietnam:

On the way from Japan to Da Nang we followed our usual custom of sending our estimated time of arrival as soon as possible. Since we could not contact the local station at Danang advised both Manila and Saigon, requesting the latter to inform Danang. We happened to hear that the "old" *Louise Lykes* was at Da Nang and after that sent our messages through the old *Louise* to pass to the agent at Da Nang. We were informed by the agent, through the *Louise* that we would have a delay of at least 3 weeks before we would start discharging due to the arrival of a Liberian vessel with 14,000 tons of rice the previous day, we passed the information on to Manila.

December 17: Arrived off Da Nang at 8 p.m., but due to heavy weather stayed outside and hove to, but reported our arrival to the harbor entrance control, requesting an anchorage. We had talked to the *Christopher Lykes*, which was also in the bay and were advised not to attempt to enter as the vessels in the bay experienced very heavy swells and high winds. We had no intention of entering as we had listened to phone calls from vessels stating that they were dragging their anchors, requesting new anchorages.

December 18: Approached the entrance to the bay at daybreak and hove to 3 miles off, reporting and requesting again to have an anchorage assigned to us. The weather had moderated somewhat, but we could not see the land due to constant rain squalls. Finally, at 1 p.m., received instructions to anchor 280 degrees, 4,800 yards from Observatory Light. Entered and anchored in the middle of the bay, rolling very heavily and shipping water on deck, laying broadside to the swells entering the bay. Talked to old *Louise* and to the *Christopher*, both of whom informed us that they had not seen the agent in a couple days due to the bad weather. Sent a message to the agent through the local station informing him of our arrival.

December 19: No contact yet, no news. Informed by another vessel that the "agent will be out tomorrow." Vessel neither entered nor cleared. Lykes Manila wanted to know best draft we could trim to. Informed Manila best draft 30 feet, 6 inches.

December 20: Agent did not come aboard. No contacts.

December 21: Received message from agent through local station, "Wait instructions advice from Saigon" Centraco. Received message from Manila quoting concern of New Orleans regarding delay at Danang, requesting we explore possibilities of debunkering at Danang to *Louise, Christopher, Ruth,* or any vessel. Called *Christopher* on the phone, were told that agent was aboard *Christopher*, passed a message from us to agent, also passed message from Manila to agent, at the same time demanding that agent come out to vessel immediately. When the agent came aboard it became apparent at once that there was absolutely nothing that he could do to assist us. Rather than risk further delay went with agent to *Louise* to explore possibility of giving bunkers to *Louise* which needed them.

Found that *Louise* had neither hose nor fittings and neither did we. Conditions for coming alongside in this port are extremely hazardous due to swell at times. An old oil barge which we were going to use as a fender between the vessels was found to have sunk in the meantime. Since the *Louise* was ready to sail by this time we continued ashore with the agent in order to talk to MSTS but were told that they had neither barges, hose, nor fittings, that they would explore possibilities and let us know. Talking to the *Christopher* we found that she could take 8,000 barrels, had hose, and could make some sort of fittings. But then the question of camels or fenders arose. We could not go in where she was due to our draft, she was MSTS and working at the time. MSTS had to be contacted, the Navy or fenders located somewhere.

Before we could pursue the matter further we received a message from Manila to "proceed Manila for debunkering acknowledge advising ETA." We had advised Manila regarding our efforts and failure up to then. We might have succeeded in the end, but valuable time would have been lost as it would have taken a minimum of a day or more to coordinate everything, then possibly another day, with the ever-present possibility of swell or the inability to obtain suitable fenders.

Advised the local authorities, harbor entrance control, port conrtol, the agent through the *Suomico* a USNS tanker, that we were leaving as soon as we had steam up. In the meantime we were still trying to contact the *Ruth Lykes* at Cam Ranh Bay, apparently a very sheltered place, but were unable to raise her. Called the local control stations, since they are in touch with each other, explaining our difficulties, requesting permission to use the channel. While sympathetic they did not want to be bothered, but suggested that we use the local Western Union. We would have gotten an answer in a week. MSTS was going to advise us what they had come up with. We asked how, by phone? They said their phone did not reach across the street, they had no insulators on their antennas. Going ashore with the agent we had to wait first while the boat crew repaired or made adjustments to the motor. Going ashore it became doubtful whether we would be getting back to the ship again. Communications are extremely poor.

Sent some radios to Saigon, asking if we could debunker at Cap St. Jacques, if we could obtain barges, hoses, fittings? No answer. We could not raise Cam Ranh Bay. Later I found out that efforts were being made at Saigon along those lines, in fact were in progress while we were calling, but ended in failure for one reason or another. Knowing we have a message at a station we would call for an hour or two before they would deign to answer. Saigon for instance sends her traffic at certain hours and you either catch the station then or not at all. Many times other ships would relay for us and we would do the same as otherwise no one would get any messages through except possibly a few lucky ones.

December 22: Sailed from Da Nang at 12:30 a.m. and at 9 a.m. advised Manila that we had sailed, giving our estimated time of arrival, Manila. Received orders at the same time canceling the diversion, telling us to keep in touch with Manila, in the meantime to remain at Da Nang. Since we were already 160 miles from Da Nang slowed down, heading south and awaited developments. Since jettisoning fuel was mentioned we were in position to do so any time we were ordered to commence.

We remained in touch with Manila and Saigon throughout the day and night, receiving and answering instructions, passing messages from Manila to Saigon, adding our own requests. In the meantime continued steaming south slowly in order to be able to proceed either Manila or Saigon as ordered, at the same time to be near enough Saigon to insure making the tide if ordered to jettison fuel.

December 23: at 1:30 a.m., informed Manila that we were starting to jettison fuel as the deadline had arrived to jettison, staying far enough offshore and at the same time make the tide on the 24th, adding if objection advise immediately. No answer came back, so we continued to jettison until we felt we were light enough to be able to proceed upriver on the tide. I had left myself time as I did not know how long it would take to jettison that much fuel, also the speed the ship would make once we started steaming again. We did not want to jettison, then fail to make the tide. It seems our worries were unfounded. Completed jettisoning at 4 p.m. and started for Cap St. Jacques making 20 knots.

During the night, after we picked up the first landmarks, slowed down in order to enter Cap St. Jacques during daylight hours. Arrived and anchored off the Cape at 8 a.m. Read the draft as well as we could both forward and aft and amidships, port and starboard and came to the conclusion that we were on the draft we were supposed to be on. We still had water in the forepeak which we were going to use to trim, but did not use it for fear of tipping the vessel aft too much. We had figured that we would have to pump half of it out, but left well enough alone.

Orders came out by boat saying that we would proceed upriver about 1400, also asking the draft. Informed pilots 29 feet 2 inches, as read. When the pilot came aboard he also asked, we told him 29 feet 2 inches, or 29 feet 10 inches fresh water. When we crossed the bar, apparently a mere two or three ship lengths, the vessel never hesitated, did not slow down, did not stir up mud, just kept steaming as before. On arrival at Saigon the draft was found to be 30 feet 3 inches forward and 29 feet 11 inches aft. The only berth available were buoys at the lower end of the harbor. The distance between these buoys is insufficient for a vessel of this size, so we made one buoy fast alongside of the bow and using an anchor, in order to have the after buoy astern of the vessel. While being cleared by the local authorities we were informed the discharge would commence Christmas Day at 7 p.m.

December 25: Barges alongside at 7 p.m., but no labor. It seems that barge people had advised everyone that barges could not be alongside before 2200. No work this day.

December 26: USOM and AID people aboard with agent. Commander Fink of USOM informed me that he had been trying to line up a large fuel barge to debunker us at Cap. St. Jacques. At the same time use junks and barges to discharge part of the rice while debunkering. He was going to bring the vessel into the river above Cap. St. Jacques in order to be in quiet water and had arranged for a naval patrol to see that we were not surprised by the Vietcong. Labor costs would have been tripled sending stevedores that distance (40 miles), but it would have been still cheaper than jettisoning. But he could not get anywhere with his plan due to the obstructionist attitude of the local government. He stated that we needed a permit to discharge at the rivermouth, then there would be trouble bringing the rice to Saigon. When pointing out that the rice was destined to Vietnam and that Cap. St. Jacques is in Vietnam as is Danang he merely shrugged his shoulders saying that he could not force people, that he could merely advise them. I could only agree with him, having dealt with the same people.

Labor boarded the vessel at 1460 this day and knocked off again at 1500. The receiver had failed to obtain a permit at the customhouse to discharge into lighters. No work this day. Informed Manila by radio.

December 27, 9 a.m.: Two gentlemen from AID aboard accompanied by a Colonel Jock(?) from CPA, the Vietnamese Government agency receiving the rice. I asked him regarding the debacle the previous day when the discharge of badly needed rice was stopped for the lack of a piece of paper, which is given by one Government agency (customs) to another (receiver) which after all is only a matter of form. In the meantime a very expensive ship is being held up. He drew his whole 5 feet up and stated that we do not work on Saturday and Sunday. This did not sit too well with me and I pointed out that I not only worked on Saturday and Sunday, but day and night, every day, so did everyone else, the crew, the AID people, the people loading the ship at home, in fact everyone and one sure thing, the Vietcong were working. It made no impression on the gentleman at all. The AID people took off in high dudgeon telling the colonel that they would see the Minister, whoever he is, some Vietnamese Cabinet officer.

At 1315 five gangs came aboard and started discharging Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. During the day Mr. T. Gleason and five aids came aboard accompanied by Commander Fink, USOM. They are here, as you probably are aware, to use their talents in unsnarling the local bottleneck by improving coordination, using labor and barges and other facilities intelligently. I received the impression that Mr. Gleason has been here since October, but from all I can gather while they know where and what the trouble is, there is very little that they can do except advise. You might as well advise the rice to get out under its own power, you get just as far as advising the local yokels. You think you have troubles?

Mr. Gleason and his gang came back later during the day. We still had five gangs working and continued to do so until 2315 when the barges at Nos. 2 and 5 were loaded and no replacements had arrived. The rest continued until 0500 the next morning when the shift ended and the barge at No. 3 was loaded.

December 28: At 0730 five gangs came aboard, two went to work at Nos. 5 and 6, while the gangs at Nos. 2, 3, and 4 stood by, waiting for barges. Apparently they only get paid while they work, because at 10 o'clock, when a half a dozen barges showed up the labor was gone. Mr. Gleason, ILA and aids, with a gentleman from AID came aboard again, watching operations for a while, pointing out that the load was always hanging in the air, waiting to be lowered in the opening in the roof of the barge. The opening is at one end and the cargo, or rice, has to be carried clean to the other end in the barge. Mr. Gleason stated that he had forwarded a report to Washington in October, pointing out that they needed large flat barges, land the cargo on them and cover it. That is all that happened, no one paid any attention to it. At the present moment we have four rice ships here now.

Apparently the rice is not needed as badly as we think. I heard an aside between the AID people, saying: "What are we going to do with it, they are harvesting in the delta and they will come up with another 200,000 tons."

At the present moment we have six empty barges alongside (2 p.m.) but no labor on the barges to land and stow the rice in the barges. While the rice is checked off the ship, it also must be checked on to the barge. The barge checkers have not shown up either.

I am writing this little epistle from notes which I am trying to keep in chronological order. If they are confusing, or if you are confused, think nothing of it, so am I. I keep asking questions, prodding the agent and stevedore, but half the time I do not know what they are talking about, because while I received excellent training during my 3-year sojourn in Turkey, these people can teach the Turks when it comes to procrastinating and evading. The agent and stevedore both are doing their best apparently, but it is also apaprent that it is not good enough.

We discharged some 1,350 tons of rice yesterday up until 5 a.m. today in what may be called 2 interrupted shifts (lack of barges etc.). However, most, if not all the discharged cargo is still alongside. The cargo has to be discharged into warehouses some distance from here and the barges returned for further loading. If the local people could coordinate their efforts it would be only a matter of days to discharge a vessel such as this, but either there is no labor, or no checkers, or no barges, or the tide is wrong or too strong or even the lack of a piece of paper which nullifies all efforts. I have been informed by Mr. Gleason that there is no trouble getting labor at any time of the day or night, so there should be no trouble on that score.

So far the military cargo has not been touched. I understand that we will probably have to shift to another berth in order to unload, unless the military are willing to unload their vehicles into barges. It is too early to start prodding as some of the stuff is still buried by the rice, even though No. 1 can be discharged now.

I hope the foregoing is what you had in mind when you requested that I inform you of any and all delays. A detailed log will also be kept and forwarded prior to sailing from Saigon. In order to keep this epistle down to manageable size I shall close now, continue to keep notes and complete it before sailing from here.

Yours very truly,

H. G. Beck, *Master.*

Mistakes of McNamara Are Danger to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the pressure to do something about the multiplying McNamara errors in judgment is increasing with the unfolding of every day. A good example of the temperament of my constituency is contained in the following article entitled "Mistakes of McNamara Are Danger to Nation," by Henry J. Taylor which recently appeared in the San Diego Union is in the must-read category for my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this as a portion of my remarks:

Mistakes of McNamara Are Danger to Nation

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Another of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's great plans has folded under him (and under our men in Vietnam) like a dying camel. But who would know it?

This war is not the administration's war. It's the American people's war. And the truth we fail to get is utterly—shamefully—appalling.

Once again, in the largest matters Mr. McNamara's judgment apparently vanishes like a pricked balloon.

Among other examples, the records show him dead wrong, successively wrong and wrong on all sides of the Vietnam situation. In February 1962, Mr. McNamara stated: "By every quantitative measure we are winning the war in Vietnam." And so it goes wth Mr. McNamara.

Now it's about ships. And this brings us to the facts herein; just one more example, but you can frame it:

In testifying to Congress 4 years ago after returning from Vietnam, Mr. McNamara stated he had decided to take ships largely out of the defense picture. Air transport would be substituted as our primary military supply vehicle. This would take the place of ships "we do not need."

Were Mr. McNamara's computers just spinning their reels? Representative Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat, of Maryland, acting chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, and others apparently told him it would take 260 of the C5A planes to carry the load of a single C-4-type workhorse ship. And it would cost eight times as much per ton mile.

Flanked by his whiz kids, fresh from their computers, the answer was Mr. McNamara's same old yakety-yak of leave-it-to-me, a-one, a-two, a-three.

Well, here it is 4 years later and what is the truth about what's happened? By the Defense Department's own records, 2 of every 3 soldiers in Vietnam had to be transported by ships. As of January 24, 98 percent of the cargo and supplies for the war went in ships.

But because Mr. McNamara was wrong we haven't got the ships. Instead, our fighting men have got the shortages in Vietnam.

When will Mr. McNamara admit that Vietnam cargoes are piling up scandalously in New York, New Orleans, Oakland, Norfolk, and Baltimore? When will he admit the few ships he has belatedly reactivated cannot unload their cargoes fast enough to get back here and take on the supplies that are piling up?

When will he admit that even these few ships often wait in Vietnam sometimes nearly 3 months, with their supplies undelivered to our troops because the ships arrive to find no suitable unloading conditions?

In July, Mr. McNamara finally caved in to the extent of (quietly) reactivating 50 ships, and then another 25 or so, from our mothball fleet. But he demanded a 10-cent job for their refitting, and practically no time for testing.

Water, instead of detergent, was quickly pumped through the boiler tubes. It resulted in a scandal. But who would know it Unremoved oil sediment and sludge caused boiler after boiler to blow up or break down at sea.

Accordingly, Mr. McNamara now needs ships so badly and so fast that there isn't time to refit enough in time to move the cargoes.

Mr. McNamara's computer-backed words are convincing. His housekeeping in the Defense Department is splendid and his remarkable intelligence fully deserves the praise received. But intelligence is not the same as good judgment. And at top levels no man can claim to have good judgment who fails to make allowances for the consequences if he is wrong.

This is the first requirement of good judgment. Yet Mr. McNamara repeatedly bets the very essence of our national security that he's right, with no place for us to turn if he's wrong.

To be that bullheaded, that positive you are right, is dangerous. On his record in the big questions that really count most, Mr. McNamara should resign.

Tribute to the Honorable Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the loss of Albert Thomas, as a Representative of the State of Texas and as a symbol of great statesmen is an irreplaceable one.

My admiration for him began during my first days as a Member of Congress from the State of New York.

All of the outstanding attributes for which the image seekers of today search, veritably shone in the great mind, the wit and above all, the character of Congressman Thomas. I hasten to join in tribute today with my colleagues. He was a gentleman and a scholar.

His magnificent verbal sparring on the floor of the House of Representatives, either in the presentation of a supplemental budget or in his flawless elucidation of an argument, was eagerly anticipated by each and every Member of Congress.

I am grateful to have served with Congressman Thomas in his capacity as chairman of the Democratic caucus and I am proud to have called him my colleague.

I wish to express my deep sympathy to the Thomas family and pray for God's blessings upon them to endure their sorrow.

New Needs and New Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Second District of Michigan, which I am privileged to represent in this body, contains a number of excellent institutions of higher education. Among them, of course, is the University of Michigan, one of the oldest and most distinguished State universities in the Nation, and, indeed, one of the great universities in the world.

Last week, I had the honor of being asked to serve as congressional host at the 14th annual congressional dinner, held by the University of Michigan Club of Washington, D.C. The main speaker that evening, Dr. Harlan H. Hatcher, projected the future of the university. As its president, Dr. Hatcher is, of course, concerned with that future. But he is also vitally interested in the future of all higher education in this country.

Under permission granted, I include at this point in the Record, an article by President Hatcher, discussing some of the trends in higher education. The article appeared in the January 1966, issue of the Michigan Business Review, published by the Graduate School of Business Administration of the University of Michigan.

The article follows:

New Needs and New Opportunities

(By Harlan Hatcher)

Let me feed into your personal computers some items of information, and then we can try to draw some conclusions and some new directions.

Item: In August, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported that during fiscal 1966 more than $3 billion will flow from the Federal Treasury through a single agency, the U.S. Office of Education, to schools and colleges, teachers and students, libraries and librarians. Since that report was made, the Higher Education Act of 1965 has been signed by President Johnson, notably providing 140,000 undergraduate scholarships.

Item: In fiscal 1966, four of the largest Government agencies contracting with colleges and universities for research—the National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the U.S. Public Health Service—will spend an estimated $840 million through our colleges and universities. Please note that this figure does not include the operation of the research centers which a few of our universities administer for these agencies, nor does it include the training programs of these agencies.

Item: The published listing of the programs for which Federal money will be spent in 1966 through the Office of Education includes 67 titles. Every one of them is mission-oriented; every one of them has a given, specific purpose for which alone the money can be spent. The grants and contracts for research are equally specific and project-centered.

Item: In 1 recent year, the total current fund income from all sources of all our colleges and universities was $7.3 billion—only about twice the sum of the two Federal items I have already mentioned.

Item: Corporate giving to higher education has risen from $80 million in 1954 to $250 million in 1964—a notable increase. But some observers note a leveling-off in corporate giving and some murmurs are heard to the effect that such giving is now less necessary because of the influx of Federal dollars.

A CARROT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Let me make one other point concerning the magnitude and nature of Federal spending before turning to something else. Just a week ago, in reporting the ceremony of signing the Higher Education Act, the New York Times education editor, Mr. Fred Hechinger, made this statement: "The law is, perhaps first and foremost, a carrot to persuade higher education that it ought to lead in the search for the Great Society."

In other words, the legislation was written, not so much to help the colleges and universities reach the goals they have set for themselves, but rather to use these institutions to achieve certain goals for society which the makers of the laws perceive.

This is, of course, entirely legitimate. Setting goals for the Nation and selecting methods for achieving them is a proper task of Government. Participating in this task is also proper for education—but it is not the whole of the universities' responsibilities.

DIMINISHING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

Now let us take a look at another set of facts which have a bearing on the topic "New Needs and New Opportunities."

We have long been accustomed in this country to distinguishing between colleges and universities on the basis of whether they are "private" or "public." We have today 743 institutions which are considered public, and 1,357 classed as private. In the public institutions, we have now well over 60 percent of all the students enrolled, and by 1980 probably three-fourths of all our students will be in the public institutions.

But this distinction between public and private is harder and harder to make—and less and less significant. Already, private institutions of higher education receive enormous sums of "public" money—including more Federal research funds than go to all the so-called public institutions. And conversely, some of the public institutions own some of the largest endowments, even though endowment is often considered the hallmark of the private college.

Still another interesting development is the growth of cooperative programs of various kinds which involve both public and private institutions. I will cite just two, centered in our own Midwest. The Committee on Institutional Cooperation embraces the nine public universities of the Big 10 and the one private member—Northwestern—plus the University of Chicago. The CIC is blazing a trail in interinstitutional cooperation which is being noted by educators throughout the country. Another organization is the newly formed Argonne Universities Association, comprised of 16 public and 10 private institutions. This association will formulate policies for the operation of Argonne National Laboratory.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

What we are seeing today is a blurring of the once sharp distinction between public and private and the emergence of another distinction of great importance. This is the distinction between college and university—certainly not a new phenomenon, but one that has great significance for us in this time of swift evolution of our total educational system.

Traditionally, the emphasis of corporate giving has been upon the private colleges—the traditional 4-year liberal arts institution under private control. The results are cause for national pride, for we have a truly outstanding group of private colleges—such institutions as Amherst, Beloit, Carleton, and so on down the list. Over the years, this Nation has looked to such institutions as these for its leaders in business, industry, government, and the professions.

We still expect a considerable portion of our leadership to come from the liberal arts college, both public and private. But today, more and more of those prospective leaders graduate from their liberal arts studies and go on to a university for advanced and professional training. And this is the level—the graduate school and the professional school—at which great new needs and opportunities exist for private support.

Perhaps I can illustrate this by mentioning a report I received a few days ago from the school of business administration of my own University of Michigan. The report indicated that last year more than 300 corporations sent representatives to our campus to interview prospective graduates about jobs. The median starting salaries for the people employed by these companies were $590 per month for bachelor's degree people, and $700 for master's degree recipients. The top salaries were $725 per month for the bachelor's degree and $1,350 for the master's. Obviously, our corporations place a considerable monetary value on graduate study.

This is not a point which needs belaboring, for I think it is now widely recognized that as our total supply of knowledge expands—and it has been expanding at a dizzying rate this past half century—the number of years which an individual spends on his formal education must likewise expand. And we know also that these graduate and professional programs of instruction are expensive, a great deal more expensive than the basic 4-year undergraduate liberal arts sequence.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR CORPORATE SUPPORT

Out of these somewhat disparate items, let us now see if we can chart some new directions for corporate participation in support of higher education in the next several years.

First of all, it seems to me that the only possible direction for corporate support is upward. This is not simply because Federal spending is expanding. Rather, corporate support should go up because the need is greater and because the capacity of our economy to meet that need is greater than it has ever been in our history.

Second, corporate support must move upward in another sense. It must be increased at the graduate and professional levels of education, both because this, too, is where needs are growing most urgently and because this is the level from which corporations are increasingly drawing their technologists and their managers. Farsighted corporate policy dictates support for this level of education because business is changing too, and will need more and more technologists and better trained managers in the future.

Third, private contributions must expand in order to maintain the diversity of higher education in the United States. For many years, we have thought of that diversity in terms of a balance between public and private institutions. But now we need to maintain both public and private interests in both public and private institutions. If the public institutions become solely dependent upon tax funds, then we may be sure that their programs will be geared to fit the mission-oriented funds available through Government agencies. If private institutions are to be confined to private funds alone, some, at least, will simply face bankruptcy. The diversity of our educational system—in kinds and levels of institutions and programs—depends upon continuation and expansion of both public and private support for all kinds of institutions.

And we might add that the rising proportion of our young people who attend the so-called public institutions means that private support must go to these universities as well as those dubbed private. Such support will be necessary if the private sector of the economy is to have much influence upon the total course of higher education.

Finally, education needs most urgently to see an expansion of private support in order to have the funds necessary for innovation, for experimentation, for pioneering. At the risk of undue repetition, I remind you of the project nature of Federal appropriations. Advances in education come most often from the institutions which have the resources to follow their own stars, not simply those of offices in Washington and the statehouse.

OF STUDENT ACTIVISM

Finally, I want to touch on a subject which may seem at first to be extraneous, but is not, I believe, irrelevant to our topic. In recent weeks, presidents of a good many colleges and universities have been receiving letters about what is usually called "student activism," and more specifically about the actions of a small but very vocal group of students in regard to the conflict in Vietnam. At the University of Michigan, where we are now engaged in an effort to secure $55 million in capital funds gifts, some have suggested that our funds drive may be "hurt" by these demonstrations. Some few are fearful that student activism is so unpopular with the public that support for higher education may level off or even decline.

I have no precise measure for the popularity or lack of it of such things. But I submit that popularity is not the issue here. The question, rather, concerns the rights of citizens.

On that score, I can only reiterate the position taken not only by my own university but by other responsible institutions of higher education. As citizens, students have the same freedom of speech, peaceful assembly, and right of petition guaranteed to all citizens by our Constitution. Activities of students sometimes result in violation of the law. When such violations occur, it is the responsibility of the law enforcement agencies to take appropriate action.

Perhaps a distinction needs to be drawn between actions which are offensive or distasteful to many of us, and those which are illegal. To prohibit expression of student opinion with which we disagree, or because we dislike the manner in which students choose to express their opinion, would be a violation of the constitutional freedoms so precious to all of us.

I do not believe that universities will suffer, in the long run, because they guard the freedom of their faculties and students. Free speech, right of assembly, right of petition were not created by universities in this country, but were first established in America by those who wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The universities have the obligation, however, to continue and to help protect these basic liberties. In good conscience, we cannot do otherwise.

In conclusion, I turn your attention to one final characteristic of our American system of higher education. This is the emergence of what, for want of a better term, I shall have to call the national universities. We have perhaps a dozen or two such institutions—universities which tower above the academic scene. Some of them are private; some are public. With their faculties of scholars, their thousands of undergraduate, graduate and professional students, their scores of academic programs, their tremendous research efforts, these universities constitute an indispensable national asset. They demand the best of all of us who work in them and for them. They deserve support from both national and regional businesses.

The Ford Foundation's Mexican-American Study Project at the University of California, Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, a great deal is heard these days about poverty, disadvantaged groups, and ethnic and racial minorities.

The impact of rapid technological change, the crowded urban areas, and the tense conditions of poverty have all contributed to a growing national concern for the less privileged who live in our country.

We, here in Congress, have voted enormous amounts of money to cope with these problems through the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to name only two of the most recent pieces of legislation.

On the administration side, the President has tried to carry out the intent of Congress to improve the lives of the long-forgotten inhabitants of our American pockets of poverty.

The task has been difficult in the extreme. Men like Sargent Shriver have sought data that would help them to implement our congressional intent. Studies have been made by the Office of Economic Opportunity and other agencies across the length and breadth of this Nation to discover the poor and to assess properly the conditions of their lives. In many areas the task of helping the poor has often been made more difficult by the lack of meaningful information. Many areas of poverty, we now realize, are little known to the larger society.

According to the 1960 census, in the Southwest, the Mexican-American people number 3½ million, and nearly 1½ million of them live in California where my district is located. These numbers are substantially larger at the present time.

For many years Mexicans in the United States have been somewhat of a mystery in the history books. Today they represent a virtually unknown factor to national decisionmakers and social scientists.

I have noted that in Washington, New York, and other places far removed from the Southwest, the term "Mexican" often evokes the image of a Mexican contract laborer. The Mexican population of the Southwest, long an integral part of America, is little known on the east coast and not much better understood in the Southwest itself.

Books in the public libraries and the texts used in classrooms tell the casual reader that Mexicans are a rural, romantic people, when they are, in fact, about as highly urbanized as the rest of our population. For years Mexican-American scholars have tried to change the image of the Mexican-American; to prove to the larger society that the Mexican-American people, like many immigrant groups, are part of the American social drama and that they, the Mexican-Americans, are also here to stay.

Unfortunately, these sporadic and usually local research efforts were not sufficient, and they did little to alleviate the grievances of the Mexican community. Systematic, reliable, and comprehensive information was rarely found. Consequently, the Mexican-American people remained an enigma on the American scene.

Not long ago, the Ford Foundation turned its attention to the plight of the Mexican-American. The Ford Foundation recognized that, unlike the Negro people and other minorities, Mexican-Americans could not point to a comprehensive analysis of their problems comparable to Gunnar Myrdal's "An American Dilemma."

At about the same time, an academic group at the University of California, Los Angeles, began to explore the Mexican-American population and its problems. This group was led by Dr. Leo Grebler, a well-known economist and professor at the UCLA Graduate School of Business Administration.

Professor Grebler himself is an immigrant and a refugee from the savagery of of Nazi Germany. His work with census data and his extensive research in urban economics made him curious about gaps in the data, and about the appalling differences between widely held stereotyped views of Mexican-Americans and the real facts. Who were these Mexicans? Why were they so terribly deprived in a society of plenty?

Why was so little known about this minority and why was so much that is purported to be known so wrong?

Dr. Grebler felt that only a comprehensive, full-scale study could provide the answers and so, together with his associates he submitted a research proposal to the Ford Foundation, which the foundation approved and funded

Because of this man's scholarly concern and because of the empathy that he felt for a people whom he suspected to be considerably underprivileged, the Mexican-American study project was established at the University of California in Los Angeles. It is the most elaborate study of the social and economic conditions of the Mexican-American people ever undertaken.

Dr. Grebler gathered a staff about him. Among the staff members is Prof. Joan Moore, a sociologist trained at the University of Chicago and now teaching at the University of California, Riverside; a young woman of great promise who has a special interest in minority problems and is the associate director of the project.

Another staff person is Frank G. Mittelbach, also a refugee from Nazi Germany who, as a child, was smuggled into

England to escape the persecution of Adolf Hitler. Mittelbach, a highly competent statistician, is assigned the task of gathering and analyzing hard data on the Mexican-American people.

To round out his central staff, Professor Grebler looked for a Mexican-American scholar who would be the only full-time staff person and who would perform both scholarly and administrative work. For this task he chose Ralph Guzman, a doctoral candidate in political science at UCLA and a man long active in Mexican-American community affairs, who, at the time of his selection, was serving as the Peace Corps Director for northern Peru.

Many other scholars representing different academic fields are working on the project. For example, Prof. Julian Samora, chairman of the department of sociology at Notre Dame University, is doing a special study of the Mexican-American population living in East Chicago, Ind. Prof. Nancie Gonzales, a cultural anthropologist at the University of New Mexico, is in charge of a study of the Spanish-American people in that State. In Texas, Prof. Arthur Rubel, an anthropologist, and Dr. Richard Brymer are looking into the problems facing the Mexican-American people in San Antonio. Many young Mexican-American students have been brought in to do the research.

Recently, the Mexican-American study project released two advance reports. One, on the relationship between education and income, has provided important insight into the social mobility of young Mexican-Americans who work hard to achieve and are later inhibited by society. The other report concerns immigration. It provides, for the first time, a comprehensive record and analysis of Mexican immigration to the United States.

Other advance reports are scheduled for release within the next few months. And a textbook to be published shortly on "California Politics and Policies" contains a chapter dealing with the Mexican-American community by Ralph Guzman, the assistant director of the project.

Beyond its many research contributions, the staff of the Mexican-American study project has been engaged in numerous lectures, training programs, conferences, and consultations. The research work is closely associated with community advisory committees in Los Angeles and San Antonio, where intensive local studies are in process. These committees include outstanding persons drawn from the Mexican-American communities. I am proud to serve on the Los Angeles committee.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Mexican-American study project performs an extremely significant role, and I believe that it promises to provide an unprecedented factual basis for better public policies and for improved understanding between this minority group and American society at large.

I am convinced that this tireless effort to discover truth will help people like you and me to understand reality more thoroughly and to serve more effectively the best interests of our constituencies. The Mexican-American study project at UCLA deserves recognition and the support of us all.

Hon. Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heart full of sorrow that I eulogize my good friend Albert Thomas, who this day was called by his Maker after many years of personal suffering. He was one of the most unforgettable characters I have ever met, but I know I am the richer for it. He never complained to anyone and always had a happy and hearty "Hi there" for everyone, together with a wave of his hand.

His service in the House of Representatives spans three decades in which much important legislation was written, and in which much history was made. It is marked with the same characteristic of no thoughts for himself, but always for his fellow man, and his welfare. The people he represented saluted this characteristic by returning him 15 times to this great body.

Albert Thomas' position on the Appropriations Committee brought him into daily contact with officials of the various independent offices of our Government. His knowledge of fiscal affairs and budgetary procedures was uncanny. He was a shrewd inquisitor of witnesses who appeared before his committee and yet was respected by all.

I join his family in mourning the loss of this great statesman who served his country well.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

New York City's Water Supply and Cornwall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we recall the excitement and dismay this past year when New York City faced the dreaded and dreadful water shortage. The crisis is still with us, although the worry and fear are not quite so vocal.

The recent heavy rains and snow have greatly helped, but the reservoirs are still far from full and the danger of a water shortage has not passed. Nor will it pass unless nature is helped by man's ingenuity.

I have noted with interest the announcement of the possibility of New York using Consolidated Edison's proposed pumped storage hydroelectric plant at Cornwall, N.Y., to help supplement the city's water supply in dry years. From the information I have, it seems obvious that long-range solution to the city's water requirements is the Hudson River. There is no need for the city to have water shortages when hundreds of billions of gallons of fresh water flow down the Hudson each year and are wasted in the ocean. This resource must be conserved for public use.

Any plan for using Hudson River water on a large scale is going to require huge pumping facilities to get the water from the river into the water system. While the engineering and economic feasibility of the plan to use the Cornwall facilities for this purpose have yet to be determined, the proposal would seem to have merit in that it would make available to the city at minimum capital cost the largest pumping facilities anywhere. This proposal to combine power and water supply in one major project indicates an intelligent approach to the development of our Nation's water resources. It would, in a sense, help the natural supply of water Metropolitan New York City now possesses. Thus, man's ingenuity becomes the handmaiden of nature.

For some time now the city has been carefully studying all practical means of augmenting its water supply. From the information available, it seems apparent the long-range answer lies with the Hudson River. The passage on November 2, of the $1 billion clean water bill by the voters of New York State brings the use of the Hudson River for part of New York City's water supply much closer to realization.

Indications are that New York City's present system of water supply reservoirs is adequate for many years to come. The problem is not one of more reservoir capacity, but rather how to have the reservoirs full at the end of each annual spring runoff period. During years of normal rainfall this is not a problem and even with 2 or 3 dry years in a row the system seems to be adequate to meet the city's needs. However, with a more prolonged dry period, as recently existed, the situation becomes calamitous.

Since late last summer the city has been studying a method of using Hudson River water to fill the reservoirs in the springtime during dry years. This involves the use of the planned pumped storage plant at Cornwall, N.Y.

During the late winter and early spring months, the volume of fresh water flowing down the Hudson averages up to 20 billion gallons a day. During this period, I am informed, the water flowing past Cornwall is fresh, and the quality of the water even now is such that normal treatment practices can make it potable. Furthermore, the condition of this water should markedly improve as the antipollution program takes effect during the next 3 or 4 years.

The problem, then, is how to conserve a portion of the huge volumes of fresh water that flow during the early months of the year for subsequent use during the dry season. The planned Cornwall pumped storage project can provide an ideal solution. It will be the largest pumping station in the world, and more than adequate to handle the large quantities of water involved.

The project will have a reservoir with a capacity of 8 billion gallons located at an elevation of some 1,100 feet. This reservoir will be at a higher elevation than several of the reservoirs in both the Catskill and Delaware watersheds. Thus, by gravity flow, it will be possible to fill reservoirs in these systems with Hudson River water from the Cornwall reservoir. As an example, it would take only the equivalent of 12 fills of the Cornwall reservoir to add nearly 100 billion gallons of water to the city's supply. This arrangement should make it possible for New York City to have its reservoirs completely filled at the beginning of summer each year.

Methods of connecting the Cornwall project to the city's reservoir system are being explored. One of these being considered would require the construction of about 8 miles of aqueduct to integrate the new source of supply. Preliminary estimates indicate that the cost of providing this additional water will be only a fraction of the average cost of the city's water supply at present, which is 15 cents per thousand gallons.

It must be recognized that some 9 million people, all citizens of the Metropolitan New York area, are to be served by this Cornwall project.

The Cornwall plant has been attacked as an invasion of the scenic beauty of the Hudson. We are all naturally interested in preserving beauty, but from what I have been able to gather, I have grave doubts as to whether or not there will be any invasion of the beauty of the Hudson. Nor is scenic beauty a sacred cow to be worshipped at all and any cost. Remember, 9 million persons are presently involved. The future will usher in millions more to be affected. I am informed that when this project was first proposed, even Governor Rockefeller refused to intervene against it. He wrote to a New York State senator that he felt the project's benefits would outweigh any damage to the scenery. Even the Governor's distinguished brother, Laurance S. Rockefeller, chairman of the Hudson River Valley Commission, said that if no alternative can be found, Con Edison should go ahead with Cornwall. I doubt whether a substitute can be found. Thus, scenic beauty is not an absolute, although highly important.

The company claims that this project will add to rather than subtract from the scenic beauty, that it will add to recreational facilities and contribute substantially to the aims of conservationists, and that there will be cleared out at Cornwall demolished buildings, abandoned factories, and protruding rotten barges as well as a burned-out pier. There will be constructed a waterfront recreational park and many acres will be added to the forest parkland on Storm King. Furthermore, I am informed that more than 80 percent of the waterfront plant will be underground and what will be visible will be low buildings along the waterfront. There will be no stacks.

I believe both demands can be satisfied, namely, the need to preserve the beauty of the Hudson scenery with a minimum of impairment and the need for fresh water and other advantages.

Judge Oscar B. Jones of Longview, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Longview Morning Journal of Sunday, February 13, 1966, about a very outstanding public official of Gregg County, Judge Oscar B. Jones. I have known Oscar many years and know he is a very fine and capable official. I extend my best wishes to Oscar and his family.

The editorial follows:

[From the Longview (Tex.) Morning Journal, Feb. 13, 1966]

COMMENDABLE SERVICE

(By Ellie Hopkins)

Now and then an elected public official does such an outstanding and thoroughly satisfactory work that he merits and should be given public recognition and commendation. Judge Oscar B. Jones of the court of domestic relations of Gregg County has performed with such capacity and understanding that we believe all the people of our country should be better acquainted with his effective service in this position.

As head of the court of domestic relations since it was created on October 1, 1959, Judge Jones has served so effectively that he has been elected and reelected to the court without opposition. This represents a fine tribute which the people of Gregg County have given to this able jurist for the good job he is doing in a difficult position.

Not everyone realizes that this court deals mostly with such ticklish problem matters as divorce and broken homes, children in need of support and parental care, and the deeply involved problems of juvenile delinquency. These are personal matters, often involving great bitterness, disappointment, and hurt. There is contention and dispute and misunderstanding on all sides.

This means that the job of being judge in the court of domestic relations is a nerve-wracking, strenuous, and often thankless one. Sitting on the bench and trying to maintain orderly process is only the beginning. Judge Jones has made himself available at all times, has given countless hours of what would be considered by most judges as private time to accommodating the needs and requests of both litigants and attorneys, and in giving all fair and thoughtful treatment.

Always before him, whether on the bench, in his official chambers, or seeking rest at home with his family at night, Judge Jones has the problems of the welfare of the children involved in broken homes, those left without paternal support, and those who for lack of a favorable home life have become wayward and delinquent. Such matters can weigh heavily on the person who feels a natural concern and normal desire to try to work out the best solution possible.

It is a matter of record that Judge Jones has secured support for thousands of children whose fathers were reluctant or refused to support them. This has saved the taxpayers many thousands of dollars when support secured through his court saved placing the children and even the mothers on public welfare rolls.

Judge Jones, with a broad background of experience and service that qualifies him particularly well for a family and children's court, spends much time in marriage counseling. He has saved many homes, helping to restore confidence and happiness and keeping the children from being forced into the problems and insecurity of broken homes. In divorce matters, it has been his practice to make the welfare of the children his first concern. Ministers in particular are well acquainted with his effective work as a counselor in family problems.

In the area of juvenile delinquency, Judge Jones has shown a deep concern and understanding of problems and causes. He has spent much time after office hours and on Saturdays in visiting and counseling delinquents who have been paroled. His patience and understanding, and his reluctance to place children in institutions if local assistance and help can be provided, have enabled him to influence many children to change their attitudes toward home and become good students in school.

The deep concern and temperamental qualities of Oscar Jones for the judgeship which he holds are well known to those who have had matters before his court. A highly regarded and well-respected member of the bar and judiciary, he is recognized for his able decisions and often complimented by attorneys for his honesty and sincerity in rendering fair decisions.

While serving as judge, he has not neglected his citizenship responsibilities. He has been president of the Longview Civitan Club, Americanism chairman of the American Legion, local and State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, member of the chamber of commerce, the Methodist church, and active in other civic and patriotic service to his community.

Before his appointment to the court and subsequent election by the people, Jones served as criminal district attorney of Gregg County. He is a veteran of World War II and the Korean war, a retired Army reservist, a husband and father. His character and reputation are unquestioned. His honesty and integrity are above reproach.

Judge Jones is due public recognition for a high quality of citizenship and we commend him for giving an unusual measure of human understanding along with judicial wisdom in his service as judge of the domestic relations court and the juvenile court of Gregg County. Such able and dedicated service earns the public appreciation and respect which has been accorded him, for it brings honor to our country.

Wheat Surplus Could Melt Fast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, there appeared an excellent article, written by Roderick Turnbull, the Kansas City Star's agricultural editor, in the February 13, 1966, edition of the Star. Mr. Turnbull is a recognized authority in the field of agriculture and is widely respected as a top agricultural editor. His article "Wheat Surplus Could Melt Fast," is particularly timely since the House Committee on Agriculture is now holding hearings on Public Law 480, popularly referred to as the food-for-peace program. Mr. Turnbull's article clearly illustrates that we are moving from surpluses to scarcities.

I believe the Members of Congress from agricultural areas, and others who regularly read the RECORD, will agree that this article accurately and timely describes the situation.

WHEAT SURPLUS COULD MELT FAST

It didn't happen overnight, but just last week it became apparent that many analysts in the grain trade have come to the conclusion the wheat carryover July 1 this year could be down to only 600 million bushels, or possibly below.

All fall and winter, grainmen have been talking about the big exports of all kinds of grain, including wheat, and there has been speculation that the carryover (surplus) would be much less than the Government had predicted after harvest in 1965.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, as late as last November, was estimating that the wheat carryover this year would be down about 70 million bushels from last year. Last year, the carryover was 819 million bushels, so with the predicted drop the total would be around 750 million this year.

Various members of the trade had been speculating that the carryover would be less than 700 million bushels and some even went so far as to say it could drop to a level of 625 million.

Now, with the big rush shipments to India and other Public Law 480 sales, plus a good dollar business, members of the trade are talking about the 600 million bushel carryover. They're hedging their estimates with some ifs and ands, but just the same that figure is being put forth seriously.

Usually, too, the grainmen contend they are reflecting opinions held in Washington that concern is developing over a worldwide wheat shortage. The United States doesn't have a shortage, but, when the rest of the world needs more wheat, the only place now to get it is the United States. Thus the indicated drawdown on U.S. supplies.

H. Hentz & Co., Chicago, in a market letter commenting on prospective exports the remainder of this marketing year, said, "It might be that record U.S. exports can be achieved in the current season and privately some theorize that our carryover might be below 600 million bushels, and, with equally large clearances next season, down to perhaps 400 to 500 million bushels or less (in 1967)."

"As a result," Hentz' letter (formerly the Uhlmann letter) continued, "A long-range solution is being discussed in Washington, and the 1966 acreage might have to be increased by as much as 10 percent."

Francis I. du Pont & Co., Kansas City office, also comments in its letters on the concern over a world wheat shortage. It refers to the wheat conditions in Western Europe.

Surveys have shown that plantings of wheat in principal nations of Western Europe are down 20 to 25 percent from last year because of early severe winter weather. It is possible to plant spring wheat in Western Europe, thus a good crop still has not been ruled out definitely. But a winter crop in good condition would hold more promise than a spring crop yet to be seeded.

The current condition of the European crop is something that could not be assessed last fall or late summer. It illustrates how things can change to affect market values.

The Australian harvest is completed and production is estimated at 255 million bushels as compared to 370 million bushels a year ago. Reports from that country are that only 155 million bushels are available for export, compared to almost twice that much the previous year.

Argentina is gathering a crop now estimated at 5.6 million tons compared to 10 million tons the year before. Argentina already has made big commitments, principally to China and Brazil, which will take almost all that it can export.

The drought in India apparently is even worse than was reported only a few weeks ago. The Indian Government is estimating its grain shortage at about 19 million tons.

President Johnson has just promised to rush to India as fast as possible 2 million tons of wheat (74,800,000 bushels) and 1 million tons of milo (40 million bushels). A USDA team that recently returned from India reported Indian ports now could handle in excess of 1 million tons a month, which is somewhat more than the grain trade had been thinking. The ports will have to handle this much if, as President Johnson hopes, the recently promised wheat and milo are delivered in the next 3 months.

In addition to the sales to India and other countries that are continuing to get their quotas of Public Law 480 wheat, dollar sales are high because of prosperity in Western Europe and Japan.

Just last Tuesday, export subsidies were approved for sales totaling 3,750,000 bushels to such countries as the Netherlands, Great Britain, Belgium, France, Spain, and Japan.

When all these things are added together—the drought and great demand from India, the relatively poor prospects in Western Europe, plus a heavy demand in the same area, poor crops in Argentina and Australia, and the war in Vietnam—it is found that a new situation has been created, one that hardly could have been visualized a year or two ago.

The wheat picture has been changed drastically. It does become entirely possible, as many in the grain trade are contending, that exports this year (up to July 1) actually may reach 950 million bushels. The previous record was 1964 at 850 million when the big sales were made to Russia.

At the Kansas City Board of Trade no doubt exists on the speeded-up exports, but there is wonder on how all this grain will be moved to ports in view of the boxcar shortage.

Part of this concern over transportation springs from another big change in the wheat situation. For many years, the surplus has been primarily in the winter wheat area. This is where the big shipments of Public Law 480 wheat have originated. This is the Kansas City trade territory area.

But now these stocks are dwindling while relatively the spring wheat stocks are heavy. December 31, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation, Government grain handling agency, owned 413,400,000 bushels of Hard Red Winter wheat and 152,500,000 bushels of Hard Spring wheat. December 31, 1965, the CCC owned 240 million bushels of Hard Winter and 142,500,000 of Hard Spring.

Obviously, if the United States is to fulfill commitments promised on wheat it is going to have to draw from its spring wheat stocks. This means wheat will have to be moved out of the Dakotas and the Minneapolis area. Until water navigation opens in the spring, on both the lakes and the Mississippi, the transportation will have to be rail.

The CCC for several weeks has been moving spring wheat to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. But a lot more will be needed to meet all orders. The same is true for shipments out of the Kansas City area to the gulf.

Government and grainmen alike will agree that it is going to tax transportation facilities to the limit to get this grain to port for export. And there'll be another crop coming on in about 4 months.

Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives stands bereft of one of its stalwarts and all of the colleagues of Albert Thomas are immeasurably saddened by his passing.

Albert Thomas distinguished himself as an able and conscientious legislator and the American taxpayer is in his debt because of his wise and prudent scanning of appropriations. We recognised his outstanding leadership in the field of governmental economics, but our hearts yearn for him today and we mourn his absence, largely because of his charm and sweetness of character.

Albert Thomas was a kindly man and his ever-present smile, even when his body was racked with pain, left an indelible mark on all our hearts. All of us are a bit better for having known him, and we shall keep his memory forever green. May Almighty God bring rest to his gentle soul.

Mrs. Dague joins with me in extending our heartfelt condolences to his sorrowing family, and it is our prayerful hope that they may be given added strength as they travel through the dark valley.

The Best Kind of Poverty War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the February 14, 1966, issue of the Los Angeles Times.

The editorial urges that serious consideration be given to the proposed legislation to grant tax credits to employers to develop programs to train poor and unskilled workers.

The Los Angeles Times, which has spoken in favor of this legislation editorially previously, states it considers this the best kind of war on poverty.

THE BEST KIND OF POVERTY WAR

This Nation faces a paradoxical situation, intensified by the escalation in Vietnam, in which many thousands of jobs are going begging at the same time that 2.9 million Americans are out of work.

The trouble is that few of the unemployed, particularly those in the poverty community, have the education or skills required for the kinds of jobs that are open in Los Angeles and other industrial areas. Some undoubtedly are unemployable.

Surely, though, there will never be a better opportunity to bridge the gap through job training—to draw into the labor force men who are passed over by employers in more normal times.

The Federal Government is doing much in this area already, but Congress should give urgent attention to whether enough is being done to encourage businessmen to hire and train workers with low or nonexistent job skills.

Without special incentives, private industry will continue to bypass the hard core of unemployed in favor of other, less marginal sources of additional labor.

Employers, for example, will increase the overtime worked by their existing labor forces, and encourage their workers to postpone scheduled retirement.

Rosy the Riveter is expected to make a comeback as industry turns to easily trainable women.

It is unfortunate that a higher priority does not go to hiring and training unskilled Negroes and other members of the poverty community. But this will not happen unless the businessman is given a dollar-and-cents incentive.

Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Federal Government is subsidizing the training or upgrading of 275,000 men and women this year.

Most of this training has been offered in schools and institutions.

However, experience shows it is cheaper and more effective to subsidize on-the-job training by employers who then have a vested interest in hiring the trainee permanently. As a result, Washington is moving now to emphasize this approach.

There are budgetary limitations, however.

Serious consideration should be given to the proposal by a large group of House Republicans to offer a tax credit to employers who develop programs to train poor and unskilled workers.

The lost revenue would be more than made up to the extent that welfare recipients were turned into working taxpayers.

This is the best kind of war on poverty.

War's Curse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Nadas Rastenis was born in Lithuania, January 4, 1891. In his boyhood he attended grade school only 7 weeks. His father became ill when he was 12 years of age so he became a farmer and worked his father's small farm.

In 1911 he came to the United States, settled in Manchester, N.H., and worked as a weaver in cotton mills. In 1914 he moved to Massachusetts, working on a farm and in shops and factories in Cambridge and Boston.

From May 27, 1918, to September 5, 1919, Mr. Rastenis served in the U.S. Army, was with Expeditionary Forces in France and was wounded. When discharged from service as a disabled veteran, he applied for permission to study law, but his application was rejected, because the Veterans' Bureau in Boston was of the opinion that since he had had but 7 weeks of schooling, it would take him some 15 years of schoolwork to become a lawyer. But in view of his persistence, he was admitted to study law and in 4 years and 5 months he had completed all required studies and graduated from Boston University School of Law receiving an LL.B. degree in June of 1924.

In the spring of 1925 Mr. Rastenis was admitted to the Maryland bar. In 1942 he was elected to the House of Delegates of Maryland and served for 4 years. During World War II, he served as an appeal agent for draft board No. 15 in Baltimore.

Who's Who for 1962–63 contains the following information:

Rastenis, Nadas, lawyer, poet, translator; born Lithuania, January 4, 1891; came to United States 1911, naturalized, 1918; son of Antanes and Domicele (Jursenas) R.; LL.B., Boston University, 1924; married Julia M. Baltrukonis, June 18, 1927. Admitted to Maryland bar, 1925, Ohio bar, 1935; practiced in Baltimore 1925–36. Cleveland 1935–36. Member Maryland House of Delegates, 1942–46. Director World Poetry Day. Served with U.S. Army, 1918–19. Member

Lithuanian Writers' Association American Legion, Bar Association of Baltimore Democrat. Author; numerous poems in English, Lithuanian, translator classic and other poems, folksongs from Lithuanian into English; works from English into Lithuanian including Venus and Adonis (Shakespeare), "Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam" (Fitzgerald), "The Raven" (Poe), others; from Russian into English, "White Night, Parting" (Boris Pasternak). Address: 818 Hollins Street, Baltimore.

When Hitler invaded Poland in 1939, Mr. Rastenis heard a Harvard professor in Cambridge condemning wars and wishing that someone would write a poem condemning wars like Edwin Markham condemned exploitation of labor in his poem, "The Man With the Hoe."

Thereupon Rastenis undertook the challenge and composed the following poem entitled "War's Curse":

War's Curse

(By Nadas Rastenis)

O lucky stars, O lucky suns.
So far from raging men and guns,
Unmarred by mad humanity
And civilized insanity.
When Mother Earth is strewn with dead,
When fields and seas are dipped in red,
When blind men other blind men kill—
Yon suns and stars are bright and still.
Because of greed and rivalry,
This Globe is but a Calvary.

O lucky suns, O lucky stars,
Untarnished by the bloody curse.
Not even the mistreated Mars
Takes any part in shaping wars.
Of all the comets whirling by,
The planets sailing through the sky,
The stars uncounted in the blue—
None ever wear a crimson hue.
The Earth alone, whereon man reigns,
Is doomed to bear the bloody stains.

From the gray dawn of human race,
In brother's blood man bathes his face.
Though Moses' voice, enfeebled, shrill,
Did cry to man, "Thou shalt not kill."
And yet, before his echo died,
The Nazarene was crucified.
And through the ages, old and new,
This Earth was drenched with crimson dew.
Withal his trained and seasoned brain,
Man still is but a ruthless Cain.

O Heavens blue, O Heavens high,
Are men sent here to slay and die?
When countless millions millions kill,
Why the Blue Heights are calm and still?
What recompense and what reward
Will get the men who die of sword?
What punishment and what regret
The authors of mad wars will get?
How will be balanced judgment's scale?
Who will go down, who will prevail?

No matter what deep punishment
For the mad lords of war is meant,
For crimson crime and bloody bluff—
All Hell will not be hot enough,
Nor the infernal wrath and din
Will ever punish their base sin.
No Demon ever will invent
For them befitting punishment
For all the murderous afright
Brought by the war, their mad delight.

What of the manhood maimed and crushed?
What of the childhood torn and hushed?
What of the aged, weak, and ill,
That bombs destroy and bullets kill?
What of the fields that give the grain,
Drenched by undrying crimson rain?
The meadows, where the flowers smile,
Upturned by guns, mile after mile?
The mighty forests laid to ground,
And all the fiendish deeds around?
What of the bridges, ships, and docks,
Sent down to Neptune's silent locks;
Vast cities, towns, and hamlets bright,
Turned into shambles over night;
The seats of learning put to smoke,
Great museums ruined with a stroke;
The libraries of volumes rare
Obliterated, set aglare;
And all the fruits of hand and brain
Reduced to nothingness again?

What of the things that wise and great
Men through the ages did create:
The works of art, the books of verse,
The theses on the universe;
What of the dreams, distorted, torn—
Lives and ideals destroyed unborn:
Lofty ideas and lucid themes
Hushed by infernal blows and screams—
Great deeds undone, wise sages slain
And all for nought, and all in vain.

What of the countless lives destroyed,
The fields and homes made bare and void;
What of the children, women, men,
Who will not work or walk again;
Who will be crippled, deaf, mute, blind,
With murdered souls, bereft of mind:
Like creeping shadows, raging mad—
Though living, yet as good as dead—
Without hope, vision, or repose,
Bearing war's curse, till lips will close.

What of the tears and bleeding hearts
Of mothers, sisters, and sweethearts;
Of mental wounds that never heal,
And all the hideous ordeal:
Blood on the fields, blood on the seas,
Minutes like mad eternities—
Torture of soul, twisting of brain,
Grief, want, starvation, mortal pain—
And all the blows of bomb and shell,
That make this world a living hell.

And what about the other side—
The things divine and sanctified?
The temples and cathedrals, built
Of marble rare, with spirals gilt,
With altars high and chiming bells—
Wherein the man his troubles tells;
Where candles shower hopeful rays,
Where a worn mortal rests and prays:
A single missile from the air—
The sanctuary is not there.

Then think about the sacred soil,
Where men, who ended their life's toil,
Out of the way, imbedded deep,
Repose in sweet eternal sleep—
Relieved of daily stress and strain,
Immune to hunger, want, and pain,
And all the earthly misery:
Forever good, forever free.
A blast of bomb, a deadly sound—
The human bones strewn all around.

If sipping wine and tasting gin
Is a soul-tainting vile and sin;
If a misdeed, a lack of care,
Is punishable here and there:
Then it should be extremely hard
To find an everfitting yard,
As well as unvarying scale,
To weigh and measure in detail
Each dreadful deed, each mortal mar,
Of each atrocious lord of war.
But the eternal judgment day
Is unannounced and far away.
And, what is worse, year after year,
The war lords seem to have less fear
Of what will happen to them all,
When Gabriel will blast the call,
Some somber and unwelcome morn,
On his soul-terrifying horn—
When seas will boil and hills will quake—
Such fear the war lords lightly take.

'Tis but the millions of the meek
That with great awe await and speak
Of long predestined judgment day,
When ev'ry culprit will repay
His lifelong unabated debts,
By floating in red silhouettes;
And ev'ry just one, at the feet
Of the All-Wise will take his seat,
And while awaiting for the call,
The millions do not stir at all.

Long centuries men watch the sky,
Long centuries men slay and die;
Long centuries men pray and nod,
Long centuries men spill the blood.
Pharaohs, Kings, Caesars, Emperors,
Begilded chiefs of horrid wars,
Each came and painted this earth red,
And went to sleep in bloody bed;
Now the dictators slay and kill,
And paint this planet redder still.

That life is precious, men of wit—
Sage, saint, and scientist—do admit;
That hell is war and war is hell,
All men and women know too well.
And yet they let the senseless curs
To drag the nations into wars,
Themselves remaining meek and mute,
Performing angular salute;
Then, when the morons spill the blood,
The silly mortals blame good God.

For man's own paltry guilt and shame,
Why lay to God the truthless blame?
For man's own definite neglect,
Why charge the heaven's Intellect?
'Tis true, the warlords gravely sin,
By drawing wine of human skin;
But those that such outrage permit,
Are likewise culpable for it;
Therefore each side should taste and smell
The fury of the flaming hell.

When men of learning and of sense
Let the marauders to advance,
To take the mastry and lead
Of nations, and permit to bleed
Vast continents and foaming seas—
Then answer, answer, if you please,
Who is to blame, who is at fault,
For bloody soil and crimson salt:
Just those who cause the sanguine fry,
Or even those that slay and die?

For brutal brawls and wicked wars,
All men are blamable, of course.
No king, no ruler, ever could
Disrupt the tranquil brotherhood
Of men and nations on this Sphere,
If mortals, honest and sincere—
The men who think, the men who slave,
Would rise united, peaceful, brave,
And damn the fratricidal spell—
Send the warmakers straight to Hell.

Please, answer, answer, if you can:
Why should sane men kill blameless men
And guiltless women, young and old,
For neither a revenge nor gold—
Destroy goods, property, and wealth,
Corrupt lives, morals, habits, health
Of countless millions, without cause—
And gather medals and applause
Of foolish men, and then creep lame,
Under a crushing load of shame?

And what's a shame, it is a sin,
It mars the face and hurts within.
The gory actors of mad wars
Forever bear the ugly scars
Of crippled bodies, souls upset,
With horrid pain and deep regret
That never cease and never fade,
And seldom variate in shade—
Forever painting woes of war,
Till the dimmed eyes can see no more.

For when the war's mad echoes die,
And the long years drag slowly by—
When the pale twilight spins around,
And the life's dreams sink to the ground:
How gruesome then it is to see
The endless march, the swaying sea,
Of men and women, maimed and killed,
Of precious blood insanely spilled:
Forever moving to and fro,
Forever staging selfsame show.

Roaring of planes, thunder of guns:
Mowing of men—fathers and sons;
Killing of wives, mothers, and babes;
Fire, ruin, and death, sweeping in waves:
Fingerless hands, bodiless heads—
Bodies, arms, limbs, reduced to shreds;
Veins slashed, skulls bent, bones blown to bits:
Gassed, shell-shocked maniacs, nitwits—
Bodies and limbs, water and mud,
Painted in red, in human blood.

Day after day, night after night,
The same bane show, the same mad fright:
Languish of hurt, horrors of dead,
Follow awake, surround in bed;
Wailing of wives, screaming of tots—
Distorted dreams by bloody blots;
Wounds, pains, moans, curses, prayers, tears,
Dull fading eyes, irk weary ears—
Drag the lone beings down the hill,
Until the heart grows cold and still.

Besides the lives ruined, damaged, lost,
Think of the war's enormous cost.
Its chest is ever bottomless—
The more 'tis stuffed, the more there's less.
Into its depth, in endless flow.
Billions do come, billions do go;
Fly like the wind-winged desert dust,
Never creating worth or trust;
Never producing any good
For human need or brotherhood.

Yes; through the ages long and sad,
Pharaohs, Kings, Caesars, Emp'rors mad,
And now dictators, blind and vain,
Have caused and cause the grief and pain,
Squandering wealth of multitude
Of men and nations, stripping nude
Young, old, and weak of the last thread,
And robbing them of daily bread,
Snatching their last coin—evermore
Striving to please the god of war.

War is the felon's gory axe.
War is the cause of endless tax:
Tax for defense, tax for offense;
Tax ages old, tax in advance.
Tax on amusement, raiment, food;
Tax on tobacco, oil, and wood;
Tax on umbrella, coat, and hat;
Tax, tax on this, tax, tax on that;
Tax, tax, and tax, on bread and wine—
Tax, tax, and tax, tax, down the line.

War is the source of deep regrets.
War is the curse of stringing debts.
Debts of this war, debts of that war;
Debts of the war that came before.
Debts of the wars centuries old,
Debts in uncounted tons of gold;
Debts since the Joshua's distant days—
Debts the taxpayer pays and pays;
Debts that are murderously made,
And in the end remain unpaid.

Think if the gold and credit was
Applied to a constructive cause;
If human sinews, brain and breath,
And lives that met untimely death,
Were used for a productive end—
This world would be serene and grand;
Unscarred by missile, bomb and shell,
Unmarred by bloody work of hell—
No mother would have suffered pain,
No son would've lost his life in vain.

Each swamp, each marsh today would be
A pasture green, a flowered lea;
The rugged roads and curving ways,
Would be smooth, straight and wide highways;
Millions of bridges, dipped in gold,
Would span the winding rivers old;
Eternal deserts, wide and bare,
Covered with green would skyward stare;
And where the murdered soldiers lay,
The fields of rye and wheat would sway.

In place of shabby sheds and shacks,
By filthy docks and railroad tracks,
And tenements by dingy shops,
Houses of glass with gilded tops,
And marble halls for township schools—
Gymnasiums, and swimming pools,
Health clinics, libraries, playgrounds,
And museums—within the bounds
Of each community would rise,
Before the citizens' glad eyes.

No child would cry for lack of milk;
Mothers could wear lace, satin, silk;
Afflicted, weary, weak, and poor,
Would not beg alms from door to door;
Men, women, working for a wage,
Would need not fear of doleful age;
They would be certain that they will
Have their own cottage on a hill;
And, there, among the shrubs and trees,
Would end their twilight days in ease.

Poisonous reptiles, rodents sleek,
Mosquitoes with infecting beak,
Dangerous bugs, flys, insects, gnats,
Black widows with alluring nets,
And deadly germs that cause disease,
Would disappear, forever cease;
And for each pain and malady,
A proper treatment there would be.
Men would be happy, unafraid;
No one would die for lack of aid.

No one would grumble or complain.
Folk would be healthy, safe, and sane.
All people would be dressed and fed,
No one would starve for lack of bread;
Men would be versed in art and lore;
Roses would bloom at ev'ry door,
By ev'ry window, path, and fence;
Children would gaily sing and dance;
Men would refrain from doing wrong—
The life would be a happy song.

O ye, good people of all lands,
Extend outstretched fraternal hands.
Ye, who are peaceful, sane and sound,
Why keep adrenched the gory ground
With brother's blood and blood of yours?
Stop, stop that damned eternal curse—
The curse of gods, the curse of men.
That all-destroying hurricane,
Which ends no grudge, and rights no wrong,
And brings but death and ruin along.

Men, kill the wars that maim and kill—
Hang the dictators, if you will.
Yes; do away with the hell's greed,
Which propagates the root and seed
Of brown and black hypocrisy,
And of red dreadful leprosy;
And then, in freedom's holy name,
Lift up democracy's bright flame:
And keep it there, and keep it high,
So that men will not slay or die.

Ah, the democracy—some state—
Is much too slow and out of date.
Yes; it is not a perfect plan;
Yet; under it enlightened men
Find more true happiness each day,
Than under any other sway.
For under true democracy,
All men are equal, safe and free;
And the freemen forevermore
Leave for the light an open door.

Under the democratic rule
Life is much more secure and full:
Each person may go his own way,
May undertake, do, think, and say,
As he may please, as he may care—
So long as he does not impair
The other fellow's self-same rights—
He is the highest on the heights;
No one may harry him or jeer:
He is the citizen and peer.

And yet some mortals even now
In certain lands leave scythe and plough,
Desk, shop, and mill, ladle, and gage,
Bench, and machine, and go to wage
A most inhuman bloody broil,
That moves the lives, ruins homes and soil—
They fight the free democracies,
Nearby and far across the seas;
They propagate debauchery,
They cast the chains of slavery.
The slavery, brown, red, and black,
The system that will bend the back
Of lands and nations vast and old,
With stress and servitude untold;
The order of the meanest kind,
Where men will be mute, deaf, and blind;
Where free expression, deed, or word,
Is never to be known or heard;
Where light will fade with candle's flame,
Where life will be a sorry game.

Ah, in the past, great men with pride
For Liberty and Freedom died.
But now, o Silent Universe,
Men fight and die for the reverse.
Some still do battle and defend
The liberty, the home, the land;
Yet others, filled with greed or fright,
Keep saying, "Let's you and he fight."—
Entrust their future to the Fate,
Then comes the end—it is too late.

War is man's most destructive curse;
Mad as it is, it still grows worse.
So, if 'twas ever worth to fight,
Now 'tis the time to show the might
Of men and women, sound and sane,
Who are determined to remain
Unburdened, unoppressed, and free—
To rise like an unharnessed sea,
To deal the fiends a mortal blow:
To send them where the hot flames glow.

Then, from each roof and mountain top,
Good men must preach and never stop
Apreaching to their fellow-men,
That they will need not fight again,
If they damn the dictatorships—
Their chains, their guillotines, their whips—
Then under sweet democracy
They will be happy, safe and free:
The nations then will heal their scars—
Then there will be no future wars.

For, with the tyrants done away,
This world will greet a joyful day—
The day for which long centuries
Men hoped for, praying on their knees,
Moisting the soil with burning tears—
Bending their heads, stretching their ears,
To hear the answer, which would bring
An end to all the suffering
Of men and women from the war;
Such answer has not come so far:

The day that will indeed extend
The Light and Freedom to each land;
For on that day there will be heard
The answer, in a single word;
That word, so welcome and so dear
To ev'ry mortal's heart and ear,
Will be outspoken by the grace
Of gods and written on the face
Of the glad earth in letters these—
Proclaiming and inscribing—peace.

The Peace, the everlasting peace,
Which will forevermore release
Each continent and commonweal
From the war's dastardly ordeal;
The peace, which thenceforth will permit
The men of the unwarlike wit
To make this earth a garden green,
Safe from the parasites unclean,
And let the women to adorn
It with a rose without a thorn.

The garden green, wherein each man
May reap the earth's fruit, as he can,
And scan the smiling heaven's glow
For his own good, as he may know;
Where men and women, hand in hand,
In each community and land,
And on each large and tiny isle,
Will live in peace, will toil and smile,
Dream, speak, learn, travel, and convene,
With happy hearts and mind serene.

For then the mankind will be free.
The war will be a memory,
A dark night's terrifying dream,
Of man's mad dash and rage extreme;
Then each dictator will be known
As the crazed show's inhuman clown.
Men in the museums will see

The murderous artillery,
The shells and bombs that kill and blast,
As the base relics of the past.

For the fulfillment of that task,
The very earth and Heaven ask—
The war-torn continents entreat,
And the raped lands and states repeat—
That the heart-rending plea and cry
Of the brave men, who slave and die
For the war's end and freedom's sake,
Should find each human soul awake.
And ready to erase the dread
Of the dictators, brown and red.

Men of all lands, men of the deeds,
Forget your politics and creeds.
The mankind dies, the mankind bleeds—
The mankind for your rescue pleads.
Arise united and avow
To slay the Axis dragon now.
For if you falter, swerve, and fail—
Your life will be a sorry tale;
A tale of cowardice and shame,
Unworthy of a freeman's name.

And all the morrows will impart,
That you have failed to do your part.
But if you'll step forth in accord,
Unsheathe the freedom's mighty sword,
And without waiting, on the spot,
Will cut the bloody gordian knot—
And, thus, forever end the curse
Of all the massacres and wars—
Then in the days to come all men
Will bless you evermore. Amen.

Baltimore, Md., *May 30, 1941.*

Wise Words on Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it has long been the favorite of uninformed critics to attack the presence of the so-called corrupt politicians in government and in Congress. Many mothers want their sons to be President—but they do not want them to become politicians in order to reach that lofty position.

I have always been amused—and sometimes disturbed—by this concept of "dirty" politics and politicians. There are a few bad apples in every barrel—someone once said—but I feel that very few, if any, of these "bad apples" have ever found their way to a seat in this august body.

For the benefit of my distinguished colleagues, whom I think are all "good apples," I would like to insert in the Record the following article from the Shenandoah Weekly Times which is concerned with our chosen profession—politics.

Wise Words on Politics by William Allen White

There is much scandalous talk by scantily informed people about the corruption of politics. The truth of the matter is: That politicians are about as honest in their business as storekeepers are in their business, or lawyers are in their business or bankers or preachers, or day-laborers, or farmers, or college professors, are in their own calling.

Of course, politicians are not so honest as lawyers imagine they would be if they were preachers; nor as preachers fancy they would be if they were storekeepers; nor as storekeepers believe they would be as lawyers. But, in the main, the business or professional man has no reason to despise the politician. For the politician does not lie unless he is forced to by another man's duplicity (which is the standard in other vocations). He does not take bribes except in ignorance—as the businessmen and the farmer and the preacher do every day of their lives. And the politician, above all, does not admire the cheat and the deceiver. The political ideals of the average ward-caucus are as high as the ideals in most other gatherings.

The brave man, who wins by raw courage and shrewd directness and simple honesty, is honored as sincerely and is as successful in politics today as he is in any other branch of human endeavor, however exalted its criterion. The county convention of Douglas County, Kans., or of Kings County, N.Y., is operated on a moral plane about as high as the faculty politics of the average university, or as that of the church politics of the various religious organizations.

In the business of politics we are all partners. The concern reflects the American average. The man who does not participate in the partnership—who refuses to vote—merely drags down the average for an honest Negro or an active Polak or a capable Irish emigrant to elevate.

It will be found that the liar fails and the honest man succeeds with about the regularity that liars fail and honest men succeed in life; while the ignorant flounder and the strong man grows weary even as in life. The complaint that they end unhappily may be filed. To which this affiant answereth: Life often ends unhappily. They are intended to be as moral as life—these stories; but no more so; and if they teach anything probably it is what politics and business and physical and intellectual life teach: That it pays to speak the truth, to be brave, to be kind, to be helpful. And further deponent sayeth not.

(Editor's note.—The above was a portion of the preface of the book "Stratagems and Spoils," written in 1901 by William Allen White, later to be known as the "Sage of Emporia." White, the beloved publisher of the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette, was credited with developing the modern journalism creed for the fourth estate's treatment of political matters in the American press. We thought you would enjoy some of Editor White's wisdom in this election year.)

National Community Senior Citizens Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for a National Community Senior Citizens Corps.

The bill would authorize grants to States which establish part-time employment programs for senior citizens over the age of 60 in projects of value to the community. Small salaries of up to $125 a month could be paid, and these salaries would not interfere with social security benefits. Ideally, most of the participants would be volunteers who would need only out-of-pocket expenses.

I can think of a million things that our senior citizens can do to brighten the lives of the people of their communities. They can work in handicraft centers, in hospitals, day-care centers, career-counseling centers, and other places where they would supplement and not displace regular members of the work force.

Just as important as the aid that would be rendered to others is the self-respect and sense of accomplishment that participation in this program would give our senior citizens. Perhaps this is really the most important aspect of this legislation. It would be a program of Federal investment in the age-old tradition of human self-respect.

Horton Marks 220th Birthday of Thaddeus Kosciuszko—Universal Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, February 12 marked the 220th anniversary of the birth of a man who stands in the foremost ranks of great patriots—Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Polish statesman and soldier. His valor on the field of battle, his courage in the face of tyranny, and his struggle for the national independence of Poland are as relevant to the 20th century as in the age of George Washington and Napoleon Bonaparte.

The struggles of the valiant American colonists against the British fired the imagination of Kosciuszko, and in 1776 he left Poland for the American Continent. While awaiting the decision of the Board of War upon his application, he found work at Philadelphia in the construction of fortifications against the expected attack across the Delaware. His expert service gained him his commission from Congress on October 18, 1776, as an engineer in the Continental service. His military career in the service of American independence was a brilliantly distinguished one. In recognition of his merit Gen. George Washington promoted Kosciuszko to the rank of colonel of artillery and made him his adjutant.

In 1783 a grateful and proud United States of America rewarded the Polish patriot for his 6 years of service and devotion to the cause of American independence by extending to him the thanks of Congress, the privilege of American citizenship, and the rank of brigadier general.

America was freed of foreign oppression, but beloved Poland, his homeland, still languished in the grip of tyranny. Thus did Kosciuszko hasten to his country, and following the proclamation of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, took a leading part in the ensuing campaigns against Russia. When the King, Stanislas II, accepted the second partition of Poland, Kosciuszko and many other Polish generals gave up their commissions and hastened to Leipzig, which soon became the center of Polish emigration.

The Polish insurgents invited General Kosciuszko to head the rebellion against Russia and offered him command of the Polish national armies. With the news of the insurrection and Russian determination to crush it, he hastened to Cracow, where he summoned his people to arm and proclaimed new decrees in favor of the peasants.

The Polish patriots led by Kosciuszko defeated the Russians at Raclawice and ably defended Warsaw but were at last overcome by the superior numbers of the enemy. On October 10, 1794, the gallant Polish force of 7,000 was almost annihilated by a Russian force over twice as large. General Kosciuszko's valor and heroism in this battle were unsurpassed. Three horses were killed under him as he rode again and again into the thickest of the battle. Finally, seriously wounded and insensible, the heroic general was taken prisoner. As the poet, Campbell, has written, "Freedom shrieked when Kosciuszko fell."

Freed by the Russians 2 years later, the Polish patriot traveled to the United States for a brief period and then returned to Europe where until his death in 1817 he continued his unceasing efforts for the liberation of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, Americans and Poles alike revere the memory of General Kosciuszko for his service to the independence of our countries. His name is synonymous with one of the noblest causes of all—freedom. His heroism transcends dimensions of time and manmade national boundaries. He is the universal patriot, and to him we pay tribute and from him we gain inspiration and strength for our own hard fight for freedom.

Hanoi's Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Ambassador Goldberg stated the case succinctly when he said:

> The United States is not responsible for resuming the bombing. President Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam is responsible.

Commenting on this, the Detroit News said:

> Ambassador Goldberg laid the blame where it should lie. His temperate and reasoned justification for the indictment won't satisfy the scattered spectrum of vociferous critics, particularly at home, because hard facts will never satisfy them.

In his efforts for peace, the editorial points out President Johnson "halted the bombing unconditionally, sent 6 special envoys to 34 capitals, contacted more than 115 governments, even directly approached the aggressor, North Vietnam."

It adds:

> The Reds were asked to show only an inkling of willingness for a negotiated settlement so that the guns could be silenced at least temporarily in Asia.

For anyone who wishes the facts, he may read this editorial and get them. Because I thought it a lucid examination of this matter which so vitally concerns us all, I offer it to the RECORD for publication.

GOLDBERG TAKES U.S. CASE TO U.N., BUT HANOI SPURNS PEACE BID

"The United States is not responsible for resuming the bombing. President Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam is responsible."

Thus succinctly U.S. Ambassador Arthur H. Goldberg, appearing before the U.N. Security Council, laid the blame where it should lie. His temperate and reasoned justification for the indictment won't satisfy the scattered spectrum of vociferous critics, particularly at home, because hard facts will never satisfy them.

In their dream world they bleat or whine about the United States being an "international outlaw with blood on its hands"—to quote Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon—and they protest it is wicked to pursue peace and at the same time, in the event that the pursuit fails, to use military power to protect those willing to resist aggression.

These oddly assorted critics were given their chance by President Johnson. He tried it their way. He halted the bombing unconditionally, sent 6 special envoys to 34 capitals, contacted more than 115 governments, even directly approached the aggressor, North Vietnam.

Here was communism's opportunity to prove Mr. Johnson's critics were on sound ground. The Reds were asked to show only an inkling of willingness for a negotiated settlement so that the guns could be silenced at least temporarily in Asia. But what was the outcome?

As Goldberg said: "No letup in war activities on the Communist side. No reduction in infiltration into South Vietnam. No reduction in terror. No reduction in the supply of men or arms during the bombing pause. No willingness to negotiate or even to talk quietly through diplomatic channels with a view to negotiations * * *, absolutely nothing."

Goldberg explained how even before the bomb pause was 1 week old, this Nation directly informed Hanoi of the suspension and advised that if Hanoi reciprocated by making a serious contribution toward peace it would have a favorable effect on further extension of the pause.

For 30 days after that we waited, to no avail. So, back to the bomb racks we had to go.

It was not, however, the end of our pursuit for peace, as Goldberg explained. Recourse to the United Nations opened up "a new dimension" in that drive, with an offer to both North and South Vietnam to come before the world's only established peacemaking forum and plead their differing causes.

But that hope apparently has died, too, Hanoi rejecting as invalid any Security Council action to settle the war. More, it wouldn't even agree the United Nations should discuss the matter. And on this stand it was backed in the Security Council by the Soviet Union and that sour apple of the Western alliance, De Gaulle's France.

The short answer to all this is that North Vietnam, the Vietcong, and Red China, that giant skulking in the background, don't mant to talk peace because they don't want peace. Trapped by their own fanaticism about power in the barrel of a gun being the final and only arbiter, they say that if the issue is to be discussed at all, it must be discussed by the 1954 Geneva accord powers and what is discussed there can be on communism's terms alone.

It appears that if the United Nations is to be blackballed and the conference table denied us and our allies, we shall now have to answer aggression in the only language it permits.

The U.S. Tax System and International Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of utmost importance that the United States diligently pursue the possibilities of resolving the many problems of international relationships in the area of taxation.

Significant progress has been made in recent years in the number of agreements effected with other nations and in our tax regulations treating income of U.S. foreign investments and the investments of foreign nationals in this country.

Former Secretary of Treasury Douglas Dillon deserves great credit for initiating many important steps, as does his successor, Henry Fowler, and Assistant Secretary Stanley S. Surrey. Mr. Surrey made a significant contribution to better understanding of this complicated problem in a recent symposium of the Tax Institute of America. Under unanimous consent I insert his remarks in the RECORD:

THE U.S. TAX SYSTEM AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS—CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS, 1965–66

(Remarks by Hon. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, at the Tax Institute of America Symposium, the New York Hilton Hotel, New York, N.Y., Thursday, December 2, 1965)

About a year ago in a paper presented at Montreal before the Tax Executives Institute, I discussed the U.S. Tax System and International Tax Relationships. Since then two income tax protocols, with Belgium and Germany, were signed and have been ratified by the Senate; three treaties with less developed countries, the Philippines, Thailand, and Israel, have been signed and are pending in the Senate; tentative agreements have been reached with the Netherlands and India; and negotiations are actively being pursued with a number of countries, including the United Kingdom, France, Portugal, Honduras, Trinidad, and Tobago, and Taiwan.

Since then important regulations and rulings affecting the international allocation of income have been issued and more are in preparation. A comprehensive bill revising our statutory income tax treatment of foreigners is moving through the Congress.

A consideration of these current developments is now appropriate. I shall divide this consideration into three parts—income tax treaties, both with developed and less developed countries, the administration of U.S. statutory or unilateral treatment of foreign income, and U.S. statutory or unilateral treatment of foreigners. Because of the length of this paper, I have prepared a summary which precedes the paper.

SUMMARY

Income tax treaties

The United States is engaged in an extensive revision of its income tax treaties with developed countries, prompted by the recent changes in the corporated tax systems of the European countries and the adoption in 1963 by the OECD of a model income tax convention. The protocol with Germany ratified recently by the Senate and the tentative protocol with the Netherlands shortly to be signed illustrate much of the pattern that this revision is taking. This pattern provides a widened flexibility to international trade and investment activities between the United States and Europe. The scope of export activities in a treaty country can now be enlarged, for instance, by displays and warehouses for the storage or delivery of goods, without subjecting the exporter to a tax in that country.

Also, in cases where a firm maintains considerable commercial or industrial activity in a treaty country and therefore is taxable there on that activity at regular corporate rates, it can at the same time make investments in that country, or establish licensing relationships, that will remain subject to the lower rates of tax which treaties provide for investment and royalty income. Investors, moreover, will generally be free from tax on capital gains arising in a treaty country. In the important matter of withholding rates on dividends paid to parent companies in one treaty country by their subsidiaries in another treaty country, the United States is in favor of the low OECD model rate of 5 percent, and likewise favors the 15 percent rate on portfolio investment. It also favors the principles that the withholding rates should be nondiscriminatory—in that a country should be willing to offer the same rates to all its treaty partners—and reciprocal—in that a country should not claim higher treaty rates than the rates it desires us to adopt in the treaty.

These concepts cover ground that has been considerably explored in recent years. But the new corporate tax systems present problems less fully mapped. Some of these systems involve integration of the corporate tax with the individual shareholders' taxes on distributed dividends, through credits to these shareholders for the corporate tax. Their structure, by limiting these credits to domestic shareholders in domestic corporations, discriminates against both their domestic shareholders who invest abroad and the shareholders from abroad who invest in their domestic corporations. The OECD convention does not fully meet these problems, and therefore an analytic framework for their solution is needed. Such a framework should be rested, as far as possible, on two basic concepts: first, the concept of long-range neutrality in a country's tax system between those of its investors who invest at home and those who invest abroad; and second, the concept of nondiscrimination in a country's tax system between its investors at home and investors from abroad.

These treaties, under the pressure of negotiating problems and inevitable differences among countries and negotiators, will not always exhibit uniformity in phrasing and arrangement, apart from substantive differences. There is therefore clearly a need to clarify the disuniformity—to state through regulations or otherwise when and to what extent different phrases and different approaches in various treaties, or even the same treaty, really embody differences in end result and are so intended. The United States intends to improve its regulations in response to this need.

The United States is also engaged in an extensive program of negotiations to obtain a network of treaties with less developed countries. We believe that such treaties significantly improve the trade, investments, and cultural relationships between the United States and these countries. Many of the European nations are also engaged in similar efforts. While these new less developed country treaties in many provisions follow those with developed countries, there are quite significant differences arising from the fact that the investment and trade flows from the United States to these countries is generally much larger than the reverse flows. As a consequence, and also in the light of the revenue problems of these countries, the reductions in withholding rates on investment income and royalties in these treaties do not always match those in the developed country treaties. There also is pressure to widen the definition of permanent establishment and thus contract the area of trading activities free from tax in these countries. In addition, since the restrictions on taxation by the source country that do emerge in these treaties bear in a revenue sense more heavily on the less developed countries, such countries seek some provisions on the part of the developed countries that can be regarded as an encouragement to investment in them.

The European nations have responded through provisions reducing the burden of their taxes on income flowing back from these investments, either through an exemption or adoption of tax-sparing credits. The United States, emphasizing instead the encouragement to the investment itself at the time that it is being considered by the U.S. taxpayer, is responding through extending to investment in less developed treaty countries the 7-percent credit now in our law for investment at home. This 7-percent treaty credit extends to investments of cash and tangible property. A complementary provision offers encouragement to the investment of technical assistance, through deferring tax in both countries where intangible assets, such as patents, processes or know-how, are exchanged by a U.S. investor for stock in a corporation in the less developed country.

We believe that extension of the investment credit is appropriate only where the other country is receptive to our investment and where its tax system, taken as a whole and in the light of any modifications made in the treaty, does not involve measures that can be regarded as significantly working at cross-purposes with this investment. This negotiating approach on our part has met with an affirmative response by the less developed countries.

The Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has performed a useful public service in holding full hearings on one of these new treaties, the Thailand Treaty. The published hearings contain a complete technical explanation of the treaty and a description of factors affecting negotiations with less developed countries.

Necessarily, as experience is gained, the present pattern that has so far evolved in our negotiations with less developed countries can be improved. The progress of these negotiations is encouraging, for it indicates that the United States and these countries can reach a treaty arrangement that each regards as fair and conducive to improved investment, trade, and cultural relationships. This attitude and the promise it holds for a growing network of tax treaties represent a major step in our political and economic relationships with these countries.

Administration of U.S. statutory taxation of foreign income—Allocation of income and section 482

The importance of developing a sound administration of the U.S. statutory taxation of foreign income is matched by the formidable nature of the task: The field is relatively new as tax matters go, and the needed experience, analysis of detail, and synthesis of concepts are still in a formative stage; the international business activities to which the rules relate are rapidly expanding in importance and number, and thus the variety of transactions and business relationships involved steadily increases; the tax rules moreover are constantly being buffeted by the shifting exigencies of balance-of-payments problems. But all of this merely underscores the challenge of the task, and the Treasury is seeking to respond in a fitting manner.

The Treasury regards as the matter presently having major priority the establishment of a satisfactory framework for the administration of the rules governing transactions between the domestic and foreign units of our business companies.

In our tax parlance, this centers on the application of section 482 of our code, authorizing the Commissioner to allocate income, deductions, and credits between related units of an enterprise so as to prevent evasion or clearly reflect the income of the various units. The variety and number of transactions in the foreign area that lie within the reach of the section have overstrained the level of technical development that had been achieved in the earlier domestic application of the section. The situation thus calls for a many-faceted implementation of the section so that it may carry the new burden placed on it.

Several steps have already been taken. The first, in revenue procedure 64–54, achieved an orderly treatment of controversies that had arisen for years prior to 1963 by permitting taxpayers to offset—against any increase in U.S. taxes occasioned by an adjustment under this section allocating additional income to the U.S. unit of the enterprise—the foreign taxes paid on the income involved and thus to avoid double taxation. In addition, the revenue procedure stated that the Internal Revenue Service would not pursue for those years adjustments based on applications of section 482 not clearly required by its previous technical development. Through its achievement of an orderly treatment of the pre-1963 years and the consequent very marked reduction in number and dollar amount of deficiencies under the section for those years, this revenue procedure has permitted the needed technical development of the section to proceed in an atmosphere free of acrimonious disputes that would otherwise have existed.

The second step, in revenue procedure 65–17, provides rules governing the transfer of income between foreign subsidiary and U.S. parent intended to reflect an adjustment correcting an understatement of the parent's income, as where it charged too low a price for goods sold to the subsidiary or rendered services to it for an inadequate fee. The principal impact of these rules is to permit broad flexibility in fitting the section 482 adjustment into a proper position within the flow of funds from the foreign subsidiary and its dividend pattern. This removes impediments to the orderly repatriation of funds from the subsidary and makes it possible for the taxpayer to accept the adjustment without increasing the transfer of income from subsidiary to parent more than it considers desirable.

These procedural steps set the stage for the development of appropriate guidelines for the substantive application of section 482. To this end the Treasury has already issued detailed proposed regulations covering transactions where assets or services of a U.S. parent are made available to its foreign subsidiary—where money is lent, where management or other services are rendered, where machinery and other tangible assets are made available. Essentially the approach is to offer taxpayers a safe conduct pass through section 482 through guidelines, based on the costs incurred by the parent and an allocation of those costs to the subsidiary in a manner that follows accepted accounting precedents outside the tax field. The second set of proposed regulations, now in preparation and far more difficult to develop, will contain, the rules applicable to intercompany sales of products and transfers of intangibles, such as patent licenses. These rules will involve the determination of a fair profit for an endless variety of assets that, under the arm's length concept of section 482, are regarded as transferred in a profit-seeking transaction. Both these regulations must then be coordinated with the rules of section 862, requiring an allocation between domestic and foreign source income of expenses not allocable to specific items of gross income.

These regulations relate to the proper formulation of our unilateral rules of allocation with respect to international transactions. But since these are international transactions a unilateral approach by the United States, or any country, is not sufficient. The rules of one country must mesh with those of other countries to avoid double taxation. Also, each country must see both sides of the problem—the rules we regard as proper to allocate income to our parent companies from transactions with their foreign subsidiaries are the rules we must be willing to accept when the subsidiary is here and its parent is a foreign corporation. The United States believes that the OECD Fiscal Committee is the proper body to undertake the task of establishing the allocation standards to guide countries in reaching accommodations with each other, and we are fully assisting the working party which that Committee appointed for this purpose.

Another aspect of the problem is to insure that any agreements reached between governments in particular cases, under present standards or those to be formulated, should be capable of being implemented in full. However, as these cases generally involve a considerable time before agreement is reached on the adjustment, a taxpayer and the countries concerned may find that procedural barriers, such as a statute of limitations on refunds, may make it impossible to implement the adjustment in the country that has overtaxed the income. To avoid this result, the United States believes that treaties should provide that a refund be allowed in accordance with the agreement, despite procedural or other barriers. Such agreements could relate either to the allocation of profits or to the source of an item of income, and in the latter case the implementation should extend to the effect of the agreed source on a foreign tax credit. Other countries appear to agree with this view, and clauses for this purpose are being incorporated in our treaties, as in the German protocol. We regard this result as a significant step toward the goal of achieving a proper framework to meet the problems of international allocation.

U.S. statutory taxation of foreigners

The steady attention focused by the United States in recent years on its balance-of-payments position has resulted in an extensive examination of the U.S. tax treatment of foreigners who invest in the United States. Against the background of the Fowler task force report to the President and Treasury recommendations, the House Committee on Ways and Means has developed a bill, H.R. 11297, now available for comment before being reported to the House in 1966. The bill recognizes that some of the existing provisions of our code have become discriminatory and inequitable to foreign investors and thus involve a barrier to investment in the United States. In correcting this treatment the bill avoids at the other extreme rules that would represent only a desire to attract foreign investment, rules which would be but mere tax inducements to tax concessions.

The bill would, in effect, draw back U.S. source jurisdiction, both under the income tax and the estate and gift taxes, to a more realistic and administratively manageable position. It would also simplify the tax rules we present to the foreigner desiring to invest here. As a consequence, in general the individual foreigner investing in our stocks and securities or real property would find his periodic income from the investment subject only to tax at withholding rates, either at 30 percent or a lower treaty rate, and not to progressive rates. His capital gains would not be taxed.

These results would not be altered by extensive trading in these stocks or securities, even where the trading is conducted by a U.S. broker who has discretion to act for him. His real estate investments would be taxed on a net income basis at regular rates if that is preferable. The foreign investor would also see a far lower scale of U.S. estate tax rates on his U.S. investments. The exemption would start at $30,000 instead of $2,000 as at present, and the top rate would be 25 percent instead of 77 percent. The effective rates would thus be drastically reduced, and would only be 3 percent on a $100,000 U.S. estate, 7 percent for $500,000, 10 percent for $1 million and 18 percent for $5 million.

The corporate investor—or an individual—with a business activity in the United States would find itself taxed at regular rates on any business income and any investment income "effectively connected" with that activity, whether the source of the income is within or without the United States. The United States would thus obtain its proper tax on this type of income.

But any unrelated investment income would be freed from business tax rates and taxed, where its source is in the United States, only at the wtihholding rates we consider appropriate for investment income. A foreign corporation whose stock is owned entirely for foreigners would no longer be subject to personal holding company tax liability. And our "second dividend" tax would only apply to a foreign corporation whose activity is almost solely confined to operating a branch in the United States. These simpler and more logical rules, applied to individual and corporate foreign investors, should in a meangful way remove tax barriers which our present structure now presents.

The approach of the bill closely parallels the pattern now taken in our tax treaty negotiations. The bill, however, would extend these steps to all foreigners promptly and on a unilateral basis. But to preserve the bargaining power and flexibility our negotiators need to obtain through treaties reciprocal concessions from other countries on income our taxpayers derive from abroad, the bill empowers the President to reinstate the former statutory rules. The President can do so with respect to residents of a foreign country when he finds that the foreign country, if requested by the United States, does not modify its taxes to parallel the changes we are making unilateraly. This power of the President can be applied on a selective basis, country by country and tax provision by tax provision, and need be applied only when he finds that it is in the public interest to do so in each case.

Conclusion

Current developments in our international tax relationships underscore the wide range of policy and administrative issues that are under consideration. Indeed, the continued rapid growth in international investment and trade has brought with it a multitude of varied tax problems that press beyond our present framework of concepts and analysis. Intensive legal and economic thought is required to develop that framework into one adequate to the task—a framework that embodies a coherent logic capable of expansion to meet new patterns and relationships. In one sense this is a truly formidable task, since each of the countries of the world can claim a voice in the effort. But the ingenuity and insight promised by this host of architects should be viewed as welcome assets. The task for the United States is to see that in this international effort we play a role fitting to our position. We can do so if all of us with a stake in the outcome—the Government and its officials, our taxpayers with international activities and their advisers, our universities and research institutions and their scholars—work cooperatively in shaping our contribution.

I. INCOME TAX TREATIES

The United States is continuing to maintain an active schedule of treaty negotiations, along with its participation in the deliberations of the OECD Fiscal Committee. The treaty negotiations cover a variety of issues, and extend both to developed and less developed countries.

Developed countries

The United States now has a full complement of income tax treaties with the European Common Market countries, and indeed with most of the developed countries. Spain and Portugal remain as the principal exceptions, and arrangements for negotiations with these countries are underway.

But the treaty process in the tax field is an ever changing one, so that we and our treaty partners of the developed world find ourselves engaged in a wide-ranging revision of the existing arrangements. The principal factors behind this reexamination have been the recent changes in the corporate tax systems of the European countries and the adoption in 1963 by the OECD of a Model Income Tax Convention. The United States recently concluded protocols with Belgium and Germany, and will shortly sign a protocol with the Netherlands. It is currently engaged in negotiations with France looking to a revision of the existing treaty, which goes back to 1939, and with the United Kingdom to meet the problems created by the extensive changes enacted this year in the United Kingdom tax law.

The effect of the OECD model convention on these treaty negotiations is significant. While there are differences in degree among the various member countries in the extent of their adherence to the language of that convention, and indeed these differences vary from provision to provision, that Convention is always kept in mind by treaty negotiators. This is, of course, understandable, since the representation in the OECD Fiscal Committee which drafted the convention is composed of the officials charged with the responsibility to negotiate tax treaties for their respective countries. And indeed for many purposes, that convention meets satisfactorily the policy and technical issues that confront treaty negotiators. But new issues constantly emerge, and old issues take different shapes, so that in some areas the guidance offered by the convention seems inadequate. Perhaps the principal areas in this respect relate first, to the rates of dividend withholding appropriate to the varying forms of domestic corporate income taxation that are being adopted by the member countries, and second, to the policy and technical problems that are emerging with respect to the allocation of profits between the components of international business enterprises.

As for the United States, the recent protocol with Germany and that to be signed soon with the Netherlands illustrate a significant part of the pattern which the revision of our treaties is taking. The German protocol was recently ratified by the Senate, and this action, together with the nature of the testimony at the hearing held on it, indicates that the pattern embodied in it is appropriate for the United States.

It therefore may be helpful to turn to the more significant aspects of that pattern. As will be seen later in the discussion of our unilateral treatment of foreigners, this pat-term is also important in the shaping of our statutory rules.

Definition of permanent establishment

The definition of permanent establishment set forth in the OECD draft is clearly becoming the model for the various treaties. The member countries have recognized that, while subject to some technical deficiencies or ambiguities, the definition is satisfactory overall. They therefore have adopted it, improving on it as the definitional problems emerge. The provision set forth in the German protocol is the form the United States is currently using. This provision is more particularized than the previous form, and somewhat more permissive in the operations that can be conducted by a business activity before it will be regarded as having a permanent establishment. It may be observed that this definition refers specifically to a "place of management" as a permanent establishment.

Though this concept was not separately delineated before, it was in effect recognized as a factor under some prior treaties, as in the case of the German treaty. But since it may be a relatively unfamiliar term in our tax lexicon, the United States is taking appropriate steps, through memorandums of understanding, exchanges of letters, and the like, together with its own regulations, to emphasize that the term refers to "management" in a substantive and meaningful sense and not to minor, representational or sporadic activities. More care is also being given in the treaties to the definition of "industrial and commercial profits" (the kind of income for which the presence of a permanent establishment is requisite to its taxation), with the result of greater particularity in the enumeration of types of income not covered by the phrase.

Given, on the one hand, the scope of operations thus afforded to a business activity before it is regarded as constituting a permanent establishment and, on the other, the tax and nontax factors that point to the use of a foreign subsidiary as operations become still more extensive, it seems likely that permanent establishments, or branch operations, are relatively quite few in number, or are generally confined to certain lines of activity, such as insurance, banking, and natural resource activities. Thus, as respects the permanent establishments of foreigners in the United States, there were less than 500 foreign corporations actively engaged in business in the United States in 1962, of which almost half reported a loss on their U.S. business operations. The total amount of income reported by the profit-making branches was less than $100 million, of which over 75 percent was attributable to 58 insurance companies and 14 investment companies.

If the deficit companies are taken into account and the insurance companies excluded from the calculations, the total taxable income of the 375 other branches is less than $7 million. This figure, however, reflects allowance of the 85 percent dividends received deduction, without which it might be considerably higher.

Force of attraction

Our previous treaty pattern, once a permanent establishment existed in a country, was to provide that all income of the taxpayer arising in that country was attracted to that permanent establishment, and taxed at the rates and in the manner applicable to business enterprises. This meant, for example, that investment income which would otherwise have been taxed under the treaty at relatively low withholding rates or fully exempt, remained subject to tax at regular rates. The OECD draft abandons this force of attraction approach and therefore leaves the investment income of a taxpayer having a permanent establishment to be separately treated, except where the asset giving rise to that income is effectively connected with the permanent establishment. Also, only the industrial or commercial profits attributable to a permanent establishment are to be subject to tax, and any industrial or commercial profits not so attributable are, lacking the relationship to a permanent establishment, exempt from tax under this approach.

This approach has much to commend it, since the separation it permits between trading or other business activity and investment activity makes for a freer movement of capital and goods between countries. The approach also makes unnecessary the steps taxpayers have taken, recognizing the utility of that separation, to achieve it through isolating the business or investment activities in a separate subsidiary solely designed for this purpose. For these reasons the approach has been adopted by the United States in the German and Netherlands protocols. Of course, any new concept and its terminology carry their interpretative problems at the edges of the concept, and this will be true of such phrases as "effectively connected" and "attributable to," just as it has been true of other phrases and concepts in the treaties. Nor can we here expect full uniformity of treaty terminology, as the combination of emerging experience and negotiating preferences will produce some variations. We hope through regulations, however, to offer guidance as the questions emerge and to place any language variations in their proper perspective.

Capital gains

The OECD draft convention, largely following European practice, restricts the taxation of capital gains to the country of residence, except as to gains on real property and assets effectively connected with a permanent establishment. While this approach is at variance with some of our prior treaties, it often has been followed by us in the past. Moreover, the approach is based on the desirability of a free movement of capital and the difficulties of effectively taxing capital gains in the source country in an orderly way.

Consequently, the German and Netherland protocols provide generally for the exemption at source of capital gains. The German protocol excepts from exemption short-term gains, on assets held for 6 months or less, where the taxpayer has resided in the source country for 183 days or more. This exception in the case of a taxpayer with an extended presence, i.e., 183 days, in the source country is likely to appear in our various treaties. A stay of that length seems to warrant a tax liability to the source country, especially where the gains are speculative in nature as in the case of assets held for a short period of time. Moreover, in many countries, such a stay will make a taxpayer a "resident," and hence subject to tax on capital gains. This 183-day exception may take variant forms, as our experience develops and the attitudes of other countries are formed.

Treatment of dividends

The OECD draft recommends, as appropriate international withholding rates on dividends, 5 percent on parent-subsidiary dividends and 15 percent on dividends on portfolio investment. A parent-subsidiary relationship requires a stock ownership by the parent of 25 percent of the stock of the subsidiary. But the treatment of dividends is one of the treaty provisions, perhaps the principal one, that is generally the subject of real differences of opinion and hard bargaining between treaty countries. Since dividends usually represent the main item in the income flows between countries, the revenue importance of the withholding taxes on dividends is usually significant, and certainly more so than for the other items.

Also, one country may find that its portfolio investment abroad is more significant than its direct investment, whereas the opposite could be the case for the other treaty country.

Moreover, the rates of the underlying corporate tax will vary from country to country. Further, the form of the underlying corporate tax also will vary: some countries may have a straight corporate tax (the United States and the new United Kingdom taxes); others a tax that provides a lower rate to the corporation for distributed profits (the German tax); others a tax all or part of which is regarded as a withholding tax on the shareholders so that the latter receive a corresponding credit against their individual income tax on their dividends. The form of this credit in turn may vary: it may be of the gross-up variety, and therefore accurately reflecting the part of the corporate tax treated as withholding tax (the former United Kingdom tax, the Belgian tax, and new French tax); it may or may not involve refunds to taxpayers who otherwise cannot use the full credit; it may or may not extend to foreigners; it may not involve a gross-up credit but only be a flat percentage of dividends received (the Canadian tax). And a country which treats part of its corporate tax as a withholding tax may also have as a collection device a supplementary withholding tax on dividends similar to its other internal withholding taxes. In addition, in some countries bearer instruments may predominate and thus restrict to some extent the degree to which certain tax approaches can be effectively implemented.

These differences in revenue significance, in corporate-shareholder tax structure, in the differing policy goals and attitudes respecting the encouragement of private savings and investment that they reflect, and in the prevalence of the bearer or registered share form of corporate shareholdings all combine to shape a county's approach to the treaty provision governing dividends. Given all this, one cannot expect uniformity in this area.

The U.S. basic position regarding the dividend provision is to a considerable degree, reflected in its recent treaty activities. We stand ready to offer any country the OECD recommended rates of 15 percent on portfolio investment and 5 percent on parent-subsidiary investment.

Some other countries chose, however, for a variety of reasons, not to adopt the 5-percent rate on parent-subsidiary investment so that as a consequence some of our treaties will, as a reflection of treaty negotiations, contain rates of 10 percent or 15 percent for that investment. But, since the United States offers the OECD rate of 5 percent to all, the variations in our treaties thus reflect the unwillingness of other countries to adopt that 5-percent rate.

We believe, however, that countries should seek to present a uniform approach to all their treaty partners, and thus as far as possible fix on a set of rates that they will offer to all comers rather than seek to differentiate one country from another. In addition, the rates of withholding tax that are adopted should be reciprocal, in that a country should not be able to claim higher treaty rates than the rates it desires us to adopt in the treaty. The other country is free, of course, to prefer rates lower than those which it seeks of us.

We prefer a definition of the parent-subsidiary relationship that uses a 25-percent stockownership test, but which would permit that degree of ownership to be met either by a single parent company or by several corporate shareholders in combination. Also, adequate attention must be paid to prevent the reduced dividend rates, as well as reduced rates on interest and royalties, from flowing to nonresidents of a treaty country, since we do not desire to encourage the tax-haven form for the holding of interests in the United States. Our treaty with Luxembourg and the Netherlands Antilles protocol reflect this approach.

The recent protocols concluded with Belgium, Germany, and the Netherlands are in keeping with these concepts. The first two adopt a 15-percent rate, reflecting the desire of those countries that the withholding rate be 15 percent for both portfolio and parent-subsidiary investment; the Netherinads protocol has the OECD rates of 15 percent and 5 percent. The German protocol provides the protection needed by a country using a lower rate for distributed profits against a dividend distribution followed by immediate reinvestment, where the latter route is advantageous tax wise, by raising the German rate to 25 percent in such a situation.

The Belgian protocol achieves reciprocal rates of 15 percent on registered shares, thus reducing the otherwise applicable Belgian 18.2 percent effective rate, while allowing a period of time to explore the administrative problems of applying the 15-percent rate to bearer shares and taking recognition of the fact that in actual practice the rate on the bearer shares typically held by American investors rarely exceeds 15 percent.

The concepts enumerated above will meet satisfactorily—many of the varying situations presented under the influences earlier mentioned. But it is quite possible that further concepts are needed to achieve a freer flow of international investment and proper international tax treatment. Some corporate tax structures result in an unneutral tax effect between those of a country's taxpayers who invest abroad and those who invest at home.

This unneutrality may not always be initially intended in the structural design, but rather may represent the way the pieces fitted together in the end. More often it will be a consequence of a structural design chosen for internal reasons, but a consequence that becomes a policy if steps are not taken to prevent the unneutrality from persisting. This is most likely to occur where a country adopts a corporate-shareholder tax relationship under which a credit it given to domestic shareholders for part or all of the corporate tax on domestic corporations.

If a comparable credit is not extended by the country to its domestic shareholders who invest in foreign corporations, then the tax system will embody an unneutrality favoring investment at home. The United Kingdom, when it used an integrated corporate tax with a grossed up shareholder credit, avoided this unneutrality by allowing its shareholders by treaty a credit for a foreign underlying corporate tax. Its treaty partners sometimes reciprocated, as in the case of the United States-United Kingdom treaty where the United States gave its shareholders in United Kingdom corporations a credit for underlying United Kingdom corporate tax. But such reciprocity would not appear to be a necessary ingredient, since it in turn may inject an unneutrality between the reciprocating country's investors at home and its investors abroad.

It would seem that an appropriate goal in international tax relationships is the achievement as far as possible of a basic neutrality in tax effect between investment at home and investment abroad. This neutrality should be a long-range aim of a tax structure. There may be reasons, such as those associated with a balance-of-payments posture, to depart temporarily from time to time either to favor investment at home or in the case of a deficit country, or to encourage investment abroad in the case of a surplus country. But even here the temporary swings could be made more appropriately through devices—such as the interest equalization tax in the United States or foreign exchange measures abroad—not associated with the basic income tax structure lest they become embedded in that structure and resistant to change when the temporary need has passed. The presence of investment incentives, such as investment credits or allowances or rapid depreciation, may also impart an unneutrality through being limited to domestic investment.

As far as possible, however, the achievement of neutrality between investment at home and investment abroad should be a part of the basic structural design of a country's tax system. But it also would seem appropriate to use the treaty medium to achieve the alteration in unilateral statutory treatment necessary to reach this neutrality. Since the OECD Convention does not really deal with this acept, it is an area where further exploration is needed.

One other matter requiring further exploration is that of the so-called "round trip dividend." If a parent in country A receives a dividend from its subsidiary in country B, there will usually be a withholding tax paid to country B on that dividend. If residents of country B own stock in the parent, then on payment of a dividend to them by the parent, there will be a withholding tax by country A. One can ask whether, as a consequence, this "round trip" is too heavily taxed. Of course, the parent's dividends to country B are not dollar for dollar traceable to the dividends it received from its subsidiary in that country.

But still some amounts have taken a "round trip." Further, there are at present very few corporate parents in the world where such flows from and to a country would be of a size in which the amounts of both flows were significant. And the technical patterns and the pitfalls of possible solutions are not readily apparent. Still, since the "round trips" are likely to increase in number and significance, the problem should commend itself to the tax experts for study.

Nondiscrimination

Another facet of international neutrality lies in the comparison of the treatment between domestic taxpayers and the taxpayer from abroad. The older version of tax treaties generally sought nondiscrimination between the domestic taxpayer and the foreign national residing in the country, and sometimes extended the coverage to a permanent establishment. The OECD Convention, in the interests of a wider neutrality, further extends this nondiscrimination to domestic corporations of a country owned by nationals of the other country. The United States believes the OECD approach is desirable, and it is contained for example in the Netherlands protocol. Generally, it would appear that the inclusion or application of this clause should not involve serious policy differences, and neutrality of this type should be achievable.

The effect of the varying corporate-shareholder tax patterns described above on neutrality between domestic investors and investors from abroad may, however, be in need of further analysis. For example, a corporate tax system under which part or all of the corporate tax is regarded as a withholding tax on the shareholders, so that the shareholders are allowed a credit for the "withheld tax," will discriminate against the shareholder investors from abroad if the benefits of that credit are not extended to the latter. The nondiscrimination clause in the OECD draft can be regarded as implying that the task of avoiding discrimination in this context falls on the country of source. The possible methods of achieving this result would of course have to be explored. And the effect of any such step on the investment relationships in the other country; i.e., the relationship between its taxpayers who invest at home and those who invest abroad (and thus become the "shareholder investor from abroad" in the first context) must be kept in mind. These also are matters not fully discussed in the OECD convention and thus require further attention.

Allocations of income

The OEDC convention continues the conventional clauses regarding allocation of income: the allowance of appropriate deductions to a permanent establishment of all expenses connected with it wherever incurred; the arm's-length standard of allocation between related persons, such as a parent-subsidiary relation; the entitlement of a taxpayer to present to his Government a case of alleged action contrary to the treaty and the exhortation to the contracting parties to resolve any such situation if well founded; and the desirability of consultation between the contracting parties to settle interpretative and other questions. In addition, any excess of "interest" or "royalty" payments over a fair and reasonable consideration is not regarded as covered by the interest and royalty articles, but the excess instead is taxed in a manner appropriate to the situation, which presumably will usually be as a dividend.

The United States seeks to follow these provisions in its treaties, since they represent a necessary technical framework. But we feel that the day-to-day problems of international allocation cut deeper and will require further substantive rules if a proper international framework is to be achieved. The main need, simply stated but very difficult in execution, is to achieve standards and criteria furnishing guidance on what are appropriate allocations in the great variety of cases that arise—the payment of interest on inter-company loans, the payment of royalties on inter-company licenses, the fixing of prices on inter-ocmpany sales, the reimbursement of expenses incurred for inter-company services, and so on. This matter is discussed further in connection with our statutory rules.

It is recognized that it will take time to evolve agreed upon standards. But the United States believes that through treaties we should now insure that any agreements that are reached between governments and taxpayers in particular cases, under present standards or those that will be formulated, should be capable of being implemented in full. As matters now stand, however, procedural and other barriers may prevent this. Thus, since disputes of this nature often take considerable time to resolve in particular cases, an agreement may be reached calling for a reduction in the tax previously paid to one of the countries only for the parties to find that the statute of limitations has run on the filing of a refund claim or the payment of the refund.

Such a procedural barrier would result in international double taxation. To avoid impediments of this nature, the United States believes that treaties should provide than an agreement once reached shall be fully implemented, and a refund allowed in accordance with the agreement, despite such procedural or other barriers. Such agreements could relate either to the allocation of profits or to the source of an item of income. In the latter case the implementation should extend to the consequent effect of the agreed source on a foreign tax credit.

Other countries appear to agree with this view, and clauses to this effect are being incorporated in our treaties, as in the German and the Netherlands protocols and the Israel treaty. It has also been agreed with Belgium that the language of our existing Belgian treaty has a similar effect. We regard this result as a significant step toward the goal of achieving a proper framework to meet the problems of international allocation.

Drafting and interpretation

Those who read and apply treaties—as well as all persons with orderly minds and habits—earnestly urge uniformity in the drafting of tax treaties. And all treaty negotiators will fully agree in principle. However, each negotiator usually has his mind set on his own pattern of a uniform and orderly treaty. And there is no negotiator who will place uniformity above agreement when the hour is late and a seemingly intractable problem yields to a welcome solution that departs "just a bit" from the words in other treaties and may "possibly" have some ambiguities which the negotiators feel any reasonable men will later be able to resolve if the cases actually arise—just as the negotiators have so successfully resolved their problem.

Uniformity and clarity never stand as impassable barriers to compromise solutions. If they did, we would have the uniformity of no treaties. Nor should uniformity with the past block improvements that are now seen to be desirable.

All of this is not said to disparage the goal of uniformity, and the United States seeks to achieve it as far as possible. But in practice we know we will fall short. An offsetting step is to clarify the disuniformity—to state through regulations or in other ways when and to what extent different words, different phrases and different approaches in various treaties, or even the same treaty, really embody differences in end result and are so intended. Despite delays that have occurred, we therefore are working on regulations that would maintain order among the variations. Whether this can be done within the framework of a master set of treaty regulations or whether some other device is more useful remains to be seen, but the end we seek seems clearly necessary.

Less developed countries

In my Montreal paper I described at length the interests of the United States in achieving treaty relationships with less developed countries, and the interests of those countries in the same goal. We are not alone in recognizing these values, for many of the other developed countries are engaged in considerable efforts to achieve a network of treaties with the less developed countries, and indeed are succeeding. This in turn behooves us to keep to the task, lest we lose the advantage which others find in this very useful device for ordering some of the relationships between the developed and less developed worlds.

Fortunately, our efforts to achieve a proper set of treaties are succeeding. We have negotiated treaties with the Philippines, Thailand, and Israel, in that order, and these are before the Senate. We have agreed on a draft with India, and are engaged in completing negotiations commenced earlier with Taiwan. We are informally discussing with several Latin American countries the appropriateness of negotiations. Also, existing treaties are being revised; thus we are considering with Honduras, whose treaty was the first we negotiated with a less developed country, appropriate modifications of that treaty. As another illustration, we are engaged in negotiations with Trinidad and Tobago to explore revisions in a treaty which has its origin in the extension of our United Kingdom treaty to that country on its independence. Indeed, we are likely to overlook the fact that this process of treaty extension has given us a set of treaties with a number of less developed countries which have achieved independence.[1]

We also have treaties with Honduras and Pakistan—as well as the three pending in the Senate—to complete the present list of our treaties with independent less-developed countries.

These treaties in one sense are in an evolutionary period, especially since for many of the countries involved the very negotiation of tax treaties involves a new activity. Moreover, many of these countries are negotiating against a background of evolving internal laws, as their tax policies change and as technical improvements are made under the pressure of modern commercial relationships and transactions. Nevertheless, a certain pattern is being achieved in these treaties, which we are seeking to utilize as we extend the range of our negotiations. The three recent treaties, with the Philippines, Thailand, and Israel, largely exhibit that pattern, with the Israel treaty evidencing the arrangement and, in general, the technical drafting which we regard as desirable.

The following is a summary of the developing pattern:

Arrangement and drafting

These treaties, while, influenced by the OECD draft, are not likely to be as closely tied to that draft in wording or arrangement. The treaty with Israel, for example, follows an entirely different arrangement of the treaty provisions, and one which we believe is more manageable.

Relief from double taxation

The countries so far have followed a credit approach to relieve double taxation, as does the United States. We may not see therefore as much resort to the exemption approach, or the combined exemption-credit approach, that we see on the part of our treaty partners in our developed country treaties.

Source of income

The treaties generally contain a description of source rules for various items of income, following international standards. In some cases this treaty approach is a way of meeting the problem caused by the absence of, or incomplete, source rules in the statutory provisions of these countries.

Nondiscrimination

The OECD Convention respecting nondiscrimination of foreign nationals residing in the country, permanent establishments, and domestic corporations owned by nationals is being followed.

Permanent establishment and industrial profits

The OECD approach is generally followed in the definition of permanent establishment and on the treatment of industrial and commercial profits, with a few exceptions. One is that the force of attraction approach is still being applied, as perhaps simpler of administration, though the desirability of continuing to use this approach is an open question. Another is that some countries (not Israel) desire specifically to treat as a permanent establishment an agent who regularly secures orders in the country for the foreign taxpayer or maintains a stock of goods from which delivery is regularly made.

If such an agent is an independent agent, however, he will not constitute a permanent establishment. These countries may desire to specify that an agent is not independent who acts exclusively or almost exclusively for the foreign taxpayer. Aspects of this approach are a cause of concern to some U.S. taxpayers who have been securing orders for their goods through a subsidiary formed in the other country. As a consequence, we will carefully explore with these countries ways of meeting this situation which do not upset these parent-subsidiary exporting arrangements or other appropriate arrangements.

Dividends

Some of these countries are hesitant to reduce their withholding rates on dividends, fearing a loss of revenue. Where relevant they point out that extensive incentive provisions of their laws often eliminate or materially lessen the corporate tax rate, so that the effective rate of total tax is well below 48 percent. The United States, where relevant, calls attention to the desirability of reducing overall effective rates to 48 percent, and even lower where not grossing-up the foreign dividend produces an excess foreign tax credit. The foreign reaction differs.

The Philippines were not ready to make any reduction in withholding rates on investment income, leaving that country with a 30-percent internal corporation tax and a 30-percent withholding tax for an effective rate of 51 percent on dividends going abroad (in the absence of a domestic incentive provision).

When all profits net of corporate tax are distributed this produces an excess credit of 8.4 percent. Thailand reduced its withholding rate from a maximum of 25 percent to 20 percent, with a corporate tax rate of 25 percent (in the absence of an incentive provision), giving an effective rate of 40 percent—the prior rate was 43¾ percent, which resulted in an excess credit of about 1 percent for a corporate shareholder. Israel retained its 25-percent withholding rate.

Israel imposes a corporate profits tax of 28 percent plus a tax of 25 percent on corporate net income after profits tax less any dividends distributed (in the absence of an incentive provision). Dividends distributed are thus subject to the corporate profits tax of 28 percent and a withholding tax of 25 percent, leaving an effective rate of 46 percent, below our 48-percent rate but resulting in an excess credit in the absence of gross up of about 3.6 percent. As will be discussed below, the United States applied certain investment provisions on its part, such as extension of our 7-percent investment credit in the Thailand, Israel, and Indian cases, but not in the case of the Philippines in part because its effective rate exceeded 48 percent.

It should be recognized that in their treaties with other developed countries, the above countries adopt largely similar approaches as respects their withholding rates.

Interest

These countries appear even more hesitant about reducing withholding rates on interest. They are willing to do so if the lender on our side is a Government agency, where exemption is granted, and in the case of Israel if it is a bank, where a 15-percent rate is used. But otherwise they appear so far to put revenue maintenance ahead of even possible reduction in interest costs to their debtors where the foreign lender is passing on the withholding tax to the borrowers.

Royalties

The royalty area presents a mixed approach. Some countries, as Israel and Thailand, reduced their withholding rates to 15 percent. Others are not desirous of taking this step, but are willing to permit royalties (and rents) to be taxed electively on a net income basis.

In all of these situations—dividends, interest, and royalties—these countries are not basically concerned about our 30-percent withholding rate since they do not receive investment flows from the United States. As a matter of treaty reciprocity, however, they ask for provisions that match their concessions.

Ships and aircraft

These countries, paralleling developed country treaties, consent to reciprocal exemption for air and ship transportation, though sometimes the latter will receive only a reduction to 50 percent of the otherwise applicable tax rather than complete exemption.

Temporary visitors

These countries, here also paralleling to a considerable extent developed country treaties, consent to exempt temporary business visitors from their taxes. The standards will differ somewhat, but usually involve a limited period of time, such as 183 days, and a limitation on the amount earned, sometimes applied on a daily basis in the case of entertainers and other performers.

---

[1] Cyprus, Jamaica, Malawi, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, and Zambia (United Kingdome treaty extension); Burundi, Congo (Dem. Rep. of), and Ruanda (Belgium treaty extension); also Netherland Antilles (Netherlands treaty extension).

Other substantive provisions

These treaties generally contain the other standard substantive provisions, such as those affecting teachers, students, and trainees (but with more emphasis on their part on this aspect and perhaps with more liberal exemptions at source being sought), government personnel, and pensions and annuities.

Procedural provisions

These treaties also contain the customary procedural provisions, such as consultation, exchanges of taxpayer information and legal information, and taxpayer claims. The Israel treaty and the Indian draft include the removal of procedural barriers to the effectuation of agreements on the allocation of profits and the source of items of income.

Provisions on the U.S. side—Investment credit, technical assistance, and charitable contributions

The treaty pattern described above represents significant accommodations by the less developed countries to the international standards that have evolved in treaties between developed countries, but do not in turn represent any real concessions on the part of the developed countries. The flows of investment income—dividends, interest, royalties—and of export trade, business, and cultural visitors, and ships and aircraft are overwhelmingly from developed countries to less developed countries. Perhaps the only exception is that of students and trainees. This does not mean that the treaty provisions are wrong or unfair in concept, but simply reflects the economic relationships on which these international tax standards are being superimposed. Yet all of this understandably presents problems to the less developed countries—problems of revenue loss, of negotiation, and of justification to their peoples.

Under these circumstances these countries have sought some concession from the developed countries. This search, in the light of their desire for additional investment from abroad, has centered around treaty provisions that they regard as offering encouragement to this foreign investment.

As a consequence, the other industrialized countries entering into tax treaties with less developed countries—and there appear to be over 30 of these treaties—have found it necessary to incorporate a provision which the less developed countries consider a stimulus to capital inflows in order to obtain a treaty with them. One approach followed involves exemption by the industralized country of various forms of income received by its taxpayers from activities in the less developed country. Another approach is the so-called tax sparing credit. In treaties incorporating such a provision, the capital exporting country agrees to allow a credit against its tax, not only for the taxes actually paid to the less developed country, but also for the taxes that would have been paid to the less developed country if that country had not reduced its income taxes under some special tax concession scheme. There appear to be some 20 tax sparing treaties in force between industrialized countries and the less developed countries.

In our view these approaches are undesirable. Thus, tax exemption of income derived from investment in less developed countries would be viewed as a highly inequitable provision by American taxpayers engaged in business in the United States and would have a highly erratic effect on the relative tax burden of foreign producers as compared with those engaged in domestic production. It would be basically inconsistent with the principle of the foreign tax credit which seeks to maintain neutrality in tax burdens as between domestic and foreign economic activities. A tax sparing credit would equally be undesirable since it would operate capriciously, providing the largest tax benefits to our investors in less developed countries having the highest nominal tax rates and without any necessary relationship to the fundamental economic needs of a country or to such policies as the Alliance for Progress. Moreover, such a credit would stimulate the rapid repatriation of profits from less developed countries rather than the reinvestment of profits in those countries.

Clearly we need some provision comparable in purpose if the United States is to obtain treaties with less developed countries. As a consequence the United States has offered to extend by treaty to these countries the 7-percent credit that now exists in the Internal Revenue Code for investment in the United States. Since in the Code this credit does not extend to investment abroad, its adoption established in effect a preference for domestic investment as compared with foreign investment.

Consequently, the extension of the 7-percent investment credit by treaty to these countries offers itself as a fitting approach to the recognition those countries seek with respect to the encouragement of capital inflows. It would, so far as the United States is concerned, remove an impediment to investment in less developed countries and thereby in this respect establish a general parity of treatment between domestic investment and investment in the less developed country. In establishing this parity and thus assisting investment in these countries, we would also be pursuing a policy reflected in other tax legislation recently adopted by Congress.

Thus, the Revenue Act of 1962, which was directed to "tax haven" or "base companies" abroad, contains a number of provisions favorable to investment in less developed countries as compared with industrialized nations. Moreover, under the interest equalization tax, loans made to enterprises in less developed countries and investments therein are treated in the same way as domestic loans and investments and thus are exempt from the tax.

Moreover, the investment credit approach is far more appropriately suited to less developed countries than the tax sparing approach or the exemption of income approach, from the standpoint of equity, efficiency, and administration. Since the investment credit operates on the act of investment, it eases the risk of investment at the very outset. Since the credit does not turn on the receipt of income in the United States from the foreign investment, as do tax sparing and tax exemption, it does not encourage quick repatriation of profits.

Since the credit does not turn on foreign tax concessions, as does tax sparing, it does not have the capriciousness of that device and its capacity to encourage concession competition among less developed countries, nor does it transfer from the United States to a foreign country the decision as to whether a tax benefit is to be conferred and, if so, the extent of such benefit. Since the extension of the investment credit to less developed countries would but follow the treatment accorded domestic investment, it does not involve the treaty process in favoring the foreign investor as against the domestic investor in a matter closely linked to the rates of tax, as did tax sparing.

The less developed countries so far have responded favorably to our suggestion that extension of the 7-percent investment credit is a recognition of their desire for an encouragement of capital inflows. We have been able to demonstrate, moreover, that the monetary benefits to the investor from this credit are generally equivalent in among to what it would receive from a tax sparing approach, given reasonable assumptions as to the time pattern of distributions, discount rates, and the like. And many countries recognize the advantages enumerated above, both to the investor and the less developed country, of the credit approach over the tax sparing approach.

In this light the extension of the 7-percent credit by treaty is the negotiating tool which permits the United States to achieve tax treaties with less developed countries which both we and they can regard as fair and balanced. The importance of this provision thus basically lies not in the benefits it extends to investors, but rather in what it thereby obtains for the United States—a sound treaty system with the less developed countries with all the advantages such a system provides—for both parties to the treaty—for improved investment, trade, and cultural relationships between the United States and these countries.

As a consequence, the provision is incorporated in the Thailand and Israel treaties and in the India draft. Its technical provisions, as expressed in the Israel draft, are of course subject to improvement as experience is gained. Moreover, the provision can be terminated after 5 years without a termination of the entire treaty.

The United States in these negotiations is quite clear on its view that extension of the investment credit is appropriate only where the other country is receptive to our investment and where its tax system, taken as a whole, does not involve measures that can be regarded as significantly working at cross purposes with this investment. In many cases the existing tax systems of less developed countries do not meet this standard. But the treaty process itself permits the foreign country to modify its tax system through the treaty and thus deal with the provisions of its tax law which act as disincentives to investment from the United States.

For example, the existence of a complex of corporate taxes and withholding taxes on dividends in a less developed country, which brings the effective rate of tax on profits earned there above the general level of the U.S. corporate tax, creates a tax barrier to our investment in such countries. It would generally be difficult to justify a tax credit for U.S. investment in such a country unless that country is prepared to reduce its taxes to the level prevailing in the United States. This often can be done by a treaty but not otherwise, since that country may not be prepared to reduce its taxes on its own nationals or those of third countries.

The treaty process also permits complementary modifications where appropriate in the tax laws of the other country which are conducive to improved international trade. Where the other country is not yet ready to make certain modifications, or is more concerned with continuing a somewhat restrictive approach to foreign investors, then the investment credit need not be extended. While it may well be that in most of these cases a treaty may presently not be negotiable, this need not always be the result, as the Philippine treaty indicates. That treaty does not contain an extension of the investment credit.

The investment credit applies to investments of cash and tangible property. The Israel and Thailand treaties, and the Indian draft, also contain a complementary provision that seeks to offer encouragement for the investment of technical assistance. Here the approach is that of a deferral of both our tax and that of the less developed country on any gain that would otherwise be recognized when intangible assets, such as patents, processes, or know-how, are exchanged by a U.S. investor for stock in a corporation of the less-developed country. Under our statutory law this deferral would, where "property" is involved, be possible if

80-percent control is obtained by the U.S. transferor. Below this level of control our tax would apply. Moreover, there is frequently a tax in the other country as well, even in the case of 80-percent control. The treaty provision deferring these taxes until the stock is sold removes an impediment to the transaction, and is of minor effect on the U.S. revenues, since a foreign tax that would be incurred in the absence of the provision would generally be creditable against the U.S. tax.

Finally, as a step in simplifying the process of contributions to charitable organizations in these countries, a provision may be inserted, as in the Philippine and Thailand treaties but not Israel, to permit a deduction against U.S. tax of contributions made directly to such organizations. Under our statute the deduction could be obtained if made indirectly through a U.S. organization. The treaty provision requires that the foreign organization must meet the standards established in each country for a charitable organization. It may be observed that our Internal Revenue Service has experience in passing on the charitable character of foreign organizations as a result of its administration of the rule under our statutory law that a foriegn organization which meets our test of "charitable" is not subject to any tax on income it receives from the United States.

The subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has performed a useful public service in holding last August full hearings on the Thailand Treaty. The published hearings contain a complete technical explanation of these U.S. provisions, as well as a detailed analysis of the entire treaty and a description of factors affecting negotiations with less-developed countries. They also contain the views of organizations representing U.S. concerns that invest abroad, and the views are favorable to these investment provisions and to the treaty itself. The only matter referred to as needing further consideration by the Treasury is that mentioned earlier in connection with the definition of permanent establishment.

Necessarily as experience is gained the present pattern described above that has so far evolved in our negotiations with the less developed countries can be improved. The progress of these negotiations is encouraging, for it indicates that the United States and these countries can reach a treaty arrangement that each regards as fair and conducive to improved investment, trade, and cultural relationships. This attitude and the promise it holds for a growing network of tax treaties represent a major step in our political and economic relationships with these countries.

II. ADMINISTRATION OF U.S. STATUTORY TAXATION OF FOREIGN INCOME

In the Montreal paper I stressed the importance of developing a sound administration of the U.S. statutory taxation of foreign income. This task is a formidable one: The field is relatively new as tax matters go, and the needed experience, analysis of detail, and synthesis of concepts are still in a formative stage; the international business activities to which the rules relate are rapidly expanding in importance and number, and the variety of transactions and business relationships involved thus steadily increases; the tax rules moreover are constantly being buffeted by the shifting exigencies of balance-of-payments problems. But all of this merely underscores the challenge of the task, and the Treasury is seeking to respond in a fitting manner.

As I stated in my Montreal paper, some matters have already been accomplished. The regulations for the 1962 Revenue Act provisions regarding foreign income have been issued. Further, one of these regulations provides the tax accounting concepts essential to any orderly administration of U.S. tax rules affecting foreign income. These regulations provide the guidance needed to translate foreign income statements into the earnings and profits of our tax laws.

Allocation of income—section 482

With this done, the Treasury has regarded as the next order of business the establishment of a satisfactory framework for the administration of the rules governing transactions between the domestic and the foreign units of our business concerns with foreign activities. In our tax parlance, this centers on the application of section 482 of our code, authorizing the Commissioner to allocate income and credits between related units of an enterprise so as to prevent evasion or clearly reflect the income of the various units.

While this section, whose presence and application are clearly necessary to a sound income tax system, had its original technical development in connection with transactions between domestic units of a U.S. enterprise, its recent importance is almost entirely in terms of its application to the foreign income field. The very variety and number of transactions in this field that lie within the reach of the section had overstrained the level of technical development that had been achieved in its domestic application. The situation thus called for a many-faceted implementation of the section so that it may carry the new burden placed upon it. The following discussion catalogs the steps being taken to achieve that implementation.

Orderly treatment of the pre-1963 years—Revenue procedure 64–54

The first major step needed was an orderly treatment of the controversies that had arisen for the years prior to 1963. The recognition by the Internal Revenue Service in the late 1950's that section 482 had to be applied on a much wider basis in the foreign field brought a sudden surge of audits and controversies, since many taxpayers in their intercompany arrangements may not have fully considered the range or implications of that section. While some aspects of the section—such as the requirement of an "arm's length price" on sales of products between related enterprise—were recognized, other requirements had not been explicitly developed.

As a consequence, many taxpayers for these years were faced with Internal Revenue Service adjustments increasing their U.S. income under circumstances which made it doubtful, at least in their view, that they could recoup the foreign taxes paid on the income involved in the adjustment—as where on audit income was for section 482 purposes shifted from a foreign subsidiary to a U.S. parent. The double taxation that could result would thus generally make it imperative for the U.S. taxpayer to resist strongly any claimed adjustment, and the lines were being formed for prolonged and widespread controversy.

To prevent this, the Treasury, in December 1964, issued revenue procedure 64–54, which allows taxpayers in the case of adjustments for years prior to 1963 to offset against any increase in U.S. taxes, occasioned by the adjustment, the foreign taxes paid on the income involved and thus to avoid double taxation. In addition, the revenue procedure states that the Revenue Service would not, except in certain limited instances, pursue for those years adjustments based on applications of section 482 that were not clearly required by its previous technical development, such at the requirement of interest on intercompany loans or royalties on patents licensed to foreign subsidiaries, or the allocation of general and administrative expenses.

The effect of this step has been quite salutary. Through its achievement of an orderly treatment of the pre-1963 years and the consequent very marked reduction in number and dollar amount of deficiencies under the section for those years, it has permitted the needed technical development of the section to proceed in an atmosphere free of acrimonious disputes that would otherwise have existed. It has thereby enabled—and indeed requires—taxpayers and the Government to consider objectively and responsibly the shape of that technical development.

The confinement to pre-1963 years of the ability under the revenue procedure to offset foreign taxes against a U.S. adjustment is of basic importance. From the standpoint of internal fairness, this limitation mirrors the fact that taxpayers by the end of 1962 had generally become aware both of the possible reach of section 482 and of the Service's decision to apply the section in keeping with that reach. But, of more importance, the limitation recognizes that a country cannot continue to administer such a section in this self-denying manner. For the continued allowance of the foreign tax offset would simply mean that the United States would be yielding control over its allocation problems to the allocation rules of foreign countries and the decisions of their administrators. Double taxation would be averted—but the cost would be borne by the U.S. Treasury.

While our foreign tax credit system recognizes that to prevent double taxation we are willing to yield first claim to the country of source, the integrity of that system depends on a rational framework of international allocation rules. The United States is thus entitled to insist on appropriate recognition of the rules it believes proper, and is not required to surrender its part in the construction of that framework. The same privilege of course belongs to any other country. The claims of the various countries may conflict and their failure to resolve them will lead to double taxation and increased burdens for the international taxpayer. But that is but another facet of the problem, to be discussed later, rather than a signal for us unilaterally to yield the field.

Hence, the import of Revenue Procedure 64–54 for the future is to underscore the importance of the formulation of rational internal guidelies under section 482.

Repatriation of income and section 482 adjustments—Revenue procedure 65–17

A section 482 adjustment in the foreign area usually means that a U.S. taxpayer has understated its U.S. income and overstated its foreign income—goods have been sold by a U.S. parent at too low a price to its foreign subsidiary, services have been rendered by that parent at an inadequate fee, and so on. What are the rules that should govern the attempt to recast the accounts between the subsidiary and the parent: Suppose the subsidiary desires now to transfer the income that is said to be the parent's income—will the transfer be a taxable dividend or handled instead as a payment on account of the section 482 adjustment? Suppose a dividend was included in the parent's income for the year to which the adjustment relates—can the dividend be recast as a payment on account of the adjustment? These questions of course required answers so that the transactions could be fitted into their proper tax niche. But balance-of-payments considerations added an extra urgency to the questions. Taxpayers wishing to respond to the Government's stress on the desirability of repatriating foreign earnings were concerned about distributing dividends from their foreign subsidiaries if they also were to be faced by section 482 adjustments in the parent's income. They saw in the combination the possibility of having more income being taxed in the United States than they desired or was required by law.

To meet these questions, the Treasury in March 1965 announced rules later embodied in revenue procedure 65–17, establishing an appropriate relationship between repatriations of income and section 482 adjustments. Under this revenue procedure a taxpayer will be permitted to recast dividend payments, for the year to which a section 482 adjustment relates, into the type of payment required to reflect the section 482 adjustment—the dividend may thus become a payment to the parent for goods or services, thereby avoiding the enlargement of the parent's income that would occur if dividend and adjustment were kept separate. In this case, of course, foreign taxes associated with the dividend are not allowed as credits.

A taxpayer that did not receive a dividend in the year to which the adjustment relates (or did not elect to recast a dividend of that year) may, within 90 days after the adjustment is made, transfer an amount from the foreign subsidiary and have the transfer treated as the required payment and not as a dividend. Necessarily, the broad flexibility thus provided the taxpayer must be protected against abuse, or else section 482 would be deprived of any self-policing content. Hence the revenue procedure states that for years after 1963 this flexibility will not be available to taxpayers who cast their transactions in a manner which had avoidance of U.S. tax as a principal purpose.

This revenue procedure is thus an important step in permitting the section 482 adjustment to be fitted into a proper position within the flow of funds from the foreign subsidiary, a position that both removes impediments to the orderly repatriation of funds and makes it possible for a taxpayer to accept the adjustment without increasing the transfer of income from subsidiary to parent more than it considers desirable. Again, as did revenue procedure 64–54, its flexibility makes possible—and likewise demands—a responsible approach to the guidelines governing the substantive reach of section 482.

Section 482. Substantive guidelines

The above procedural steps have set the stage for the development of appropriate guidelines for the substantive application of section 482. The Treasury is approaching this part of the task through the issuance of detailed proposed regulations under section 482, to replace the present regulations which for the most part simply establish the standard of arm's length dealing. The assignment is a formidable one, but we must remember that the development of the guidelines does not start from an accounting vacuum. The tax minded, and especially the lawyers, tend to overlook the fact that their new tax problems have very often been faced for some time in contexts outside the tax field.

Thus, accounting practices and conventions respecting allocations of income have had to be developed before this in nontax fields, both for internal accounting purposes and to meet the requirements of outside interests. The vast majority of industrial companies in the United States make some allocation of general and administrative expenses to their various operations as a normal business practice. The requirements of government procurement contracting and of public utility regulation have necessitated allocations of expenses between the government contract work and the other operations and between the regulated and the nonregulated sectors. And, indeed, even in the tax field taxpayers have made allocations to their foreign branches to determine the foreign taxes they consider to be properly payable.

The first set of proposed regulations, building in large part on this experience, was issued in April, 1965. In general, it covers the allocations required where assets or services of the parent are made available to the foreign subsidiary—where money is lent, where management or other services are rendered or made available, where machinery and other tangible assets are made available. Essentially the approach is to provide guidelines which, if the taxpayer follows them, offer a safe-conduct pass through section 482.

The guidelines are intended to furnish a maximum of flexibility, and of course do not prevent the use by the taxpayer of other defensible approaches. For the most part they are based on the costs incurred by the parent and an allocation of those costs to the subsidiary in a manner that follows accepted accounting precedents. The following offer general illustrations. While the guidelines cover domestic as well as foreign transactions, their discussion here, and their main area of application, relate to the foreign area.

Loans: Interest must be charged on a loan to a foreign affiliate: a 4-percent rate is acceptable; a lesser rate must be justified, and if it cannot be justified, the service will apply a 5-percent rate.

Managerial and other services: Managerial and other services rendered by the parent to benefit a foreign subsidiary must be compensated for though a profit need not be charged by the parent. The amount of the compensation generally may be the cost to the parent of those services, since the subsidiary could itself have employed the persons performing the service. While cost includes both direct and indirect costs and they are to be reflected on a full cost and not a marginal cost basis, the indirect costs may be allocated under any reasonable, consistent method in keeping with sound accounting practices.

Machinery and tangible assets: Machinery and other tangible assets made available to a foreign subsidiary can be reimbursed on a cost basis, covering out-of-pocket costs, depreciation, and a small profit representing an allowance for a return on the parent's investment. This cost allocation approach rather than that of establishing a rental figure is a method of reflecting on the income side what would otherwise generally be the required disallowance of deductions to the parent. It also eliminates the disputes that would arise under an approach seeking to establish a fair rental value based on market rates.

Arm's length test: The above rules are cast within the general framework of an arm's length test, and do not turn on following the transactions through the books of the subsidiary to see whether it used in a profitable way the money lent, the assets made available, or the services rendered. The fact that the subsidiary is losing money does not therefore prevent these allocations.

This is the essence of the arm's-length approach, and is in keeping with the fact that these are international transactions under which the United States is entitled to a fair reflection of the moneys, goods, and services that are being transferred. It is also in keeping with the general deferral rules that are consequent upon treatment of the foreign subsidiary as a separate legal entity. It also is consistent with a proper approach to consolidated return accounting.

The second set of proposed regulations, now in preparation, will contain the rules applicable to intercompany sales of products and transfers of intangibles, such as patent licenses. The problems here faced in seeking appropriate criteria or guidelines are much more difficult. The first set of regulations involved transactions which could be governed either by cost standards or by establishing an appropriate charge for a fungible item, money. But the second set of regulations involves the matter of determining a fair profit for assets that, under the arm's length rule, are regarded as transferred in a profit-seeking transaction.

Nevertheless, we seek to establish as helpful a set of rules as is possible in this area. We have, in this context, in TIR 441 issued in 1963, established guidelines to govern transactions between Puerto Rican affiliates, who typically engage in manufacturing activities, and their U.S. mainland parents, who handle the distribution of the goods. This TIR has been helpful in facilitating the disposition of a large number of difficult cases. While it deals with a situation that has some unique aspects, it still provides us with some experience in approaching the proposed regulations.

Finally, we are preparing regulations to coordinate our section 482 regulations with section 862 of the code, a section requiring an allocation between domestic and foreign source income of expenses not allocable to specific items of gross income. When such expenses are allocated to gross income from sources outside the United States, the net amount of that income is decreased. This allocation of expenses is important largely for foreign tax credit purposes (the gross income and expenses are independently already taken into account in computing the taxpayer's domestic taxable income), because the allocation, by reducing foreign source income, can reduce a taxpayer's foreign tax credit. Clearly, coordination with section 482 is necessary—as a simple example, an expense of the parent for managerial services rendered to its foreign subsidiary and compensated for by a fee should be allocated to that fee and not to a dividend received from the subsidiary.

The needed international accommodation

All of the above relates to the proper formulation of our unilateral rules of allocation with respect to international transactions. But since they are international transactions, a unilateral approach by the United States, or any country, is not sufficient. For if our unilateral rules do not mesh with those of other countries the result will be double taxation, the tax burden of which will be borne either by one government through the foreign tax credit or by the taxpayer, with the other government obtaining an unwarranted benefit. (Far less likely, though possible, is undertaxation of the taxpayer.)

Each country, of course, must see both sides of the allocation coin—the rules which the United States regards as proper to allocate income to our parent companies from transactions with their foreign subsidiaries are the rules we must be willing to accept when the subsidiary is here and its parent is a foreign corporation. This factor should have an effect in tempering the international assertion of rigid positions, and thus make it easier to achieve international accommodation. For it is clear that this must be the ultimate goal, an internationally acceptable set of rational rules to govern the allocation of international income arising through these transactions.

The United States believes that the OECD Fiscal Committee is the proper body to undertake the task of establishing the allocation standards to guide countries in reaching accommodations with each other. The OECD Fiscal Committee appointed a working party for this purpose.

We intend, as a measure of assistance to that working party, to lay before it our proposed section 482 regulations as they are developed. It is quite likely that these regulations may represent a more structurally developed and detailed framework of allocation rules than has been formulated elsewhere, and hence may prove helpful as a starting point and as a way of focusing attention on a wide range of issues. We would, of course, welcome the analysis and discussion which we expect this would stimulate. We would be ready to make modifications in these proposed rules if such changes are seen to be appropriate as a result of this international discussion.

It may turn out that full international agreement on all the rules is not possible. We would then expect that the various governments would consider what steps may be appropriate in dealing with the resulting conflicts and their double taxation effects. Various devices, which can be mentioned without an endorsement, have been suggested, such as arbitration, a payment once by the taxpayer at the higher of the two rates, or some formula to divide the burden among the taxpayer and the governments.

While this formulation of international rules is proceeding, we must remember that adjustments will be made under existing unilateral rules and many will be acceptable to both the countries concerned. However, as these cases tend to involve a considerable time before agreement is reached on the adjustment, a taxpayer and the countries concerned may find that procedural barriers, such as a statute of limitations on refunds, may make it impossible to implement the adjustment in the country that has overtaxed the income. To remedy this, the United States suggests that tax treaties contain provisions waiving these barriers and thus permitting the adjustment to be implemented. We are finding other countries receptive to this approach, and as observed in the discussion above under treaties, have already included such a provision in several treaties.

Section 367

There is another important aspect of our treatment of foreign income that requires an elaboration of the applicable administrative rules. This is section 367 of our code, which in effect requires the Commissioner's consent to be obtained by the taxpayer before the benefits available under a number of the corporate tax provisions can be achieved if the transaction in question involves a foreign corporation. Here also we are concerned with a provision of wide application necessary to prevent tax avoidance in the field of foreign income, for the taxpayer must satisfy the Commissioner that the proposed transaction—such as the formation or liquidation of a foreign corporation—does not have tax avoidance as one of its principal purposes. It would be helpful to taxpayers—and administrators—if detailed guidelines could be formulated setting forth objective standards to govern the application of that section. The Treasury is now engaged in the preparation of these guidelines and is hopeful of early action in this regard.

III. U.S. STATUTORY TAXATION OF FOREIGNERS

The steady attention focused by the United States in recent years on its balance-of-payments position has resulted in an extensive examination of the U.S. tax treatment of foreigners who invest in the United States. This examination commenced with the report on April 27, 1964, of the Committee appointed by President Kennedy on Promoting Increased Foreign Investment in U.S. Corporate Securities and Increased Foreign Financing for U.S. Corporations Operating Abroad, which was chaired by the then Under Secretary, and now Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler.

The Treasury Department study of that report, and of the entire statutory treatment of foreigners investing here, resulted in proposals to Congress embodied in H.R. 5916, introduced in March 1965. The House Committee on Ways and Means then gave extensive consideration to that bill and in September 1965 Chairman Mills, at the instruction of the Committee, introduced a modified version of that bill for comment before the bill is reported to the House in 1966. The new bill, H.R. 11297, entitled the Foreign Investors Tax Act, contains the essential elements of the predecessor bill, but with certain modifications.

In my Montreal paper I discussed the principles which the Treasury Department considered applicable to the revision of this aspect of international tax relationships, and these may briefly be summarized: (1) The rules adopted should be in conformity with acceptable international norms. The United States, with its large flows of capital and goods in and out of the country, has a responsibility to take a major role in seeing that there is developed a proper international tax framework against which the tax system of any particular country can be considered. (2) The rules should permit a fair and sensible allocation among the various countries of the income from activities that reach across international borders. (3) The rules should assist in maintaining as far as possible the free international market of capital and goods, with taxes in any country as neutral a factor as possible consistent with the domestic policies to be served by a tax system. (4) A proper balance must be maintained between the taxes paid by our citizens on their U.S. income and those paid by foreigners on the same income arising here. (5) The rules should not permit the United States to be turned into a tax haven country vis-a-vis foreign investors, nor be so framed as to permit, in combination with the tax rules of another country, the transformation of that country into a tax haven that would attract foreigners seeking to invest in the United States. (6) The rules should not be structured as to cause the capital of less developed countries, which are badly in need of the capital at home, to be drained off for investment in the United States. (7) Any benefits granted unilaterally by the United States should be so structured as to preserve a proper bargaining position for the United States in tax treaty negotiations.

The bill that has evolved from the consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means represents a balanced application of these principles. It recognizes that some of the existing provisions of our code have become discriminatory and inequitible to foreign investors and thus a barrier to investment in the United States. In correcting this treatment the bill avoids at the other extreme rules that would represent only a desire to attract foreign investment, rules which would be but mere tax inducements or tax concessions. Indeed, the bill moves to correct certain instances where in the past our legislation was too favorable to foreigners when compared with the treatment of our own citizens.

The main provisions of the bill are here summarized:

Corporate activity

Most foreign corporations that are involved in business activities in the United States generally operate through ownership of U.S. domestic subsidiaries or of significant stock interests in those corporations. The U.S. tax rules applicable are not complicated, and generally relate to our withholding taxes. This is equally so as to royalty situations. But where the foreign corporation operates here in branch form, the rules become more involved.

The existing statutory rules provide that a foreign corporation (or an individual) engaged in trade or business in the United States is taxed on all its income from U.S. sources at the regular rates applicable to business income, including not only the income from trade or business but also any unrelated investment income. The result paralleled the force of attraction concept of the permanent establishment provision in tax treaties. The new bill confines this taxation at regular business income rates to the income "effectively connected with the conduct of the trade or business within the United States," leaving the other income of the foreigner from U.S. sources to be taxed at our 30-percent statutory withholding rate or lower treaty rates. The bill thus moves our treatment in this area over to the general approach followed by many other nations.

It also is in accord with the OECD Model Income Tax Convention and our new treaty approach, evidenced in our protocols with Germany and the Netherlands, and thus has the advantage of conformity to international practice. The bill offers guidelines, to be supplemented by the legislative history, to the application of the "effectively connected" concept. A foreigner who is receiving large amounts of investment income from the United States, under the approach of the bill would no longer need be concerned that some other activity in the United States will suddenly be considered as giving him a trade or business status in the United States, and thus subjecting the investment income to business taxation. Instead, as long as the investment income is not connected with the other activity, any uncertainty as to the status of the latter would not color or affect the investment income.

The bill implements the "effectively connected" concept by: (1) Making taxable any income so connected even though its source is not within the United States, such as where a branch located in the United States imports goods from abroad and then resells the goods outside the United States, with title passing outside the United States. The income from the sale, untaxed today by the United States and indeed often untaxed by any country, would be taxable under the bill. (Any income not so connected with the trade or business is taxed only if it is from sources within the United States under the usual source rules.) (2) In keeping with the above approach, providing a foreign tax credit, against the U.S. tax on the trade or business income, for foreign taxes paid on that income, if the foreign tax is levied on the basis of source jurisdiction by the other country.

In this manner the bill obtains for the United States its proper tax on the full income of the trade or business conducted there, and on any investment income effectively connected with it. At the same time, by freeing the unrelated investment income from business tax rates, it leaves that income to be taxed at the rates we consider appropriate for investment income.

A number of our treaties provide for reduced withholding rates or exemption on investment income only if the foreign taxpayer has no permanent establishment in the United States. The adoption of the effectively connected approach, however, reflects a desire to permit application of those lower rates or exemption to all investment income which is not connected with a permanent establishment. We could achieve this result by a revision of each of our treaties to apply the lower rates or exemption despite the permanent establishment. However, this process would take a period of time. The bill eliminates this problem by unilaterally stating that these treaties will be applied to income not effectively connected as if the taxpayer did not have a permanent establishment in the United States.

Individual investment

Most foreign individuals with interests in the United States are involved in investment activities, such as the ownership of U.S. stocks or securities. Under existing rules foreign individual investors in the United States have been subject to progressive rates of tax on their U.S. income, when the total amount of that income involved a greater tax under the progressive rates than was collected through our withholding taxes. The investors in turn have sought to sidestep those rates through placing their investments in a foreign corporation and thereby obtaining either the 30-percent statutory withholding rate or lower treaty rates on the investment income. But they have had to be careful to structure the foreign corporation to avoid its being a personal holding company with respect to its U.S. source income. And of course some investors have simply sought to cover their tracks, recognizing the difficulties any tax administration faces when it moves beyond withholding taxes in its attempt to reach income going to foreigners. The consequence of all this was that the United States collected very little taxes under the progressive rates, so that the withholding rates were in practice the effective rates.

The bill simplifies this whole area by abandoning the application of progressive rates and limiting our assertion of tax, as respects investment income (not "effectively connected" with a trade or business), to the technique of withholding and to the level of withholding rates. The bill, in keeping with this approach, also exempts from personal holding company tax liability a foreign corporation whose stock is owned entirely by foreigners. Moreover, in the case of any foreign corporation receiving income from U.S. sources, it confines our assertion that dividends distributed by that corporation to its shareholders are in turn to be considered by us, in the shareholders' hands, as income from U.S. sources, to a situation where 80 percent or more of the gross income of the foreign corporation is effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States.

The tax on that portion of the dividends of the foreign corporation—our so-called "second dividend" tax—is thus confined to a case where the activities of the foreign corporation largely consist of operating a branch in the United States, so that the combination of our corporate tax on the branch profits and the second dividend tax results in about the same tax burden that would exist if the foreign corporation had conducted its U.S. business through a U.S. subsidiary.

The bill in two specific types of investment revises present law to remove tax clouds over that investment. As to real estate investment, an individual foreigner (or corporation) is permitted to elect to treat the income from the investment as trade or business income. He thereby may receive the benefits of deductions connected with that income and is taxable on the resulting net income at business rates if that approach is preferable to taxation on the gross income at withholding rates. This provision eliminates many tax uncertainties that presently attend investment in real property in the United States. As to stocks and securities, the bill provides generally that a foreigner, individual or corporate, trading in those investments in person or through a resident agent, who may or may not have discretion to carry on investment activities, will not thereby be regarded as being engaged in trade or business in the United States. This provision should serve to clarify uncertainties in present law which have confused potential foreign investors.

Finally, as respects the U.S. capital gains of foreign individual investors, the present unrealistic, and complicated rules have been restated to tax such gains only if the foreigner is in the United States for 183 days or more during the year, and thus has a "presence" here comparable to that which would make him a "resident" under the tax laws of many foreign countries. Also, capital gains effectively connected with a trade or business are subject to tax. In the case of foreign corporations, this is the only situation in which its U.S. capital gains are taxable.

This drawing back of U.S. source jurisdiction to a more realistic and administratively manageable position would materially simplify the tax rules which we present to the foreigner desiring to invest in our stocks and securities or real property. As a general rule, his periodic income would be subject only to withholding taxes, either at 30 percent or a lower treaty rate, and his capital gains would not be taxed. These results are not altered by extensive trading in stocks or securities, even where the trading is conducted by a U.S. broker who has discretion to act for him. His real estate investments would be taxed on a net income basis at regular rates if that is preferable, and if his real estate investments are so active or so conducted as to constitute a trade or business on their own account, and consequently taxable in any event at regular rates, any other investments not connected with the real estate would still remain subject only to the usual withholding rates. This simpler, logical pattern would serve to remove income tax barriers which our present structure now presents to the foreign investor.

Estate and gift taxation

The United States now presents the foreign individual investor with extremely high rates of estate tax on his U.S. investment. The estate tax starts at the $2,000 level and the rates climb to 77 percent. For a $100,000 estate in the United States this means an effective rate of 17 percent; for $500,000, 26 percent; for $1 million, 29 percent; and for $5 million, 43 percent. Such rates are among the highest in the world. Moreover, they are far above the rates we impose on our own citizens, a relationship that is just the reverse of that which generally prevails in other countries, or under our income tax provisions applicable to foreigners. It is thus clear why foreigners regard our estate tax as a real barrier to investment in the United States, and one that very often bars the investment or channels it into an investment made in foreign corporate form.

The bill recognizes the unreality of this existing rate structure. In seeking a lower and more realistic level, the bill uses as a standard the effective rates applied to our own citizens (under conditions where the estate of the U.S. decedent is eligible for the marital deduction, which permits property passing to a spouse to be untaxed up to one-half the total estate). The bill thus starts with an exemption of $30,000, in place of the present $2,000, and applies a 5-percent rate to the first $100,000 of taxable U.S. estate, rising to 10 percent thereafter up to $500,000 and then 15 percent up to $1 million. The top rate is 25 percent reached at $2 million (higher than the 15 percent recommended by the Treasury). The new rate schedule would thus provide effective rates of 3 percent on a $100,000 estate, 7 percent for $500,000, 10 percent for $1 million, and 18 percent for $5 million.

The bill reshapes the definition of U.S. property to include bonds of a U.S. corporation and other debt obligations of a U.S. obligor, regardless of the physical location of the instruments, and also deposits in U.S. banks. It thus rounds out the present definitions into a consistent pattern.

As a consequence, the foreign investor would see a far lower scale of U.S. estate tax rates on his U.S. investment, and one that compares favorably with a number of foreign countries. Moreover, since many of the European countries grant their citizens, either by statute or treaty with the United States, a credit against their domestic estate tax for the U.S. tax on the U.S. estate, the new rates would be largely or entirely absorbed through these credits. As respects our gift tax, the bill would leave applicable to that tax only tangible property located in the United States. Thus, the bill would present the foreigner with a U.S. estate and gift tax structure vastly different from the present pattern, and one that should in a meaningful way remove barriers that the present pattern now imposes.

Relationship to tax treaties

The provisions of the bill provide distinct benefits to foreigners with U.S. income or assets as compared to present law through the changes that we would be making in our statutory provisions. These changes, at the same time, represent approaches which we think are appropriate in the treaty area as well. Thus, our recent protocol with Germany, and the tentative draft of the Netherlands protocol, reflect in a number of instances the changes in the bill, for example, with respect to the abandonment of the force of attraction and the cutback in capital gains taxation.

And in the past our treaties, in establishing reduced withholding rates for investment income, have thereby also abandoned application to that income of our progressive rates. But treaties are bilateral and their restrictions reciprocal. These concessions on our part have been matched by similar concessions granted by the treaty country on income our taxpayers derive from that country. A unilateral grant of these concessions on our part, by a statutory revision, might thus seriously affect our treaty bargaining strength and make it more difficult for us to secure similar treaty concessions in the future. At the same time, we desire to remove as quickly as possible any inappropriate tax barriers to the foreign investor now contained in our statutory system. Unilateral action can be prompt and cover all foreigners, while the treaty process takes time and operates country by country.

The bill neatly meets these difficulties by, first, providing prompt action and wide coverage through the unilateral act of a statutory revision, and, second, by retaining treaty bargaining power and flexibility through empowering the President to reinstate the former statutory rules. The President can do so, with respect to the residents of a foreign country, when he finds that the foreign country, if requested by the United States, in a treaty negotiation for example, does not modify its taxes to parallel the changes we are making unilaterally. This power of the President can be applied on a selective basis, country by country and tax provision by tax provision, and need be applied only when he finds that it is in the public interest to do so in each case. Our treaty negotiators will thus be able to point out to a foreign country that our concessions are reversible, so that the negotiations can, in effect, proceed on a reciprocal basis.

Expatriates

The abandonment of the application of the progressive income tax rates to foreign individuals investing in the United States, the cut-back of other income tax provisions, and the reduction of estate tax rates would establish a distinctly brighter tax picture in the United States for the foreigner. Indeed, the picture is such that Americans may be tempted to become "foreigners" for tax reasons. In 1936, when the United States had similarly abandoned its progressive income tax rates as respects foreigners, it quickly restored them a year later, in part because some Americans had given up their citizenship to take advantage of the change. But to the extent possible we should not permit our tax problems with Americans to act as a bar to rational revisions in our treatment of foreigners. The proposed bill meets this objective by keeping American expatriates still subject to full U.S. tax on their U.S. income and assets, for 5 years after loss of citizenship in the case of the income tax and for 10 years in the case of the estate tax, where the loss of citizenship is motivated by the desire to avoid our taxes. Where such a result is contrary, however, to a tax treaty, the treaty would govern. But since our tax treaties are largely with countries whose tax systems involve rates at significant levels, an expatriate who establishes residence in those countries is not likely to be motivated by a desire to avoid U.S. taxes.

CONCLUSION

Current developments in our international tax relationships underscore the wide range of policy and administrative issues that are under consideration. Indeed, the continued rapid growth in international investment and trade has brought with it a multitude of varied tax problems that severely strain and press beyond our present framework of concepts and analysis. Intensive legal and economic thought to develop that framework into one adequate to the task—a framework that embodies a coherent logic capable of expansion to meet new patterns and relationships. In one sense this is a truly formidable task, since each of the countries of the world can claim a voice in the effort. But the ingenuity and insight promised by this host of architects should be viewed as welcome assets. The task for the United States is to see that in this international effort we play a role fitting to our position. We can do so if all of us with a stake in the outcome—the Government and its officials, our taxpayers with international activities and their advisers, our universities and research institutions and their scholars—work cooperatively in shaping our contribution.

The Food and Agriculture Organization—A Report on the 13th Session of the Conference, U.S. Assistance in Skopje, Yugoslavia, the Food-for-Peace Program in Greece and American Cemeteries in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the past session of the 89th Congress, it was my privilege to be selected to serve, together with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Olson], as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation at the 20th anniversary session of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations held in Rome, Italy.

During my participation in the FAO Conference, I also had an opportunity to briefly visit Greece in regard to a pending title IV, Public Law 480 agreement, and spend 1 day in Skopje, Yugoslavia. While in Italy, I also visited American cemeteries for servicemen killed in action in World War II.

Upon the convening of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, a report of my activities and observations was submitted to Speaker McCormack, who suggested a report along the lines contained in my correspondence to him be inserted in the Record. The Speaker's letter is as follows:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1966.

Hon. Bob Dole,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob: I am in receipt of your letter of January 21, giving me full information in relation to your attendance at the 13th session of the Conference of Food and Agriculture in Rome, Italy, which very informative letter I have read with special interest. I appreciate very much your thoughtfulness in sending the same to me. It would seem to me that you ought to insert a statement or report of some kind in the Record along the lines outlined in your letter to me. Such an insertion would be very informative to the Members of the House and to countless of persons who read the Congressional Record.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

John W. McCormack.

Accordingly, there follows my observations and report on the FAO Conference, the results of U.S. assistance to Skopje, Yugoslavia, the food-for-peace program in Greece, and comments on my visit to American cemeteries in Italy:

THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

A short distance from the ancient Colosseum in Rome, Italy, stands the very modern, white marble and glass complex of buildings known to the modern Romans as "fow," the Food and Agriculture Organization. Here 112 nations of the world gathered for the 13th Session of the Conference which is the primary governing body of the FAO.

BACKGROUND OF FAO

In May and early June of 1943, a 44-nation Conference on Food and Agriculture was held in Hot Springs, Va. Here the groundwork was laid for the organization which resulted in the signing of a constitution by 34 nations in Quebec, Canada, in October of 1945, and the first meeting of the conference. Before the conference had ended, 8 additional nations had joined, bringing the membership to 42. Temporary headquarters were established in Washington from 1945 to early 1951 when permanent headquarters were located in Rome.

During the two decades of its existence the membership has increased over 250 percent to its present strength of 112 nations. Many new nations have become members and some of the older ones have withdrawn. At one time China, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary were members. Now the only Communist-bloc country members are Cuba, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

The Conference, the primary governing body of FAO, holds regular sessions biennially. Special sessions may be called to deal with emergency or other special problems. Each member government may send one delegate to the Conference and has one vote. The delegates may be accompanied by alternates, associates, and advisers in accord with the desires of the respective governments. The Conference acts on application for membership in the organization, elects member governments to the council which is the governing body between sessions of the Conference, decides the level of the budget, sets the scale of contributions, reviews and approves the program of work, reviews the state of food and agriculture, makes decisions on administrative and constitutional questions, discusses any special topics that it may include in its agenda, and appoints the Director General and the Independent Chairman of the Council.

THE 13TH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

The rather large American delegation to the Conference, which met from November 20, to December 10, 1965, was led by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, accompanied by the official U.S. delegate, Assistant Secretary Dorothy Jacobson, and representatives of many other branches of the Government, including the State Department, Agriculture Department, and AID. The House of Representatives was officially represented by the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Olson, and myself, accompanied by Mr. Hyde Murray and Mr. George Misslbeck, staff members of the House Committee on Agriculture. While in Rome, two Members of Congress from Texas, Mr. Poage and Mr. Purcell, also attended the staff meetings and plenary sessions of the FAO. Some of the leading farm organizations were also represented; notably the American Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, the National Grange, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. At 8 a.m. on each morning of the Conference, the U.S. delegation held a staff meeting to discuss the previous day's activities and the day's agenda. We found these meetings both interesting and useful.

The first 7 days of the meeting were devoted to addresses by the delegates. Each delegate was allotted 20 minutes, and the majority used this time fully. Simultaneous translations in English, Spanish, French, and German were carried through headphones throughout the large auditorium.

Many of the delegates spent much of their time describing the accomplishments of agriculture in their respective countries, giving long lists of statistics. Some were critical of the accomplishments of FAO and the quality of technicians sent to the developing countries. The Cuban delegate subjected the membership to a 43-minute screaming harangue toward the end of which the Director General walked out after twice warning the Cuban that his time was up. The Cuban delegate made many comparisons between the conditions of agriculture before and after the revolution, painting a glowing picture of their tremendous successes, making one wonder why the Cuban people were standing in line waiting to leave the country. He also made numerous references to the North American capitalists, the neocolonialists, and the imperialists across the Straits of Florida.

Doing the balance of the Conference, three commissions met (often simultaneously) on the subjects within their jurisdiction. These meetings were more or less the sessions at which most of the work of the Conference was accomplished.

WORLD FOOD CRISIS

The general thought seemed to pervade the entire Conference and the various social gatherings that the world is at the doorstep of an enormous calamity. The population explosion, particularly in the underdeveloped nations, is fast outstripping the supplies of food. Unless some drastic measures are taken and more emphasis placed on food production rather than industrial production, the famine which now faces India will spread elsewhere in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the next couple of decades. Nearly two-thirds of the people living in poor nations do not get enough to eat, yet their food supply must double in the next 30 years if they are to maintain their same miserable level of existence. Population control was discussed as an eventual solution, but not as one of immediate practical impact. Expanded food output by both developed and underdeveloped nations were generally conceded to be the most practical step available in the next decade to close the mounting "food gap" on this planet. One could not escape the implication that unless something concrete is done, and soon, on this question facing the world, the possibility of a world famine will eclipse in importance contemporary issues of war or peace in the nuclear age.

CONCERN ABOUT U.S. FARM LEGISLATION

Another thought that one heard frequently, when talking to the various delegates, was the fear that the recent passage of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 would reduce the surplus of agricultural commodities in the United States to the point where we could no longer provide any aid even in emergencies. Secretary Freeman assured the meeting that this was not so and pointed out that the United States could put millions of acres back into production should any emergency be impending.

FAO BUDGET

The budget was approved and each country's contribution was assessed. The U.S. contribution is about one-third of the $49.5 million 2-year administrative budget and about 40 percent of the financial obligations under the special programs which are budgeted at $82 million during the period 1966-67.

The congressional advisers were in agreement that the American delegation effectively represented this country, both in the official functions and in the many social gatherings where political discussions were also carried on. I personally feel that Mrs. Jacobson did an excellent job in representing our country.

MEETING WITH DIRECTOR GENERAL

In a private half-hour meeting with the Director General, Dr. B. R. Sen of India, Mr. Murray and I were told of the famine now facing India. He said that unless the United States or some country can supply about 12 million tons of wheat during 1966, some 8 to 10 million people will die of starvation. India has been troubled with a shortage of water and severe drought conditions, so that even if they could under normal circumstances feed their own people, it would be impossible at this time. Dr. Sen also reflected the general concern expressed at the Conference over U.S. policies which might result in a reduction of American farm output. He also indicated his strong support for the concept that U.S. aid should be conditioned on action by recipient countries to increase their own agricultural production.

VISIT TO SKOPJE, YUGOSLAVIA

Background—Skopje disaster, July 26, 1963

On Friday the 26th of July, an earthquake of disaster proportions struck the city of Skopje, Yugoslavia. Reports there indicated almost the entire population was left homeless and that approximately 80 percent of the city's buildings were destroyed or rendered unfit for use. Over 1,000 people were killed. When the news of this disaster was flashed around the world, the response was immediate. During the first 7 days, while the men and women of Skopje were still searching the ruins for possible survivors, some 43 countries and voluntary agencies responded immediately with cash and material assistance.

Beyond meeting the immediate needs of the Skopje victims the U.S. Government took further measures. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman visited Skopje on August 9 and reported in part as follows:

"It was dramatically clear to me that the brave and resourceful people of Skopje already are beginning the difficult task of rebuilding their fine city. I was glad therefore to be able to inform President Tito that following urgent consultation with my colleagues in Washington, I have been authorized to offer Yugoslavia additional financial resources to the value of $50 million toward relieving the economic burden of the disaster. The additional resources are derived from dinar funds owned by the United States as a result of sales during recent years to Yugoslavia of our surplus agricultural commodities under our food-for-peace program (Public Law 480). These dinars originally had been set aside under sales agreements for the exclusive use of the United States. They will be made available on this basis: $25 million (equivalent) as a grant and $25 million (equivalent)as a long-term loan. These funds will be used for the relief and rehabilitation and reconstruction of Skopje.

"The United States has dinar holdings in Yugoslavia well in excess of U.S. needs for the foreseeable future. These local currencies are not dollars and they can be used only with Yugoslavia."

CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION VISIT IN 1963

At about the same time as the visit of Secretary Freeman, members of the House Committee on Agriculture also visited Skopje, accompanied by other Members of the House. This delegation consisted of Representatives HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman; W. R. POAGE, vice chairman and chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Operations; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, ranking minority Member; ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Armed Services Committee; GERALD R. FORD, Appropriaions Committee; and EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Foreign Affairs Committee.

On Sepember 26, 1963, the House Committee on Agriculture held a hearing on the Skopje earthquake tragedy and a lengthy discussion was held on the amount and type of aid given and projected. During the discussion Mr. COOLEY said: "I saw a lot of devastation in Europe and the Pacific during World War I and World War II, but I think this devastation is utterly complete and indefinable."

Mr. COOLEY also said concerning the $50 million: "We didn't see any sign of it over there. As Mr. POAGE says, there was a lot of talk about it. Now, has the money actually been made available, and if so, to whom and when?"

OBSERVATIONS ON SKOPJE

This question was not completely answered and with this in mind Committee staff members Hyde Murray and George Misslbeck and myself made arrangements to visit Skopje, some 2 years and 4 months after the tragedy. Transportation arrangements were made through the Embassy in Rome for the Naval Attaché at the American Embassy in Greece to supply an aircraft, an amphibious land-sea rescue craft, to fly from Athens to Skopje, although some doubt was cast as to how soon this could be accomplished as the Yugoslavs usually require that a flight plan be filed 7 to 10 days before the flight. Here was the first indication of their cooperativeness when the flight plan was approved within 24 hours. However, the Ambassador in Belgrade filed a flight plan to fly to Skopje to be with us and this was refused.

We left Athens about 8:30 a.m. on November 24, 1965, and after a flight through sleet, rain, and snow, landed on the grass and gravel runway of the Skopje airport. Here we were met by an aid to the vice president of the city council, Mr. Antonie Sazdovski, and a woman interpreter, Mrs. Dannce Sazdovski (no relation). There was a delay of about a half hour while waiting for an indifferent customs official. When he did arrive he said he couldn't stamp the passports as he did not have the rubber stamps which were in someone else's custody. After much discussion between the two escorts and the customs official, it was finally agreed that the passports would be stamped when the group left the airport in the afternoon. He was the only one who created any difficulty; everyone else was very hospitable and courteous.

Two cars were supplied for our group and they proceeded to the heart of the city. All rubble has been cleared, but many buildings still have large cracks and will eventually have to be demolished. The railroad station is still a shambles and may be left in that condition as a monument to the victims of the earthquake. The clock on the outer wall of the station still stands where it stopped at 5:16 on the morning of July 26, 1963.

The next stop was the temporary home of the city council where the delegation was greeted by the vice president of the council, Mr. Dragaljub Starrev, and another woman interpreter, Miss Ilinka Drakolevaska. She spoke excellent English and had recently returned from a year of study in England. She was an employee of the protocol office.

A short meeting was held in the office of the vice president, and he recounted a short history of the earthquake. His first mention was of the American field hospital which arrived only 24 hours after the disaster. The hospital was turned over to the local authorities when the Americans left and is now in storage to be used for emergencies.

Eventually the question came up as to what has been done with the $50 million worth of dinars given and loaned by the United States to the city—very little that we could determine. A very small amount had, been used for clearing expenses, but what was really needed in the initial phases of reconstruction was hard currencies to purchase supplies in other countries. However, we were told that the money will be used, particularly for roadbuilding. City officials said that only 10 days before we visited the city, a master plan for the complete rebuilding of the central part had been approved with great plans for wide avenues and boulevards, one of which will be named Kennedy Boulevard. Apparently here is where a good portion of the money will be expended. Mr. Starrev expressed the gratitude of the local citizens for all the aid they had received from many foreign governments and from the United States. He then suggested that the delegation tour some of the rebuilt sections of the city.

The first place visited was a fully equipped, four-story clinic, a gift of the Rumanian Government. One department was especially designed for ailments of athletes and featured special exercising equipment, therapeutic baths, and massage tables. Another department was a rather modern-looking X-ray facility. Hospital officials said that all people who work are entitled to free medical care. Outside the dental department was a large waiting room filled with people, and in the office were two dentists and another half-dozen people waiting their turn in the chairs.

Rumania also contributed three modern styled apartment buildings with 110 flats. The Czechoslovakian Government built a small community of steep-roofed houses completely furnished. Other bloc countries made their contributions of housing and this was pointed out. The Russians had contributed a steelmill. The Swedes and Norwegians were building a 250-bed hospital for children, specializing in TB cases. This was on a hillside overlooking the city and was a very attractive building. Inside it was completely equipped with modern kitchens, cribs, small tables and chairs, and medical rooms. It was to be turned over to the Yugoslavs in a few days.

THE AMERICAN CONTRIBUTION

Then our group was driven a short distance out of town to see the American contribution. It was a rather disturbing sight. Here were a large group of dirty quonset huts set in a muddy field. Concrete walks covered with corrugated plastic did connect the various buildings within a group, but the streets connecting the groups were deep in mud. Gypsies were quartered in these buildings, one of which had been set aside as a school. Heating was supplied by GI potbellied stoves. We understood one interpreter to say that these buildings had been used for the American Army units stationed there for rescue work and then turned over to the city. The other interpreter said that these units had been built specifically as a gift and had been occupied for about a year. They looked to be 10 years old.

Mr. Starrev insisted that we have lunch with him at the local hotel and it turned out to be a rather elaborate dinner. Relations were very cordial and the dinner was enjoyed by all. Unfortunately we had to return to the airport immediately after eating to be able to take off before dark. There were no landing lights or any navigational aids at this airport serving this city of a quarter million people.

On the return flight we encountered strong headwinds, heavy icing conditions, and limited visibility, but the skies cleared as we approached Athens and a good landing was made at about 9 p.m.

TITLE IV 480 AGREEMENT WITH GREECE

During our 2 days in Athens, I had an opportunity to discuss with our agricultural attaché, Mr. Motz, and Ambassador Phillips Talbot, a pending title IV long-term dollar credit agreement involving the sale of feed grains to Greece under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program.

Without going into all of the details, this proposal involved the question of exporting feed grains to Greece at a time she held a modest surplus of wheat. The reasoning in support of such an arrangement was impressive and I expressed this sentiment to Secretary Freeman in Rome, and to Agriculture Department officials in Washington, upon my return. Recently our Government announced the new title IV agreements, which call for the eventual repayment of the entire proceeds in dollars.

We also toured agricultural areas surrounding Athens and saw vast areas devoted to wheat farming. The Lake Kopais reclamation area was of considerable interest. We were informed some 60,000 hectares of land had been reclaimed and used for irrigated farming. Although the farms were small, modern farm equipment was being used. As in our country, Greek farmers have a problem in acquiring sufficient farm labor. Many Greeks have emigrated to Western Europe for better paying industrial jobs.

In Greece, as in many other countries, cattle are tripurpose animals: work, milk, and meat. Beef-feeding operations are almost unknown. The largest beef-feeder is feeding about 300 head, which is mainly for the hotel trade. Most of the beef is slaughtered one day and sold fresh the next day. There is little or no refrigeration in the majority of the shops visited.

Poultry is still a delicacy and generally costs more than lamb, mutton, or beef. When frozen American poultry was first introduced, it gained wide acceptance. The trade name of the first frozen birds is still synonymous with all frozen poultry and commands the highest price.

Poultry raising is a farmyard operation, but we were told, about 20 integrators are now in operation. The largest is growing about 500,000 birds. He produces his own feed, processes it, feeds it, slaughters, and distributes through about 50 retail outlets in Athens. We visited one retail shop in a residential area, and the chickens being sold were very similar to our white broilers of 3 to 3½ pounds, and were about 52 cents a pound. The only other product handled in these outlets was fresh eggs.

Later we visited the Greek Parliament which, in appearance, is very much like the U.S. House Chamber. The Speaker is in the center, and the Members' seats are arranged in a semicircle. The galleries for spectators are the same except that there are two levels. The king sits where our press gallery is located. The conservatives sit on the right of the Speaker, the majority party in the center, and the leftists on the left.

I also visited with two Athens families related to some Kansas constituents. They were most hospitable and we enjoyed visiting about Kansas and Greece.

Upon our return to Rome from Greece and Yugoslavia, I attended the American delegation staff meeting and conferred with Secretary Freeman in regard to a pending Public Law 480 title IV agreement with the Government of Greece.

NORTHERN ITALY

Over the weekend of November 26, 1965, I visited the area in northern Italy, around Castel D'Aiano, where I had been wounded in World War II while serving as a platoon leader in the 10th Mountain Infantry Division. It was indeed a strange feeling to return to the spot of foreign soil which had such a profound effect on my life.

There has been little change in this mountainous area, but I was more than a little surprised to find the trenches and foxholes much as they were over 20 years ago. It was from this general area the American forces launched their last major push in Italy which carried them across the Po Valley. The return to the Appenines was an interesting personal experience I shall long remember. Needless to say, the pro-American attitude of the Italians there was impressive and encouraging.

AMERICAN CEMETERIES

Nearby, in Florence, the U.S. Battle Monuments Commission maintains a truly beautiful memorial cemetery for American troops killed in World War II. Together with the cemetery at Anzio-Nettuno (which we later visited) some 12,000 of the 35,000 Americans killed in the Battle of Italy are interred. These cemeteries are both well managed and well maintained as fitting memorials to those Americans who made the supreme sacrifice for their country. At each cemetery I presented the officials in charge an American flag which had flown over the U.S. Capitol. Every American who visits Italy should take time to visit an American cemetery if at all possible. You feel proud of your country and thankful, beyond description, to those who have given their lives to preserve our precious freedoms.

In conclusion, I again thank Speaker McCormack and the minority leader, Mr. Ford, for this assignment as it was interesting and gratifying to have such an opportunity. I feel certain this assignment will be invaluable in the days ahead as new challenges are faced at home and abroad.

Improving Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. HANSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, since its conception in the 1940's, our foreign aid program has been an almost constant target of the professional critics. I would like to present some factual statistics concerning the program.

The present aid program represents less than six-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product, and less than 3½ percent of the Federal budget. These percentages are the lowest since the program began in the 1940's.

More than 80 percent of all aid dollars are spent for U.S. goods and services. Less than half was spent on U.S. goods 5 years ago. The program's impact on our balance of payments is thus a rather minor factor. It is far smaller, for example, than tourist expenditures or luxury imports.

No fewer than 14 recipient countries are now in the process of transition from depending on aid to relying on more normal sources of lending and investment. So the program has not been without successes.

Recently President Johnson has proposed several changes to further streamline and improve our foreign aid program.

I submit an editorial from the February 3 issue of the Des Moines Register for the benefit of my colleagues. This article gives a short and concise view of the President's plan:

IMPROVING FOREIGN AID

President Johnson proposed a number of constructive changes in his foreign aid message to Congress.

He submitted requests for $3.39 billion for military and economic aid in two bills instead of the usual one, for the purpose of "clarifying the goals and functions of these programs in the minds of the public and the Congress." This is a step which Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has long advocated.

The change had been resisted in part for historic reasons. Practically all U.S. aid was military or "defense support" at the time of the Korean war. There was also a hope that some of the congressional and public support for the military would rub off on economic aid. President Johnson now opts for clarity rather than sympathy.

The President said he would send a separate message and additional separate bills soon for $1 billion for food aid, assistance to foreign agricultural productivity, and to foreign health and education. (Much of the $1 billion is included in the $3.39 billion asked February 1.) Food aid he recognizes as a temporary device and proposes to shift to harder financial terms "as quickly as our mutual interests permit." But health, education and agricultural productivity he rightly regards as efforts to deal with the basic causes of poverty.

For aid to foreign agricultural production he asks a big increase of half a billion dollars a year. Too much foreign aid money has been spent on showy buildings, dams and highways, and not enough on what should come first in hungry peasant lands: more efficient production of food.

The administration has started classifying food for peace as foreign aid, which it is, instead of including it in the Department of Agriculture budget as aid to farmers. The Department of Agriculture will continue to have major duties in handling the food-for-peace program, in cooperation with the Agency for International Development and the food-for-peace office. But an attempt will be made to get across to the public that the entire cost of this program should not be charged on the books as a subsidy to farmers.

The President's intention is to be much harder headed in the whole aid program than in the past. He wants to concentrate U.S. aid on countries willing to help themselves, willing to keep their commitments and "not hostile to us."

Finally, the President is making another try to get a longer term "authorization" from Congress, for 5 years instead of 1. The actual appropriations will continue to be for 1 year at a time, so this in no way diminishes the power of Congress to insist on changes from year to year. But it is a reminder to Congress and to the country that this is a long-term proposition. Needs will continue, results will not be quick.

Americans can take pride in the growing number of countries which have outgrown U.S. aid, including some in Asia as well as Western Europe. But things are tough almost all over, and foreign aid remains a moral duty of an affluent nation and an indispensable tool of U.S. foreign policy in the interests of the United States itself. Mistakes have been made, some of them avoidable; but the program continues, year after year, under constant scrutiny and readjustment by President and Congress.

Father Shea Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Francis J. Shea, P.R., has been appointed pastor emeritus of the Immaculate Conception Church, Waukegan, Ill., as of February 15, 1966. This climaxes more than 50 years of service as a priest in Waukegan and Chicago.

The golden jubilee celebration honoring Father Shea was held last May 30, 1965. Many of the events which have been identified with Father Shea's life were recalled and this great man of God was appropriately honored at that time.

Father Shea came to Waukegan from Chicago in 1926 to become the pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church. He was among those who officiated at the laying of the cornerstone of the new edifice in 1928. Indeed, this great structure will always be associated with Father Shea's life of devotion and service to his parishioners, his church and his community. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because Father Shea was primarily responsible for the relocation of Immaculate Conception Church, the parish school, rectory, and convent which now stand as a great center of religious and educational activity at Grand Avenue and West Street in Waukegan. The Immaculate Conception Parochial School, erected at a cost of more than $900,000, was opened for classes in 1955.

Father Shea's service spread to other areas of useful activity. He was one of those responsible for the location of St. Therese Hospital in Waukegan and of the Ascension Catholic Cemetery near Libertyville. He has served many other needs over the years.

During World War II, Father Shea arranged for the purchase and directed the activities of a Catholic United Service Organization Center in Waukegan. Here was provided hospitality for thousands of servicemen, particularly from the Great Lakes Naval Training Center nearby.

In assuming his new duties as pastor of Immaculate Conception Church, Father Paul J. Cull has made public acknowledgment of his heritage gained through close association with Father Shea. Public figures and religious leaders from all denominations are united in their tributes of respect and honor to Father Shea on the occasion of his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Father Shea's leadership as pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church and the spiritual and moral direction which he has provided within his own parish and within the community have brought precious gifts from which residents of Waukegan and all citizens of the 12th Illinois District have benefited. I join today, in behalf of all of those whom I have the privilege of representing, in honoring and paying tribute to Father Francis J. Shea, pastor emeritus of Immaculate Conception Church, Waukegan, Ill.

Majority of One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the good newspapers in the 14th District of Illinois is the Naperville Clarion, and its editor is Jane Witte, who writes an excellent personal column called "Majority of One."

In it she discusses with considerable perception a great variety of subjects, and in a recent column she had some things to say about the Federal Government. To be sure, it was written with tongue in cheek, but I think it could be instructive to all of us here in Washington.

MAJORITY OF ONE BY JANE WITTE

I was going to begin saving money systematically.

Old age and poverty would probably arrive at the same moment, I reasoned. One of the two is enough—or so I thought.

Last week I listened to a new program on television, a color spectacular called "The L.B.J. Giveaway."

Then, somehow, the idea seemed so futile and so unnecessary, after 30 minutes of listening to "never fear, Lyndon's here."

I discovered that by the time I get turned out to pasture, it is going to be great to be poor.

No need to worry about doctors' bills, hospital bills, dental bills. Someone will care—medicare will care.

The poor home of the future will have features in step with the times, I envision my own suite in Federal Poor House, Ill., 6223. It overlooks a lake in a scenic but economically depressed section of our great strong wealthy Nation. It was built of native material under the direction of and financed by the rural renewal program.

A motorized wheelchair will whiz me down the dock—an army surplus number left over from world war III. There I can cast my hula popper with the help of an electric, automatic reel which prevents backlash, to my heart's content.

By that time, hula poppers will not only wiggle over the water, they'll hum harmonies such as "Lovely Hula Hands" which all bass will find irresistably attractive.

Handsome lads—members of the Job Corps—will be on hand to gently disengage the hopelessly hooked bass from the steely clutches of my hula popper. I shall have my choice, bass fried in (surplus) butter or bass pitched back into the (Federal flood control program) waters.

When bored, I'll motor back into the poor house and from my third floor balcony watch the sun set. Sunset colors will be varied evening to evening by space walkers who from great heights are painting the (smog-free) clouds with sunshine.

These men are retired astronauts who do this for a hobby.

As the light dwindles, I open the sliding doors and view the index on the book selector. A quick touch on the keys indicated: Up the shoot comes my novel for the night, courtesy U.S. National Educational Equal Opportunity Act CLC.

And the late snack. The food selector tells me what's in the poor house larder. Synthetic shrimp (made with soybeans), diet crackers (made with soybeans), that delicious ice in three dozen flavors, take your choice (made of soybeans)—it's only a question of what flavor soybeans I'd like. At this stage, soybeans are still very popular in the Department of Federal Food for Poor People.

A beautiful young creature glides in to dial my bed to the correct degree of warmth for my old weary bones. She pats my frail shoulder, placing six pin curls in my few remaining scraggly grey locks, finds my hormone face cream under the dressing table where I dropped it, then wishes me good night.

She is training in the new Government program "Human Touch." It is required that each day she touch 10 old people on the shoulder and so comfort them for the dark night ahead.

There I am—old, frail, poor—it is true. But on a full stomach, with a well-stocked lake in front of my (poor) house and with instant books and instant multiflavored (soybean) snacks at my beck and call.

Will it be that way? Who knows. But isn't it a lovely thought.

Say yes. Because after we get done picking up the tab for the Great Society via higher auto prices, via higher phone taxes, via (it has to come) higher income taxes, via now-increased social security payments, after struggling with the mortgage and sending kids through school and feeding (the L.B.J. way) the underfed of the world and educating (the L.B.J. way) the uneducated of the world.

And after eradicating poverty (the L.B.J. way) where do you think people like us are going to be—rich?

Like I said, I changed my mind. Saving money is not only futile, unnecessary, but also impossible.

Guess I'll buy a new dress.

Serious Reflections by 16-Year-Old Mark Slack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to include extraneous material, I want to call to the attention of the membership of the House of Representatives, some words of wisdom expressed by 16-year-old Mark Slack, son of Dr. and Mrs. Frederick Slack, who is an honor student in Dixon, Ill., High School.

The following article which reflects the consensus of today's youth and their high regard for law and order recently appeared in the Voice of Youth Column of the Chicago Tribune:

ARE YOU A TRAITOR?

(By Mark Slack, Dixon junior)

According to the famous English philosopher, John Locke, everyone is born with certain God-given rights, among these are life, liberty, and property. He also believed that the Government should protect these rights.

These beliefs are the ones around which our Government was formed. We still believe in this theory almost 200 years later.

There are some persons, though, who do not seem to concern themselves with these rights—persons who are so prejudiced they have taken the lives of civil rights workers; persons who are so indolent, they have abused their liberty by not voting; and persons so blinded by intolerance they have destroyed another's property.

Who do people think they are that they can take away God-given rights? To me they are traitors to themselves, to God, and to the United States of America.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mark Slack, 16, son of Dr. and Mrs. Frederick Slack, is on the honor roll in Dixon, Ill., high school where he sings with the robed choir and is a member of the dramatics club, chess club, and science club. He has not chosen a college but will major in mathematics.)

Fifty-eight Percent Say Congress Should Decide Dates for Daylight Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. **FRASER**. Mr. Speaker, there is broad public support for Congress to pass a law that would set uniform dates for starting and ending daylight saving time wherever it is used in our country. In my own State a poll showed 58 percent favoring congressional action.

A number of bills are before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. These include S. 1404, passed by the Senate last year, H.R. 1581, introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], the chairman of the committee, two I have introduced, and several others.

The committee has completed hearings. I hope we can take action in time to avoid the scramble of time changes that threatens to strike again this spring.

I have unanimous consent to set out in the RECORD a report of the opinion poll from Minnesota on this subject:

MINNESOTA POLL: 58 PERCENT SAY CONGRESS SHOULD DECIDE DATES FOR DAYLIGHT SAVING

Minnesotans are divided on whether to start daylight saving time (d.s.t.) in late April or in late May, but a majority of State residents think it would be better if Congress set uniform limits for all States who use it.

In a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll, 58 percent of the people interviewed favor having Congress establish uniform dates for daylight time.

The switchover to d.s.t. in Minnesota was complicated this year because some communities like Duluth and Winona started 4 weeks ahead of the official date.

That development led Representative DONALD FRASER of Minneapolis to introduce a bill in the U.S. House of Representatives calling for daylight time to begin each year on the last Sunday in April and continue until the last Sunday in October. His bill would apply just to d.s.t. States.

The final question in the series was: "Which do you think is better—that Congress decide when daylight time should start and end for all States that use it, or that each State decide that for itself?"

The response of different types of State residents:

[In percent]

	Let Congress decide	Let each State decide	Other and no opinion
All adults	58	35	7
Men	58	34	8
Women	59	35	6
Residents of Twin Cities and Duluth	61	34	5
Smaller cities	61	36	3
Town	64	25	11
Farm	42	47	11
People who—			
Like DST	60	36	4
Dislike DST	53	35	12

Padded Agricultural Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. **FISHER**. Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested in the progress of agricultural exports and, judging by official reports, they have been performing admirably in recent years.

The following table will show the progress during the past 12 years, through 1964:

U.S. exports of agricultural products, 1953–64

Year	Exports (millions)	Share of total exports (percent)
1953	$2,847	18.0
1954	3,054	20.0
1955	3,199	21.0
1956	4,170	22.0
1957	4,506	22.0
1959	3,955	23.0
1960	4,832	24.0
1962	5,034	24.0
1963	5,585	24.0
1964	6,347	25.6

Source: U.S. Foreign Agricultural Trade by Commodities, calendar year 1963, June 1964, ERS, U.S. Department of Agriculture; also October 1965.

By looking at these statistics we are struck not only by the doubling of dollar exports since 1954, but also by the increase in the share of total exports enjoyed by agricultural exports. This share rose from 18 percent in 1953 and 20 percent in 1954 to 25.6 percent in 1964.

This fact would seem to call for congratulations to the Department of Agriculture.

However, let us not forget that Public Law 480 was passed in 1954. In 1956 agricultural exports jumped to $4,170 million or by a billion over 1955. Since 1959 there has been a steady growth in exports of farm products, rising to $6,347 million in 1964, a record high. The 1965 total is not yet available but the indications are that there was a slight decline to $6.2 billion in that year, from the 1964 high.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in a statement in the November 1965 issue of "Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, Economic Research Service, Department of Agriculture." It said, to quote:

> The major factor behind such a rapid export expansion was the high rate of industrial growth in Western Europe and Japan.

However, if we look at page 7 of the same publication, table 1, we find that the share of Europe in our total agricultural exports dropped from 48 percent in 1959 to 43 percent in 1964. Asia's share went in the opposite direction, or from 25 percent of the total in 1959 to 31 percent in 1964. However, Japan's share dropped from 39.5 percent of our total agricultural exports to Asia in the 1955–59 period to 36.9 percent in 1964. India's share, on the other hand, rose sharply from $153 million in the 1955–59 period to $480 million in 1964 or from 15.6 percent of our total agricultural exports to Asia in the 1955–59 period to 24.6 cents in 1964. There was also a sharp rise in such exports to Iran—a sixfold increase—and a threefold increase to Pakistan—see table 14, same publication, pages 17–18. The upshot is that of the billion-dollar increase in our agricultural exports to Asia during this period only a third went to Japan while two-thirds of the increase went to other Asiatic countries, mostly to India, Pakistan, Iran, and Iraq.

It is therefore difficult to follow the statement quoted above, to the effect that the major factor behind the rapid rise in our agricultural exports has been the high rate of industrial growth in Europe and Japan.

When Europe's share of our total agricultural exports dropped from 48 to 43 percent between 1959 and 1964 and Japan's share of our exports to Asia dropped from 39.5 percent in the 1955–59 period to 36.9 percent in 1964, it must be apparent that some other factor was at work; and of course it was the increase in shipments to such countries as India, Pakistan, and so forth. These were, as we know, heavily dependent on Public Law 480 shipments.

Mr. Speaker, we are very much in need of clear statistics in this field, particularly if we are to unravel unsubsidized and unassisted exports of farm products from exports that move in private channels on a competitive basis.

For the latest fiscal year the Department of Agriculture reports total agricultural exports of $6.09 billion. This was for the year ended June 20, 1965. Of this total $1.669 billion were indeed reported in the Agriculture Department's publication as exports under Government-financed programs, leaving a total of $4.426 billion which were classified as "commercial" exports.

The trouble with this classification so far as reflecting the competitive position of this country is concerned, is that it does not go far enough. My reason for saying this is that we export "commercially" about a billion dollars worth of wheat, wheat flour, raw cotton, rice, and so forth, outside of the Public Law 480 or AID program. These sales are made because of a considerable Federal subsidy of these products and not because we are competitive.

If we add such exports to those that we shipped under titles I–IV of Public Law 480, and so forth; that is, those classified by the Department of Agriculture as Government-financed programs, the $1.669 billion rises to $2.605 billion. This will leave $3.599 billion as truly commercial competitive exports of agricultural products in the 1964–65 fiscal year instead of $4.426 billion—see table 3, page 15, of the above cited Department of Agriculture publication.

This leaves a considerably less brilliant accomplishment. No doubt we could export well above $6 billion in agricultural products if we first, sold more for foreign currencies under title I, Public Law 480; second, moved more exports under famine and emergency relief under title II of Public Law 480; third, increased foreign donations under section 416, Agriculture Act of 1949 and section 302, Public Law 480; and fourth, and offered more shipments under barter programs—CCC Charter Act; section 303, Public Law 480; and so forth.

But if we did so we would not advance by one iota the competitive capacity of this country in foreign markets. This is a matter of production costs, and giving away agricultural products does not reduce costs of production. It tends to raise them because of the higher tax burden created.

Mr. Speaker, the false impression created by the inclusion of subsidized farm products in our exports and shipments under Public Law 480, and so forth, is matched by another statistical practice that is equally pernicious in its effects. I refer to what has been called the f.o.b.-c.i.f. distortion. All the other leading trading nations report their imports on the c.i.f. basis. This merely means that they record the true cost of the goods imported by adding to the foreign price, the cost of shipping and insurance incident to bringing the goods to their ports of entry.

What is our practice? We leave off these charges and record the value of our imports at their foreign price, point of export. If anyone believes this to be a minor matter he should compare the price of an automobile at its f.o.b. Detroit level and what the cost would be if he took delivery several thousand miles away.

From calculations made on the basis of actual import and export statistics of this country in its trade with England and Japan, it seems safe to say that our imports from these countries are undervalued from 20 to 25 percent for the reason just set forth. This represents a serious distortion, and we should review all our import statistics with this distortion in mind.

Surely we cannot base our trade policies on unreliable statistics. Yet that is what we have been doing.

It has been estimated that in place of a $5.2 billion surplus in our exports over imports for 1965 as reported recently by the Department of Commerce we actually ran a deficit of about $2 billion, when the figures are corrected by the guides I have set forth above.

I am very anxious to see this statistical practice corrected as soon as possible and am introducing appropriate legislation to that end. I urge all who are concerned about a sound foreign trade policy to take an interest in this matter and to support the legislation.

Migratory Bird Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the Congressional Record a release from the 31st North American Wildlife & Natural Resources Conference to be held in the Hilton Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., March 14–16, 1966, at which time an announcement will be made of the establishment of a Migratory Bird Treaty Stamp to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Migratory Bird Treaty between the United States, Great Britain, and Canada.

This was one of the great milestones of American conservation and wildlife history and it is highly appropriate that the announcement be made at that time. Also inserted into the Record is background information on the 50th anniversary of the Migratory Bird Treaty with Great Britain and Canada made available by the Wildlife Management Institute, one of the outstanding wildlife and conservation organizations in the United States.

The material follows:

Migratory Bird Treaty Stamp To Be Issued at Wildlife Conference

A new 5-cent postage stamp commemorating the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Migratory Bird Treaty that provides uniform protection for migratory birds in the United States and Canada will be issued on March 16 at Pittsburgh, Pa. The stamp-issuance ceremony will be held in conjunction with the 31st North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, which will be held at the Pittsburgh Hilton Hotel, March 14–16, under the sponsorship of the Wildlife Management Institute.

Described as a starkly modern artwork, the horizontal stamp features two birds in white outline, one flying north, the other south, at the Canadian border. Canada is red; the United States blue; the Great Lakes a lighter blue. At the top in a white panel appears in black capitals "Migratory Bird Treaty/1916 United States-Canada 1966." The words "U.S. Postage Five Cents" appear in black in a white panel at the bottom.

The Migratory Bird Treaty was signed in Washington, D.C., by Sir Cecil Arthur Spring and Secretary of State Robert Lansing on August 16, 1916. President Woodrow Wilson, after receiving the advice and consent of the Senate, proclaimed the treaty December 8, 1916.

The treaty observed that "many species of birds in the course of their annual migrations traverse certain parts of the United States and the Dominion of Canada; that many of these species are of great value as a source of food or in destroying insects which are injurious to forests and forage plants * * * as well as to agricultural crops * * * but are nevertheless in danger of extermination through lack of adequate protection during the nesting season or while on their way to and from their breeding grounds."

Collectors desiring first day cancellations may send addressed envelopes, together with remittance to cover the cost of the stamps to be affixed, to the Postmaster, Pittsburgh, Pa., 15219. Send money order or certified check only. The envelope to the Postmaster should be endorsed "First Day covers 5-cent Migratory Bird Treaty Stamp." Requests must be postmarked not later than March 16.

Background Information: 50th Anniversary of the Migratory Bird Treaty With Great Britain and Canada

By 1910 it was apparent that the effects of year-round hunting of migratory birds with improved firearms for both sport and commerce, coupled with the vagaries of weather and the demands of an expanded rural population, were drastically decreasing the abundance which characterized the frontier era.

It was also evident to the leading conservationists of the time that this was a matter of national concern which would not be met by individual actions of the several States.

On August 16, 1916, the Convention Between the United States and Great Britain for the Protection of Migratory Birds in the United States and Canada was signed. The treaty was ratified later that year and proclaimed by President Wilson on December 8, 1916. It remains a unique action among nations in dealing with wildlife protection and preservation. It was an extraordinary treaty between sovereign nations when it was signed and remains so after 50 years.

This treaty afforded international protection for the first time to named migratory game and nongame birds common to both Canada and the United States and made each nation responsible for enacting its own laws to implement the treaty provisions.

Nine families of migratory game birds and 33 families of insectivorous and other nongame species are under its protection. Migratory waterfowl and the recreation these birds afford have particularly benefited from the treaty.

The direct and indirect effects of the treaty and the resulting national legislation to implement it have been much broader than those envisioned by the proponents of the treaty. This international agreement has affected legislation and regulations of most of the States.

More than 230 waterfowl refuges and over 45 general migratory bird refuges comprising over 2 million acres have been acquired or set aside by the U.S. Government in addition to nearly 100 waterfowl production areas comprising over 100,000 acres. A broad program of migratory bird research costing over $1,800,000 anually has developed in the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

An International Bird Banding Center at Laurel, Md., is the focal point of a single system of bird banding on the continent. Here records are maintained on automatic data processing systems which support studies of migratory birds by both professionals and amateurs.

An International Migratory Bird Committee, consisting of an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and an Assistant Secretary of the Interior for the United States, and the Canadian Director of Agriculture and Canada's Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, was formed in 1961 to give further attention to the continental management of migratory birds.

Four flyway councils, consisting of State and Provincial officials, give continuing attention to the welfare of migratory waterfowl. Cooperation among these councils, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Canadian Wildlife Service provide for the most comprehensive annual surveys and continued studies of migratory birds in the world.

The Canadian Government carries out research, establishes hunting regulations, and provides law enforcement in its implementation of the treaty. Canada also is embarking on a wetlands preservation program.

The effectiveness of this treaty led to the development of a similar agreement with Mexico, concluded in 1936.

Your Town May Just Need Stirring Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRAHAM PURCELL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, every person who has the opportunity to visit Burkburnett, Tex., is impressed by the aggressiveness and activity in that community.

Burkburnett offers ample evidence of the old rule that "communities that pull together get things done."

Recently the Christian Science Monitor told the story of Burkburnett's projects which are being entered in the 1964–65 community improvement program sponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears, Roebuck Foundation.

To those interested in learning what an outstanding community can do to make itself a better place to live, I commend the following article:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 26, 1966]

YOUR TOWN MAY JUST NEED STIRRING UP

BURKBURNETT, TEX.—When high school students must travel 15 miles to the nearest library to study for exams, your town's in a bad way.

Facing such a dilemma, citizens of Burkburnett decided a library was first among many town needs. The Council of Federated Study Clubs, of which Mrs. F. M. McMurtry is president, saw those needs, entered the community improvement program (CIP) last February, and called a communitywide meeting at the town hall.

High school students as well as their elders were on hand for the meeting.

"We will make enough patrons to justify the library," said the students. They were articulate. They still are and they take active part in Burkburnett's community projects. The student council is among the 40 organizations represented on the Community Service Council.

The Community Service Council was organized by the steering committee appointed at the initial meeting. Having no pattern for the new council, Burkburnett cut its own. Mrs. Marjorie Kauer wrote the constitution and bylaws.

Like many another community, Burkburnett's big need was for citizens to pull together. That they had not done so until recently might perhaps be explained in part by the town's history.

When Burkburnett was incorporated in 1907, there was an oil well in every back yard, and water sold for more than oil. A decade later came World War I and an oil boom. Remember the movie "Boom Town"? Burkburnett was that town. Its population soared to 30,000 but slumped back to 5,000 when peace came and ended the boom.

POPULATION CLIMBING

Old shacks and store buildings remained as shabby reminders of the vanished prosperity. A few of them survived over the years. But they have been fast disappearing as Burkburnett, spurred by its women citizens, presses on with the library and other projects.

The population is rising. In the past decade, Burkburnett has doubled its population and tripled its school enrollment. Farming, ranching, and business from Sheppard Air Force Base give stability to the economy.

It was spring in January the day I landed at the Wichita Falls Airport. On the 15-mile drive to Burkburnett, I heard about some of its accomplishments.

There was a cleanup week (November 8–15) with Joe Salter, chairman of the civic improvement committee and vice president of the Community Service Council, in charge. On November 11, schoolchildren were given a half holiday and furnished litter bags with which they cleared the streets. High school students worked by classes on assigned areas; the seniors won the student council award for the best job.

Members of the ministerial alliance manned tractors to mow vacant lots. Members of the men's clubs cleared downtown streets and alleys.

As we swung into town through an underpass, one of my hostesses apologized for beer cans and other roadside litter. Burkburnett itself is dry by local option, she said, but beer is available in nearby towns. Boy Scouts are trying to cope with the nuisance and do the clearing-up, but soon the police will step in.

At the home of Mayor James E. Frye, some of the clubwomen talked of their projects while Mrs. Frye, the steering-committee chairman, served hot-mulled cranberry and pineapple juice and sandwiches.

LIBRARY PUSHED

"The most important thing for us," said Mrs. Frye, "is to have a real cross section of our town in this, and we have. No one group or individual is doing it."

Membership in the Community Service Council extends to two rural home-demonstration clubs and the nearby Clara-Fairview organized rural community. Claude Adams, Clara-Fairview president, is chairman of the Burkburnett library committee and board.

"I've lived here all my life," said Mrs. Philip Carpenter, first and only woman on the Burkburnett City Council, "and we've never had a library—always had to go 15 miles to Wichita Falls."

The library committee did research on the choice of a site, funds available, and standards. They visited other libraries and consulted with the Texas State librarian in Austin.

"Many of our first ideas had to be revised," the women told me. "Our park would not be an ideal site. The library couldn't be successfully operated by volunteers. We knew that what we got we'd have to live with a long time. If we were going to have a library we'd have to think big."

At this point things happened. Mr. and Mrs. Walter Bohner gave a lot opposite Town Hall with a frame building, their former family home. They also gave $1,000. Many other donations have since come in.

The old house will be removed to an adjoining lot. Meanwhile, architect's plans have been approved for an $84,000 library building. The city will vote on a $42,000 bond issue to be matched by State funds.

"A bunch of little people trying to do big things," some people said at first. But now that they see things shaping up they've changed their opinions. Everybody is behind the project.

"People's attitude is wonderful," said Mr. Adams.

Vietnam Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, during this period of discussion on the whole range of problems associated with the Vietnam conflict some very excellent appraisals of the situation have been made. I respectfully include in the RECORD the following editorial from the Long Island Press about the views of former Ambassador George Kennan, and commend it to the attention of this distinguished body:

NEITHER DOVE NOR HAWK

George Kennan, our former Ambassador to Moscow and one-time chairman of State Department policy planning, did the Nation a great service last week in his testimony at a Senate airing of Vietnam policy. He made the point, too often lost in the passion of this debate, that we have to be neither doves, hightailing it away from danger, nor hawks, swooping down on the enemy. We can be wise old owls—or better yet, reasonable, realistic human beings.

Surrender? Of course not, said Kennan. "Precipitate and disorderly withdrawal could represent in our present circumstances a disservice to our own interests and even to world peace greater than any that might have been involved in our failure to engage ourselves in the first place."

On the other hand, he doubted that even the most formidable military successes would bring about "the complete disappearance of the recalcitrants with which we are faced, the formal submission by the adversaries to our will and the complete realization of our present stated political aims."

If we have such difficulty in tiny Vietnam, just think of the formidable task in imposing our will on 700 million Chinese.

To "dig in and wait" for a political solution to emerge, as Mr. Kennan suggested, is essentially what we are doing in Asia. And it is essentially the policy we have followed successfully in Europe—since 1945, a policy largely shaped by Mr. Kennan himself. The differences are in degree, not in substance—whether it be Mr. Kennan's "diggin' in" or Gen. James M. Gavin's enclaves or Lyndon Johnson's more aggressive, yet quite limited, kind of war.

We can profit from the long experience of cold war confrontation in Europe and apply some of its lessons to the hotter war in Asia. The hawks and the doves were busy in Europe, too, with one side urging us to destroy the other to embrace the Soviets. But the Russian bear dies hard, as Hitler discovered even before atom bombs; and his embrace can be a fatal hug, as hundreds of thousands in East Europe well know.

We took—and still take—neither course. Instead, we built up our allies in West Europe and drew lines beyond which we made it clear Russia must not tread—in Greece, in Iran, in Turkey, in Berlin and in Cuba. We dug in and we waited and now each day, the prospect of war in Europe grows less and less likely.

A millenium? Utopia? Detente, even? Of course not. We will have profound differences with Russia and will for years to come. There can be, as Mr. Kennan said of Vietnam, "no happy way out of this conflict." What we have had since 1945 is a de facto coexistence, neither intolerable surrender nor impossible victory, but the difficult and painful sharing of a crowded planet with disagreeable neighbors.

This is what we seem to be up to in Asia. Just last Friday Peiping screamed that the Soviets have joined the United States, India, and Japan in forming a "ring of encirclement" around Red China—not de facto coexistence but de facto containment.

We do not, however, share Mr. Kennan's misgivings over the Honolulu Conference. There are many ways—none without risk—to wage limited war. Honolulu was basically an extension of how Lyndon Johnson chooses to do it. Instead of just digging in, we are trying to pressure the enemy to the peace table. And, at the same time we are trying, sad to say, belatedly to improve the political and social climate so that we can put to work the gains of the battlefield. It is a difficult and dubious path. But this is a difficult and dubious world that seldom offers perfect, absolute answers.

School Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to serve notice that I am very much opposed to the administration plans to slash funds for the school milk program. During the last fiscal year this program benefited more than 90,000 schools and child care institutions. The amount appropriated for the special milk program during the current fiscal year was $103 million. According to the Milk Industry Foundation, the school milk program and the national school lunch program accounted for the usage of nearly 3 billion pounds of milk.

If the milk had not been used it would probably have been acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation where at present support prices it would have cost the taxpayers exactly the same amount of money as was required to finance this program which is so highly beneficial to the nourishment and health of American schoolchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it makes very little sense to fund new expenditures and untried programs which cost many millions of dollars more and then penalize a tried and true program like the special milk program or the school lunch program.

I am amazed that an administration which professes to be so interested in fighting the war against poverty and in doing something about school dropouts is so shortsighted in its approach to these problems. Furthermore, as a Representative from an area where dairying constitutes an important part of the farmers' cash income, I am distressed that the Government's false economy will result in a curtailment of the consumption of milk. There are so many other areas in which savings could be accomplished without sacrificing the health and welfare of the schoolchildren of America.

Connecticut's Highway Commissioner Ives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the text of an article published in the Hartford Courant, in the issue of February 7, 1966, about Connecticut's highway commissioner, Howard S. Ives.

Commissioner Ives, who resides at North Stonington, Conn., in my district, has devoted a lifetime of service to the State highway department dating back to 1917. He started as a rodman and was appointed commissioner in 1959 by the then Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff. Commissioner Ives has been nationally honored for his work on highway beautification and is regarded as one of our most safety-minded road engineers and experts.

The article about Commissioner Ives not only tells us about the man and his accomplishments over the years, but also his views and outlook on life, his character and his fine qualities. I am delighted to count him among my friends. The article reads as follows:

Howard S. Ives: Man in Middle of the Roads

(By James J. Devaney)

State Highway Commissioner Howard S. Ives is the man in the middle.

Everyone agrees the State needs roads, but no one wants the road to go through his house.

Ives has been nationally honored for his work on highway beautification—and his name arouses ire among lovers of Bushnell and East Rock Parks.

He is noted as one of the most safety-minded engineers ever to head the department—and is criticized for allegedly dangerous crossovers on I-91 in Hartford.

CONSCIOUS OF COMPLAINTS

Ives is acutely conscious of the complaints, but he points out, "I'm charged with running a department, carrying out the mandate of the legislature—to build facilities with the funds made available.

"We're not a bunch of firebreathers, but we have to keep our minds on the goal—to put these facilities where they will do the most good for the most people, and we can't deviate from that."

He feels many critics would remain silent "if people would only realize the extremes we go to to insure safe, economical and engineeringwise sound roads.

"What people don't realize," he continues, "is you can pick up a newspaper in Providence, or Talahassee, or just about anywhere else and find the same complaints. But these roads are the work of the best engineering minds in the country."

But Ives has a real concern for people affected by new highways. One of his aids said "I've seen him leave meetings and take off to some little town in a far corner of the State to investigate some complaint personally."

Ives comments "One of the most painful things in the department is the displacement of people. It tears us apart, but we do what we have to do under the law, as fairly and humanely as possible."

Discussing the charge that highways destroy natural beauty spots Ives says "People think of ruthless destruction as they see the bulldozers, earthmovers, and trucks. But this ruthlessness—these earthmovers—are to the engineer a sign of progress.

CITES GOALS

"This ugliness is temporary. The goal is a highway. Two roads divided by a median. Something planned and executed very carefully.

"The landscape engineer is active in every phase of construction. We try to design a highway so it looks as if it belongs there.

"When we put a road through woodland or countryside, conservationists complain. But we've enabled thousands of people to enjoy that area who never had a chance to do so before.

"As a conservationist, I look at a tree, and know how long it took to grow it and that it is a beautiful thing. As a safety man, I hate trees—those near the pavement—because people can run off the road and kill themselves."

Much of the superhighway activity in the State since Ives took office July 1, 1959, has been concentrated in the Hartford area.

"We talk about the population explosion, and it's a real thing," Ives said. I-91 was designed several years ago with the 1970 population in mind. Now we're designing for 1990 and 2000."

Ives continues "The Hartford highway complex isn't complete. It won't really work until I-291 is complete." I-291 is the link between I-91 and I-84 which will give Hartford a belt highway system.

Discussing criticism of I-91 and its link to the city and over the bridges of the city Ives says "There isn't anything that has been done that can't be corrected—and will be corrected; only minor changes are needed.

"The fact that we've made some changes in signs and movement is not a sign of bad design. We know that one of the worst troubles is that people drive too darn fast.

"No one in the department will make excuses for anything we do. If we make mistakes, we say so, and correct them. We don't make the same mistake twice."

LOVES BRIDGES

He sums up: "All I'm trying to do is run the highway department. And when someone says 'Ives, go home,' I'll go home, but I want to leave a heritage of highways.

"Outside of my family and my country, this has been my life."

Born in New Haven, July 31, 1900, Ives grew up in Norwich, where he attended local schools and planned his future. And he knew what he wanted to do.

"I can't remember when I didn't want to build bridges. I read every book on bridges I could get my hands on, starting when I was about 10 years old.

"If there's anything I love to do it is to build bridges. A bridge is something alive and beautiful. If I could do what I want to do. I'd be building bridges, not sitting here."

Ives started his career with the highway department as a rodman with a survey crew in the summer of 1917. One of his cherished possessions now is a plaque which reads "From rodman to commissioner." "That's the story of my life," he says.

He worked for the department until 1922, and after various engineering positions and his qualifications as a professional engineer in 1925, he returned to the department in 1927, and started his rise through the ranks.

And he helped build bridges—the Middletown-Portland Bridge, the Housatonic River Bridge connecting the Merritt and Wilbur

Cross Parkways between Milford and Stratford; the Charter Oak Bridge; Gold Star Memorial Bridge over the Thames between New London and Groton, and the Raymond E. Baldwin Bridge over the Connecticut between Old Saybrook and Old Lyme.

CITES FAVORITE

His favorite was the Arrigoni Bridge in Middletown. "It was the first big bridge on which I was project engineer, and the first high level bridge in Connecticut. Fortunately, everything came together right, or I'd be living in Mexico."

Ives was appointed deputy highway commissioner in July 1955, and concentrated on organizing the department for the completion of the Connecticut Turnpike, and the development of a division of research and development within the department.

He resigned in 1956 to become general manager of the Edward Balf Co. of Hartford, but returned to the department when he was appointed State highway commissioner by Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff in 1959.

Between the time he took office July 1, 1959 and June 30, 1965, the Department spent more than $600 million for about 223 miles of new highways.

In addition to his career as an engineer, Ives managed an active military career.

He enlisted as a private in the Connecticut Army National Guard in 1938, when he was 38 years old.

"I went for a year's active training, and it stretched to more than 5 years," he said. "I like it, but I didn't care too much for the spit and polish."

Ives served as an engineer officer both in the Pacific and in Europe during World War II. He was recalled to active duty during the Korean war, but to his chagrin, instead of being sent to Korea, he wound up commanding the antiaircraft defenses of Baltimore, Md.

"It bothers me that I had to retire a few years ago, and I cant' get into this one," he comments. Ives retired in 1957 as a brigadier general.

SERIES OF BOATS

Ives and his wife, the former Caroline Wallen of Norwich, live at Long Pond, North Stonington, in a former summerhouse they converted to year-round as a family project after World War II.

He lists his hobbies as his eight grandchildren and boating. His boat the "Kitty Higgins VI," is a cruiser rigged for sport fishing.

Ives explains "Kitty Higgins" was a nickname he first gave his wife—it was the name of a comic strip character. Ives has had five boats—"Kitty Higgins II" was his jeep in Europe during World War II.

Ives is acutely aware that his position is a hot spot. "People ask me 'Why do you stick to it?' I don't know. Every 3 months or so I say 'I'd better go home.' But I don't, and I don't want to. I just hope I know enough to go home when finally I should."

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in behalf of the Lithuanian people, who 48 years ago, at Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, proclaimed their independence after over a century of Russian rule and went forward as a free nation, achieving a high level of economic and social prosperity. Tragically, this taste of freedom was brief. It was only a little over two decades after the establishment of independence that Lithuania once more became the victim of her overpowering neighbor. The totalitarian might of the Soviet Union has since been used to exterminate any sense of Lithuanian nationhood. Despite oppression, the Lithuanian people continue to resist tyranny and attempt to preserve their heritage of freedom.

Today, our prayer and hope is that this proud nation of people dedicated to the cause of liberty throughout their history will once again join the family of free nations. We honor these people on this 48th anniversary of their independence and join with all Americans of Lithuanian descent in renewing our devotion to the cause of freedom and justice.

We're on the Winning Track

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, success in fulfilling our commitments in Vietnam is now within reach.

The following column by Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 9, 1966, gives a realistic estimate of the war situation and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

CONG FORCES WANINGS: A VIETNAM REPORT—WE'RE ON WINNING TRACK

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—What is the most reliable and realistic estimate of how the war is going in Vietnam? Are we losing? Are we just holding on? Are we hopelessly stalemated? Are we making solid headway toward victory?

It is the purpose of this column to report the overall trend of the fighting in Vietnam—and to cite the evidence. It is based on information and judgment of people, some only just returned from Saigon, whom I consider trustworthy and objective.

Here are the essential elements:

1. The North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops are being hurt—and hurt badly. The extent to which the enemy is hurting is only now becoming evident.

2. Hanoi's whole timetable and strategy of conquest is out of gear. Vietcong "victories" during the monsoons last year were to enable the Vietcong to take the offensive. Captured North Vietnamese prisoners say they were told they were being sent south just "to wrap it up." It isn't happening that way. Vietcong morale is deteriorating and Hanoi radio is bracing its troops for a "long, hard war."

3. There is absolutely no defeatism among the highest U.S. officials (military, political, and economic) who are on the scene in Vietnam. They are confident that the independence of South Vietnam can and will be secured.

4. No easy or early victory is expected. Hard fighting, perhaps harder than we have thus far experienced, may lie ahead. There is no basis for airy, blue-sky optimism. But success is within reach.

Here are some pertinent facts.

Troop strength: During 1965, U.S. military manpower rose from 23,000 to 181,000 and will expand further. South Vietnamese armed forces increased from 560,000 to 679,000. Enemy military strength rose from 103,000 to 230,000.

Losses in battle: Enemy troops killed in battle in 1965 totaled 34,000, with 6,000 captured—a 100-percent increase in losses over 1964. U.S. losses were slightly more than 1,300 in 1965, South Vietnamese losses were 11,000.

Where Vietcong is hurting. In-depth interviews with several hundred Vietcong prisoners and defectors, carried out by experts independent of any government agency, reveal:

That Vietcong forces are thrown badly off balance because B-52 bombers constantly keep them on the run, preventing them from resting and regrouping. They complain: "There is no longer any place to hide."

That the Vietcong is increasingly losing the support of the villagers and peasants who have hid them in the past. They are losing it through terror and taxes. The villagers mostly blame the Vietcong for the air attacks which their presence brings.

The Vietcong are so short of manpower they are impressing 15-year-olds and young women into armed service.

The Vietcong prisoners complain of heavy losses in combat, and North Vietnamese prisoners admit they were misled by Hanoi, which had assured them that U.S. soldiers would be soft and couldn't fight against guerrillas.

The great majority of prisoners say that most have now come to believe the Vietcong can't win the war.

It is clear that there is a feeling among quite a few Americans in the United States that we can't win. I am convinced that the evidence is on the side that we can win, are winning, and will win.

The confidence and stamina of our men on the battlefront deserves to be matched by confidence and stamina on the homefront.

Operation Trading Stamps: Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call our colleague's attention to the wonderful community service which has been performed by one of my constituents, Mr. Al Reid, of Yonkers, N.Y.

Mr. Reid is the publisher of the Illustrated News, a weekly newspaper in Yonkers and for more than 2 years he has collected over 400,000 trading stamps. He has redeemed these stamps and has distributed more than 2,000 toys, games, and other comforting items to hospitals, convalescent centers, children's homes, homes for the aged and other deserving institutions. Recently the Peoples Savings Bank of Yonkers contributed 10,000 trading stamps to Mr. Reid's project. These stamps, in turn, were translated into a dozen toys and games which were presented to the children's ward at St. John's Riverside Hospital.

It is with great pleasure that I join with Al Reid's friends and neighbors in honoring his outstanding service to the community.

Metropolitan Dade County's Pioneering Traffic Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, since July 1, 1959, Dade County, Fla., has had a new and effective traffic court. This court has done an outstanding job in helping Greater Miami deal with the problems caused by a steadily increasing number of cars and trucks on our highways. It has had a marked effect on safety and, in the 6½ years of its operation, has proved to be one of the finest and most effective courts in the Nation.

I wish to call the attention of our colleagues to a most informative article concerning the court in this month's issue of American County Government, by the distinguished mayor of Metropolitan Dade County, Charles Hall.

The article follows:

FEWER ACCIDENTS AIM OF A PIONEERING TRAFFIC COURT

(By Mayor Charles Hall)

The metropolitan court of Dade County, Fla., has been recognized as the best in its field nationally. Winner of 10 national awards since it was established in 1957, the court received 5 from the American Bar Association for establishment of a model court and its continued progress.

Metro court jurisdiction includes all cases arising under county ordinances adopted by the metro commission. It may punish for contempt; impose fines not exceeding $1,000; commit offenders to the county jail; and issue bench warrants. If the offense is punishable by a fine exceeding $500 or imprisonment of more than 60 days, the accused can demand a jury trial.

The court, which tries all traffic offenses in Dade County, is based on the underlying concepts of traffic safety through driver education and uniform laws and treatment.

The objectives of metro court are to increase respect for traffic laws and to contribute to the total community effort required to reduce traffic accidents. The main tool in this all-out campaign is not the fear of having to pay a heavy fine but the education of the violator.

After bing in metro court, many motorists say they hadn't realized the importance of traffic laws or the dignity in which the court conducts itself. Such statements are a pleasant contrast to those charging that many traffic courts are mere fine-collecting agencies with no concern for justice or correction.

Before metro court was established, the quality of justice ranged from excellent to terrible in the 27 municipal traffic courts. Small cities were unable to afford proper facilities or full-time judges. Twenty-seven different sets of regulations made knowledge of the driving laws almost impossible.

Result? A deterioration of the driving public's attitude toward the law and law enforcement that was seriously reflected in the county's soaring death, injury and accident rate.

Metro court had to overcome many hurdles—mainly legal suits—before arriving at its present position. In one 1958 decision, the Florida Supreme Court ruled that metro traffic ordinance 57–12 expressly nullified and superseded the ordinances of all Dade County municipalities and that traffic offenses arising under county ordinances should be tried only in the metro court.

After initial legal obstacles were overcome, the board of county commissioners approved a three-phase proposal of the American Bar Association to render traffic court services to Dade County, setting up the present court system.

The court went into effect on July 1, 1959, with seven court locations (another was added latter). In addition to all 27 municipalities, the Dade County Sheriff's Department and the Florida Highway Patrol also file traffic cases in the metro court.

Except for violations of inspection regulations, equipment requirements, pedestrian and parking laws, all moving violations are scheduled for a court hearing on first offenses.

COURT APPEARANCE

Without extentuating circumstances, all persons must appear personally before the judge. This follows a national recommendation of the Conference of State Supreme Court Chief Justices. The arresting policemen are assigned specific court dates—twice a month. The courtroom for the case depends on where the citation was issued.

Personal appearance of violators affords the judges the opportunity to review the person's prior driving record, to observe any mental or physical deficiencies, and to give enough individual attention to educate and correct the individual violators rather than to punish them. In his opening remarks, the judge talks about local problems and current accident statistics.

Tourists and nonresidents may advance the trial date by arrangement with either the individual police officer at the time a ticket is issued or the clerk's office, where the offender posts a nominal bond equal to the fine for the offense. This privilege is extended to local residents when circumstances warrant it.

Dade County residents or property owners may be released without bail upon a written promise to appear in court, except for hazardous moving violations which require booking and bail. Noncounty residents may be released on cash bail except where the officer is required to book the person. The officer may also release sick persons from custody if a valid driver's license is surrendered or when he is willing to accept a written promise to appear.

All parking, standing, and nonmoving violations may be paid by mail upon signing a waiver of appearance and a guilty plea. This privilege is entended to certain moving offenses when no court appearance is required.

Strict accountability for the issuance of traffic complaints has been incorporated into the clerical and financial processing to eliminate ticket fixing. Police officers' voided, spoiled or lost complaints are processed in open court.

In 1964, 289,000 cases were handled. By November, the 1965 load had surpassed the 300,000 mark. The cases are handled by 175 employees.

A traffic school originally was maintained by the Miami Police Academy, but was assigned to the metro court, which updated and expanded it in 1961 in conjunction with the Dade County Board of Public Instruction.

The school has paid dividends. Many motorists who made dangerous errors through ignorance, inexperience or faulty judgment are not fined but sent to the school.

In the drive for traffic safety, the court promotes vehicle and pedestrian safety in English and Spanish on radio, TV, newspapers, billboards, photo and literature displays, waste cans and postmarks on metro mail.

The court sponsors the ABA program, "Go to Traffic Court as a Visitor, Not as a Violater," and hosts groups such as the Boy Scouts and civic organizations.

Realizing that Dade County has a large number of Spanish speaking people, a Latin American safety education program was launched in 1960. Some 1,800 Latin Americans attended classes taught in Spanish and learned all phases of driving regulations and the Florida financial responsibility law.

Five years ago the metro court's student traffic safety council, recently cited as the most outstanding such countywide group in 13 Southeastern States, was organized. The council has representatives from 33 county high schools. The judges send student defendants to the council for driving education punishment.

Another court project is the distribution of a printed monthly report of its activities with complete accident analysis, including conviction rate by type of violation.

Metro judges are chosen in accordance with the so-called Missouri plan, approved by Dade County voters. Candidates for the 13 judgeships are screened by a committee consisting of attorneys, laymen, and the presiding senior judge of the circuit court. The county commission appoints one of three selected by the committee to serve until the next primary. At that time, the candidate runs unopposed for the approval of the electorate. If he wins a majority, he receives a full term. The top seven in the balloting serve for 6 years; the others, 4 years.

Hope Is Seen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's quest for peace in Vietnam has at last received a glimmer of encouragement.

This comes from the fact that the Vietnam issue has been moved to the corridors of the United Nations. I was one of the Members of the House who communicated with President Johnson last month to request that he formally request the United Nations to seek an effective cease-fire and that we pledge our support and our resources to such an effort.

Certainly, the decision of the U.N. Security Council to place the Vietnam issue on its agenda marks a clear victory for this administration. It could prove the necessary step in moving the problem from the battlefield to the conference table.

Commenting on this, the Baltimore Sun said the fact that the issue now is before the United Nations Security Council "means that another door is being held open while another possible route to a Geneva conference is being examined."

The editorial suggests that "words like hawks, doves, and aggression, for example, could well be dispensed with for the time being while calm, dispassionate efforts are made to discover the basis for a rational peace settlement."

Here is a calm, dispassionate appraisal of a subject of vital concern to us all, and place the editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 4, 1966]

IN THE UNITED NATIONS

As Ambassador Goldberg keeps saying, what the United States is trying to do is to have the Vietnam war brought to the conference table. Our objective, our belief, our hope is to have it settled there rather than on the field of battle. The fact that the issue now is before the United Nations Security Council, after procedural preliminaries which tended to obscure the modest nature of the United States proposal, means that another door is being held open while another possible route to a Geneva Conference is being examined.

To this extent the involvement of the Security Council, limited as it is, may be helpful. Communist China and North Vietnam, which pour vituperation on the United States and scorn the United Nations, may talk more candidly with some of the small nonalined states. Diplomatic conversations thus could be more useful than a public debate in the Security Council over a formal resolution, especially if a debate should end in a Soviet veto.

Public debate is useful, of course, at the proper time, when it promotes understanding by sifting the grains of facts from the chaff of speculation and emotion. Words like hawks, doves and aggression, for example, could well be dispensed with for the time being while calm, dispassionate efforts are made to discover the basis for a rational peace settlement. This applies to the Senate committee's inquiry as well as to the United Nations.

Ad Hoc Congressional Conference on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting below the report of an ad hoc congressional conference on Vietnam, held in Washington on January 21 and 22. The conference was sponsored by eight Members of Congress, listed in the report.

The report represents the views of a group of experts particularly qualified to discuss American diplomacy. The conclusions were reached by that group, rather than by the congressional sponsors. The sponsors believe the report merits careful consideration by their colleagues, the executive branch, and the American people.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE AD HOC CONGRESSIONAL CONFERENCE ON VIETNAM, HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 21 AND 22, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL SPONSORS

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York, chairman.

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Democrat, of Michigan.

DON EDWARDS, Democrat, of California.

LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Democrat, of New York.

DONALD M. FRASER, Democrat, of Minnesota.

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

WILLIAM F. RYAN, Democrat, of New York.

Foreword

On January 21 and 22, 1966, a group of experts and scholars met in Washington at the invitation of eight Members of the House of Representatives to analyze the current situation in Vietnam and prepare realistic proposals to help end the war and facilitate a negotiated settlement.

The sponsoring Congressmen have felt unsatisfied with the recent role of Congress in foreign affairs. They believe their office requires a more fundamental examination of foreign policy than that allowed by even the most careful consideration of specific legislation. The sponsors are convinced that the level of congressional analysis can be raised through greater intimacy between the legislative branch and the intellectual and university community. It was with this in mind that they invited to Washington a group of experts particularly qualified to discuss with them Vietnam and its implications for American diplomacy.

Some of the participants have spent considerable time in Vietnam, and have obtained intimate association with conditions there. Others offered the important perspectives of experience in negotiation, study of economics, diplomacy or international law, or expert knowledge of relevant geographical areas.

Participants were requested not to dwell on episodes or errors of the past. Instead, they were asked to discuss present policies and possible alternatives to them; to analyze the problems involved in reaching and enforcing a settlement in Vietnam; and to project the outlines of a creative American policy toward Asia.

Certain conclusions and recommendations by the participants emerged in the discussions and these are stated explicitly at the beginning of the report. The subsequent summary of the discussions also includes some individual points which contributed to the analysis, although they were not unanimously endorsed.

The sponsors regard the proposals made by the conference as important contributions to their own thinking about Vietnam and the formulation of American foreign policy. They feel the report deserves the attention of their congressional colleagues, members of the executive branch, and the American people. Finally, they view the conference as having set an important precedent for future congressional initiatives in foreign affairs.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Arthur Larson, chairman, director, Rule of Law Research Center, Duke University; former director of the U.S. Information Agency, and Special Assistant to President Eisenhower.

Mr. Richard Barnet, codirector, Institute for Policy Studies; former Deputy Director, Office of Political Research, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Prof. Robert Browne, professor of economics, Fairleigh-Dickinson University; former A.I.D. official in Vietnam.

Mr. Benjamin V. Cohen, former counsellor to the Department of State.

Prof. Richard Falk, associate professor of international law, Princeton University; editor, American Journal of International Law.

Prof. Bernard Fall, professor of international relations, Howard University; author of "The Two Vietnams."

Mr. Arnold Fraleigh, lecturer in political science, George Washington University; former Foreign Service officer.

Dean Edmund Gullion, dean, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; former Counsellor of American Legation in Saigon; former Ambassador to the Congo.

Prof. George McT. Kahin, director, southeast Asia program, Cornell University.

Prof. John Lewis, professor of government, Cornell University.

Prof. John Lewis, professor of government, Cornell University.

Mr. Robert Nathan, economic consultant.

Mr. Marcus Raskin, codirector, Institute for Policy Studies; former member of the special staff of the National Security Council.

Prof. Louis Sohn, Bemis Professor of International Law, Harvard Law School.

Mr. James. Warburg, writer on foreign policy.

Betty Goetz Lall, Rapporteur, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University.

Paul T. Gorman, executive assistant.

Mr. Nathan attended that part of the conference dealing with economic aid but did not participate in the preparation of the report.

Dean Gullion is not in agreement with a majority of the findings and recommendations.

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

The conference reached the recommendations and conclusions set out below. A summary of the discussions from which they were developed follows:

Present strategies

There are diplomatic alternatives, not yet fully explored, to continued military escalation of the war in Vietnam.

Continued bombing of North Vietnam is not in the American interest either in shortening the war or in improving prospects for a negotiated settlement.

There should be no further escalation of American troop commitment. There are serious risks of inviting greater North Vietnamese and Chinese activity.

Unilateral withdrawal of all American troops prior to a cease fire or peace conference is not in our national interest.

New policy initiatives

The most productive course for the future is a deescalation of military activity and commitment.

The National Liberation Front must be recognized as a principal belligerent in the war, and as a necessary party to any peace conference and settlement.

To improve the likelihood of negotiations, the Saigon government should be broadened to include representatives less hostile to negotiations.

The United States must help promote greater contact between all South Vietnamese factions—representatives of the National Liberation Front, the Saigon government, and influential private citizens.

Negotiations and the convening of a conference

The differences between the several negotiating positions are not insurmountable. The United States might agree to Hanoi's four points, treating them as one interpretation of the 1954 agreement and thus an appropriate basis for negotiations. The controversial point 3 of the Hanoi program would then be a subject for subsequent discussion rather than prior approval.

The 1954 Geneva Conference should be reconvened with all parties to the hostilities represented.

A procedure for reconvening the Geneva Conference would be to have the three nations on the International Control Commission (Canada, India, Poland) request a conference to receive new instructions on enforcement of the 1954 agreements.

The inability of the United Nations thus far to use its good offices to help end the Vietnam war dramatizes the urgency of including China as a full member of that institution. Despite the difficulties of involving the United Nations in a settlement of the war, all parties should seek opportunities to utilize the United Nations in appropriate ways.

Terms of a settlement

A cease-fire must be secured. Given the dispersed nature of the conflict, such a cease-fire might be more easily reached at a conference, though the possibility of a prior cessation of hostilities should be explored carefully.

Agreements must be reached on a provisional government in South Vietnam and procedures for the holding of elections to form a constituent assembly. A provisional government might be established on the basis of geographical areas controlled, with contested areas to be administered temporarily by the International Control Commission. Alternatively, decisions regarding such a government could be reached by prior negotiations between all parties in the south.

All parties must firmly adhere to the results of free elections.

Amnesty must be granted for all parties in the conflict.

Guarantees of the cease-fire, the provisional government, free elections, troop withdrawals, amnesty, and neutralization must be enforced by an effective International Control Commission. The International Control Commission must therefore be significantly strengthened. United Nations participation in this process might reduce administrative difficulties and set precedent for future United Nations participation in the solution of other civil conflicts threatening world peace.

A settlement should assure the neutralization of the two zones of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Arms control agreements must be reached applying to other nations of the area, prescribing their nonparticipation in military alliances, the freedom of their territory for foreign military bases, and their protection from outside arms, material, and armed personnel infiltration.

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

I. The current situation in Vietnam

In discussing the present situation in Vietnam, the Conference concentrated on two major issues: the status and relations of the several Vietnamese parties in conflict and the political effect of various military tactics and strategies.

The Vietnamese Antagonists

There is little information about the National Liberation Front and its military arm, the Vietcong. Their top leaders are not easily contacted; below the top leadership few of their personnel have been adequately identified by Americans. Many of the participants felt this lack of knowedge itself obstructed needed initiatives in the diplomatic sphere. Several participants acquainted with politics in South Vietnam reminded the Conference that the Vietcong had grown out of the resistance movement when all of Vietnam was struggling against the French. The National Liberation Front is clearly dominated by the Communists, although several experts pointed out that the Front does consist of various factions, some of them more nationalist than Communist. It was felt that attempts must be made to learn more about the structure of the Front, constituting as it does, such a significant force in the south.

There were varying viewpoints regarding the strength of the South Vietnamese Government, and the Conference was aware of the extreme mutability of circumstances in Saigon. Some participants believed there was no organic non-Communist political structure left in South Vietnam, and that the military government was simply an extension of the American presence. Others argued that there was considerable structure intact. The Conference agreed that the stability and prestige of the Government was largely a function of the degree of American support.

Many participants were deeply disturbed by the Ky government's insistence that talk of negotiations jeopardizes its life and threatens to dissolve its army's will to fight. All agreed that this position should not be allowed to prevail. In fact, it was felt that a broadening of the South Vietnamese Government would be a prerequisite for moves toward a negotiated settlement.

Relations Between Saigon and the National Liberation Front

Given the above evaluation, the participants were deeply convinced that steps must be taken to promote greater contact between the National Liberation Front, members of the Saigon Government, and influential South Vietnamese citizens. American policy, in its insistence that the war is a simple case of external aggression, may be undercutting this goal. While many noted the intransigence of Saigon on stimulating contacts, several of the participants pointed out that some South Vietnamese officials, Buddhists, independent political figures, and non-Communist intellectuals are undoubtedly acquainted with the National Liberation Front agents and officials. The United States, through local aid and intelligence officials, should actively seek to promote these relations. The participants thought that the United States must persuade the Ky government not to obstruct this process and inflict punishment on citizens engaged in promoting contact between presently hostile groups. If, as all parties to the conflict agree, a future South Vietnam must be autonomous and free from foreign interference, then attempts at reconciliation within the country must be made.

Relations Between the National Liberation Front and Hanoi

Many in the group believed there are differences between the National Liberation Front and the North Vietnamese Government regarding the conduct of the war. Some argued that those fighting in the south are likely to feel less inclined to compromise for a settlement. An example of this difference was the variation in interpretation given by the National Liberation Front and North Vietnam to the statement first issued by the Front on March 17, 1965. The North Vietnamese version, broadcast 3 days after the National Liberation Front account, was much toned down.

The difference in outlook between the Front and North Vietnam was cited as another reason why the United States should encourage the Government in South Vietnam to make contact with the National Liberation Front. We could be committing serious errors if we assumed that Hanoi had such complete authority over the National Liberation Front that it could speak for it on all issues of stopping the war and negotiating a settlement. We do not know definitely that the National Liberation Front would accept Hanoi's terms for a settlement. In fact, it was felt that one of the reasons why reunification of North and South Vietnam is no longer an issue of priority was the recognition by Hanoi that even with a Vietcong victory, reunification would involve a complicated process of bargaining between Hanoi and whoever formed a South Vietnamese Government.

The Political Effects of Military Tactics: Bombings in the North

The Conference participants were in agreement that the bombings in the north were of little military value, while the diplomatic disadvantages were very serious. It was agreed that the bombings had helped bolster South Vietnamese morale; but it was believed this factor did not outweigh harmful diplomatic effects. Further escalation of the bombings, it was felt, could not be expected to improve the situation.

The Political Effects of Military Tactics: Operations in the South

The Conference expressed extreme anxiety over the prospect of increased American troop commitments in the south. Echoing the conclusion of the recent Mansfield report, the participants argued that an escalation of troop commitment would likely result in stalemates on yet higher levels of engagement. There was profound awareness of the risks of provoking greater North Vietnamese and possible Chinese ground participation. No member of the group believed the United States should withdraw all its forces from Vietnam prior to a settlement. But the group agreed that the most desirable future course would be a deescalation of military activity and involvement. Many held that American initiatives on staged withdrawals would be more in the U.S. interest than a continued enlargement of our involvement.

The Conference also noted that bombings in the south and ground clear-and-hold operations were creating a serious refugee problem. The number of refugees, estimated at 1 million in 1965, was growing beyond the capacity of pacification programs to absorb them. The problem was thought to be of increasing importance to the stability of the South Vietnamese Government.

Throughout the discussion there was concern expressed that the more the United States makes the war our war, the less chance we have of building attitudes congenial to a settlement. With respect to U.S. economic efforts, for example, it was argued that without the willingness of the South Vietnamese Government to commit itself to improving conditions in the countryside, large increases of U.S. economic aid and personnel are not likely to achieve intended political results.

II. Negotiations and a peace conference

The conference discussed in some detail the present bargaining positions of the parties in conflict. From here, it turned to an examination of the problems involved in initiating negotiations and convening a peace conference.

Current Negotiating Positions

On the surface it appears that both sides in the war are agreed on what should constitute the basis for negotiations and a peace conference. The United States and North Vietnam have said that the 1954 Geneva Agreement should form the foundation of a settlement; the United States has presented 14 points as representing its own position. The North Vietnamese position is represented by the four points announced on April 8, 1965. Of these, point three has been the principal obstacle to agreement. This point reads: "The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, in accordance with the program of the NFLSV (the South Vietnam National Liberation Front) without any foreign interference." The United States has indicated that all points, 4 or 14, could be dealt with in negotiation. Yet there is still considerable controversy regarding the true nature of Hanoi's point three. One view was that point three meant that Hanoi would settle for nothing less than a settlement based entirely on the program of the front. Many, however, disputed this interpretation, arguing that the four points are but an elaboration of Hanoi's understanding of the 1954 agreement. Cited as documenting this contention were the preamble and postscript to the four points. The preamble states that it is the intention of the North Vietnamese Government "to strictly respect the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam and to correctly implement their basic provisions as embodied in the following four points":

A significant number of participants felt that the negotiating positions of the parties were not so irreconcilable. It was then proposed that the United States should accept the four points of Hanoi, treating them as one interpretation of the Geneva accords, and thus an appropriate basis for negotiations. The controversial point three would then become a subject for discussion at a conference rather than prior to it. This American diplomatic initative would give Hanoi less reason to oppose negotiations.

There was some belief that Hanoi was not disposed to negotiate now since it felt that the United States could be worn down psychologically.

If, however, the above view is not entirely the case, and if the positions of the several parties are not so opposed, what then is holding up the convening of negotiations and a conference? There appears to be the lack of conviction on each side that the other side does in fact accept the conditions proclaimed for a settlement. There may also be conviction that military success is still possible. And clearly there is ambiguity regardng the role of the National Liberation Front, in addition to other procedural difficulties regarding the convening of a conference.

Dealing with the National Liberation Front

A main stumbling block to negotiations has been the refusal of the United States to accept the presence of the National Liberation Front as one of the necessary parties to the negotiations and settlement. The U.S. position has been, in the words of the President: "The Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem." This has appeared to be insufficient recognition to satisfy the Front and North Vietnam. And Hanoi has sometimes seemed to take the extreme view that the Front is the only group from South Vietnam that should be dealt with.

The group felt strongly that the United States should be clearer about its willingness to deal with the Front at the negotiating table. While the United States should consult fully with the South Vietnamese Government on its view, the Ky government should not be permitted to exercise a veto over U.S. policy in this respect. One approach to dealing with the Front might be an American decision to grant the Front belligerent status.

Reconvening of the 1954 Geneva Conference

The reconvening of the 1954 Geneva Conference is almost a certain prerequisite to negotiating an end to the war. There is, however, a procedural problem as to which government or body should request the reconvening of this conference.

While there are considerable uncertainties regarding future developments, the participants thought it important to discuss likely alternative procedures for convening a conference.

The cochairmen of the 1954 conference—the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union—are unlikely to issue a conference call because the Soviet Union might not wish to expose itself to further denunciations by China or complicate its good relations with North Vietnam. So this avenue was therefore considered unpromising.

Another possibility is that the United Nations might request the reconvening of the conference. The principal problem here is that neither North nor South Vietnam or China are members of the United Nations; and North Vietnam and China may continue to regard any United Nations action as likely to be partisan and therefore unacceptable.

A third possibility, now unlikely, is to act on a former (1964) Cambodian request to reconvene the conference to guarantee its neutrality and borders, which Cambodia charged were threatened by the Vietnam war. This conference might then be used by the parties to discuss a settlement of the war in South Vietnam.

There is a fourth possibility, as yet untried, which might be most acceptable to all parties. The three countries of the International Control Commission (India, Canada, and Poland) could request that the Geneva Conference be reconvened in order that they receive further instructions on the implementation of the 1954 agreement. At this conference, the terms of a settlement to the present war could be considered.

In requesting such a conference, the International Control Commission members might propose that representation be determined along the lines of the 1961–62 Laos Conference, which allowed each of the warring factions to participate in discussion. One of the major functions of that conference was to provide a channel through which leaders of the three groups met and eventually agreed on the formation of a government. The Laos accord was then intended to be a guarantor of the settlement.

III. Terms of a settlement

Cease-Fire

A cease-fire will have to be a precondition for elections to form a government for South Vietnam. Yet given the dispersed nature of the conflict, there would have to be prior negotiations.

The U.S. position is that it will accept a cease-fire before a conference or will agree to a cease-fire as the subject of a conference. The group agreed that either sequence could be tried. But given the complexities of such matters, a cease-fire would probably have to be worked out at preconference or conference negotiations.

The United States is accepting some risk in being willing to have a cease-fire before a conference. It is one thing to call upon major military forces to stop fighting, and quite another to rely on the observance of a cease-fire by guerrilla forces. Yet, the United States side would gain politically as a result of a cease-fire. Participants noted that there are many recent examples where negotiations were convened while fighting continued. This was the case in Indonesia, Cyprus, Yemen, Algeria, and, in 1954, Indochina. What is desirable is that the belligerents agree, at least tacitly, that they will engage in a maximum amount of deescalation so as to permit a conference to meet in the most relaxed possible atmosphere.

Provisional Government

One of the most difficult questions for a reconvened peace conference to settle is the nature of any provisional government pending the holding of elections. Some believed that this question is so difficult for outside parties to decide that elections to form a constituent assembly for South Vietnam should take place as soon as they could be organized. Others thought that elections immediately following a cease-fire would present serious problems.

Two principal ways of forming a provisional government pending elections were discussed. At the national level, an all South Vietnamese Government would be composed of representatives drawn from geographical areas. Although many details would have to be worked out in conference, the essential functions of government would be divided among the major South Vietnamese groups and the International Control Commission. At the local level the Saigon government would continue to exercise authority over areas controlled by it, and the same would be true for the National Liberation Front as well as such largely autonomous groups as the Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, and some of the Montagnard groups. As to those geographical areas which are contested, the International Control Commission would need to exercise temporary control. (It was noted that there is some precedent for this in the agreement which gave the United Nations temporary administrative control in West Irian.) In this connection, members of the group again stressed the importance of promoting closer contacts by the different groups in South Vietnam.

A second way of forming a provisional government is the more traditional one of having the parties decide on a cabinet where portfolios would be divided among them. Within this context the I.C.C. could be given special responsibilities. Some expressed anxiety that this form of provisional government has provided Communists with a means of staging a coup d'etat. It was pointed out by others that whether such a provisional government can function until elections are held depends in large measure on the political orientation of the population. In such countries as France and Italy, Communists were included in the cabinet of the immediate post-World War II governments with no subsequent Communist takeover. In the Laos Agreement of 1961–62, a coalition government that was formed at the time subsequently broke down when the Communist faction withdrew its support and refused to participate, leaving the centrist and right-wing groups to run that part of the country they controlled.

Elections

There was unanimity that elections should be held for the purpose of creating a government of South Vietnam and that the United States and all other parties to a negotiated settlement should be absolutely firm in their willingness to accept the results of them. The United States, among its 14 points for a settlement, includes the "support of free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice." Most of the group felt that the U.S. Government would honor this commitment.

Fnding acceptable means by which elections can be held will be a difficult task. The International Control Commission was commissioned at Geneva to supervise elections for the reunification of the two zones of Vietnam. The group assumed that the International Control Commission could also be given the duty of supervising elections for the formation of a constituent assembly among whose responsibilities would be the formation of a government.

Amnesty

The Geneva Agreement of 1954 provided that the representative authorities of the northern and southern zones of Vietnam "must not permit any individual or collective reprisals against persons who have collaborated in any way with one of the parties during the war, or against members of such persons' families." This amnesty will need to be reinforced in a peace settlement. If necessary, the ICC must be given special authority to see that amnesty is being observed, and to consider reports of violations and recommend action in their event.

Unification With North Vietnam

The Geneva Agreement of 1954 provided that elections would be held in July 1956, for the purpose of reunifying the northern and southern zones of Vietnam. Among the members of the group who have had close contacts in Vietnam there was agreement that North Vietnam would not demand early reunification of the country. Since the United States is on record as supporting any free decision of the people of Vietnam on reunification, this issue no longer appears to be among those causing great controversy. A constituent assembly could be given responsibility for achieving reunification. On this point it was noted that in January 1957, 6 months after the failure to hold elections in Vietnam for reunification, the Soviet Union proposed that North and South Vietnam be admitted to the United Nations as separate states. The United States rejected the proposal at the time.

Neutralization of North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia

The Geneva Agreement of 1954, by providing that North and South Vietnam could not accept foreign military personnel and bases or participate in military alliances, set the stage for a military neutralization of the four areas comprising Indochina. It was recognized by the group that such neutralization does not preclude governments in these countries headed or controlled by Communists, but that insofar as military matters are concerned, Communist or non-Communist governments could not be alined with other countries. It was the conviction of the group that neutralization of North and South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos would not jeopardize the security interests of America or the non-Communist states of Asia.

Withdrawal of Troops

Informally and unofficially, many Communist spokesmen have stated that it would not be necessary for the United States to withdraw its troops in advance of a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. There is, however, some uncertainty whether Hanoi and the Front are in accord on this point.

The U.S. position is that we "want no U.S. bases in southeast Asia," and that "we do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured." Assuming flexibility on the part of both sides on this issue, the group did not think that the withdrawal of troops per se would constitute a major issue in the negotiations. The exact staging of the withdrawal of troops on the part of both the United States and North Vietnam, of course, would need to be the subject of rather detailed discussions.

Enforcement Provisions of a Settlement

The International Control Commission, under the terms of the 1954 Geneva Agreement, is made responsible for implementing the terms of the agreement. However, in the 1954 agreements it was expected that the French Army would provide the necessary logistic support and that financial support would be given by the French Government. When the French withdrew from South Vietnam in August 1956, the Commission was left without any means of support. The need for a reinforced ICC, therefore, was strongly felt by all members of the group. If the ICC is to perform the tasks assigned to it in 1954, plus any additional ones designated by a new peace conference, there must be agreement on a new financing formula. The Laos Agreement of 1961–62 bolstered the ICC in its operations in that country; this included a financing formula whereby the United States, the Soviet Union, China, France, and the United Kingdom each agreed to pay 17.6 percent of the costs. The other parties agreed to pay lesser percentages.

Some of the group felt that the ICC by itself did not have the kind of administrative structure needed to perform its duties. It was therefore suggested that the United Nations could provide administrative support to strengthen the implementation of a settlement. Whether the Chinese would agree to such administrative support was not known, but some participants thought that a United Nations decision to support strict observance of the Geneva Agreement would be evidence to the Chinese of the United Nations impartiality regarding a settlement.

IV. Related aspects of a Vietnamese settlement

China

At a number of points in the conference China was discussed. These discussions covered China's view of the Vietnamese conflict, and the relation of its domestic affairs to foreign policy. Thought to be particularly important were the problems of providing sufficient food for its expanding population, the succession question, and the adaptation of the army to political rather than professional military purposes. Chinese food needs cannot be met by extending control over small states in the area. Only in the loess region of North China can total food production be substantially raised, something in the order of 40 percent. As to the question of succession, the older leadership has attempted—with only only moderate success—to instill revolutionary and anti-American attitudes in those younger men likely to replace them. American policies, however, can affect the degree of success the older leadership has with this indoctrination process.

It was also noted that the Maoist leadership fears that the United States may attack the mainland soon and that China must be prepared to meet this attack by various forms of defense encompassing guerrilla-type operations. There are signs, however, that army leaders may be seriously resisting the role assigned them by the party in the defense of China.

On Chinese foreign policy, the specialists in the group noted the gross misinterpretation given by many to the September 1965 statement of the Chinese Defense Minister, Lin Piao. This statement, contrary to popular and some official beliefs, advocated scaling-down of overt Chinese action and those militant policies which increased the risk to China itself. The Chinese espoused the view that revolutions and wars of liberation could not be imported, and that conditions within a country had to be ripe in order for such revolutions to succeed. This did not mean that China would not send out agents and propaganda to foment revolution. Yet such tactics should be differentiated from the likelihood of repeated large-scale Chinese aggression and the sending of Chinese troops and arms to local Communist groups in the developing areas of the world. Notable too in the Lin statement was the absence of threats to the United States in Vietnam, even though China had issued many such threats in the earlier months of 1965.

Thus in Vietnam, China has exercised caution. Yet in assessing future Chinese intentions it was stressed that there undoubtedly was a threshold for China's active participation in the war. At some point in a continued U.S. escalation the Chinese would doubtless feel compelled to enter.

Many believed that since 1963 Chinese foreign policy had suffered a series of significant setbacks in the developing areas primarily because of the hostile reactions of indigenous populations and leaders.

Wars of Liberation

The group considered the above evaluation as having particular relevance to Communist policy on wars of liberation. Given Chinese inability or reluctance to commit military force to support wars of liberation, and what some felt was a growing uneasiness on the part of the Soviet Union unilaterally to promote these conflicts, the participants felt it important that the United States revise its conception of Communist aggression.

American response to Communist agitation for conflict in developing areas must not be to react unilaterally with military forces. U.S. aid to certain governments with anti-democratic features appears to have pressed the Soviet Union into incerasing its agitation for disorder. Yet Soviet and Chinese exhortations to developing countries have met with little success. Those nations which are in their post-colonial stage are anxious for periods of sustained economic growth which increased revolution and violence would only disturb. There are still some nations, nevertheless, in which revolution is, or may soon be ripe. This must be anticipated by the United States. It was felt that our own particular revolutionary tradition was not appropriate to guiding these revolutions. But our interests are most likely to be served by a sympathetic rather than a hostile response when these events finally occur.

In discussion of possible responses to revolutions in the developing nations, the conference emphasized the need for discovering new roles for international organizations. Likewise, the participants thought the United States should seek to explore new avenues of cooperation with the Soviet Union within the United Nations.

In discussing the role of major powers in local conflicts of the future, many favored stress on developing procedure within international law rather than emphasis on securing agreement on general principles.

There was some discussion of whether Communist-inspired violence was likely to break out in Thailand. The topic was considered to be highly speculative, though several experts expressed the view that a major outbreak of hostility was unlikely. Local tension and increased terror, on the other hand, were thought to be a distinct possibility. Some thought was given, therefore, to the possibility of multilateral action to anticipate strife and prevent a crisis analogous to that in Vietnam.

The group also noted the need for arms control agreements in Thailand and possibly other areas. Such agreements might prohibit the import of arms or armed personnel, the establishment of foreign military bases, and the joining of military alliances. These steps could be incorporated into a general conference on Vietnam, or as an adjunct to a Vietnamese settlement. Our greatest interest, finally, should lie in insulating these conflicts from outside interference.

On the relationship of Vietnam to other countries in southeast Asia, including Thailand, it was pointed out that Vietnam was the only case in southeast Asia where the Communists effectively identified themselves with the country's nationalists. Elsewhere in southeast Asia, nationalism has not been forced into fusion with communism. Indeed, the failure of Communist insurrections in Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, and the Philippines testifies to the positive contribution of Asian nationalism. In each of these cases, the inability of Communist insurgents to secure nationalist backing defeated their ultimate goals.

"Not To Doubt," by Richard Chaput—A Saga of Spiritual Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, I paid tribute in the Congressional Record—page A62—to Mr. Richard R. Chaput of Nashua, N.H., who was named 1 of 10 outstanding young men in America by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce.

On January 20, I paid further tribute to Mr. Chaput and inserted a wonderful editorial from his hometown paper the Nashua Telegraph—Congressional Record, page A 260.

Mr. Chaput achieved his distinctions in spite of the fact that he is nearly totally paralyzed as the result of childhood polio. His accomplishments include the authorship of his autobiography "Not to Doubt," which contains a foreword by Richard Cardinal Cushing.

Since my remarks appear in the Record, a number of my colleagues have inquired about the book and I am taking this opportunity to repeat the name of it and to recommend it as an honest, gripping, moving story of a man's conquest over pain, fear, depression, loss of faith, and frustration at what apepared to be a hopeless life.

I have sent a copy to the President in the belief he would find the story of a man whom trouble could not conquer inspiring in this time of our country's troubles. I wish it were possible for me to send a copy to each of my colleagues in the Congress, who also bear great burdens in these days of strife and uncertainty.

Again, I am pleased to recommend "Not to Doubt", an inspiring story of spiritual conquest by a brave man.

Lithuania: A Captive Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, nations like individuals, wish to be free to order their affairs as they see fit. How tragic it thus is when a nation is deprived of its independence through no fault of its own. Certain great states were deprived of their freedom for a few years recently because they had shown complete disregard for the rights of other peoples. But when a nation is subjugated to the will of a foreign power simply because it was too small and weak to resist the brute force of its neighbors, then we are faced with a situation which is wrong and which assaults all the instincts for fairplay and decency which we profess.

Lithuania is one such case of a nation held captive by a stronger, rapacious neighbor. The Lithuanian people have an identifiable history dating back to the Dark Ages. They have a proud history as one of the great nations of Eastern Europe. They have a culture and language which has set them apart from their neighbors. They certainly have as much right to an independent national existence as any people. Yet, this is not today the case. Since 1940 Lithuania has not been an independent country. While it is right that our Government has not recognized the destruction of the Lithuanian state and still has diplomatic relations with representatives of independent Lithuania, the unpleasant fact is that more than 2½ million people live under the yoke of Soviet Russian domination in their own homeland.

The last two and a half decades have been especially hard years for the people of Lithuania. Their country was a battleground in one of the most merciless of conflicts—the Eastern Front of the Second World War. After the Soviet armies returned in 1944 the infamous methods of Stalinist repression increased the suffering of the people. Opposition was quickly blotted out. Sovietization of all forms of living was imposed. The population declined. Russian immigrants appeared to fill the places left empty by the deaths and deportation of tens of thousands of the native populace.

But what is especially terrible about these events is that they began by the destruction of the independent Lithuanian nation. When the Soviets reimposed the rule of Russian czars, they ended 22 years of Lithuanian freedom. Lithuania had become independent on February 16, 1918. In the years which followed, a great deal of progress was made, especially in social matters, which indicated that Lithuania would be a peaceful, developing nation. It is particularly sad that this renaissance was so viciously ended and the freedom and progress of Lithuania transformed into the sterile slavery of a Communist satrapy. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is thus especially appropriate that we take note of the 48th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. Let me extend to the people of captive Lithuania my deepest wishes that the great hope for the future embodied in the anniversary of their independence may soon be fulfilled.

People to People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times when international understanding and good will are so important, it is heartening to note the individual acts of brotherhood performed by some dedicated citizens.

One fine example of such action is well demonstrated by the work of my good friend, Mr. Frank M. Perper, of Arlington, Va. This businessman, who is president of the Motel Management Corp. of America, Inc., has made many unselfish contributions of his time and energy, as well as his resources, to help further friendship between the people of Korea and the United States.

Therefore, I was particularly pleased to attend a recent reception held in his honor by the Korean Ambassador and Madam Kim. The Government of the Republic of Korea honored Frank Perper on this occasion in appreciation for his arduous support of the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation. His efforts are in the highest tradition of our country's "people-to-people" program and we can all be proud of Frank's contributions to international understanding and good will.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the Record a letter from the Korean Ambassador at large concerning the tour of the "Little Angels" and the letter of appreciation to Frank Perper:

THE KOREAN CULTURAL AND
FREEDOM FOUNDATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1966.

DEAR FRIENDS: The Little Angels' 1965 tour of the United States was a cultural triumph. Audiences responded to performances by these 26 young ladies and 1 boy from Korea with ovations. Critics used such words as "charming," "magnificent," "superb" to describe their skillful and entertaining Korean folk dances, accompanied by ancient oriental music.

In these critical days in Asia, of course, the Little Angels' performances do more than bring Americans a better understanding of the centuries-old Korean culture. They also honor those Americans who have fought and died to preserve the independence of the Republic of Korea and emphasize that Free Korea is one of America's stanchest allies in the defense of freedom in Asia.

The Little Angels would like to return to the United States this year as part of a world tour planned by the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation. All funds raised by the tour will assist the greater cause and objectives of the Foundation, which include the education of underprivileged children in Korea.

Whether or not the 1966 tour will be possible depends in large part upon the people like you who have an abiding interest in culture and in people-to-people exchanges as a means of increasing world understanding.

With warm personal regards.

Sincerely,

YOU CHAN YANG,
Executive Vice President and Ambassador at Large of Korea.

MINISTRY OF PUBLIC INFORMATION,
REPUBLIC OF KOREA,
Seoul, Korea, November 1, 1965.

This letter of appreciation is presented to Mr. Frank M. Perper, the Motel Management Corp. of America, Inc., Arlington, Va., in recognition and gratitude of his unselfish contributions which helped to further the friendship between the peoples of Korea and the United States.

As an arduous supporter of the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation he has made tangible aid available in assisting the recent tour of the Little Angels, Korean children's musical and dancing group.

He also cooperated cordially in providing facilities and services for official and ceremonial occasions in Washington, D.C., area, and has shown warm humanity by assisting many Korean students in the United States to become self-supporting in continuing their education.

The generosity of Mr. Perper will long and affectionately be remembered by the Korean people, and is hereby recognized and commended.

HONG JONG CHUL,
Minister, Ministry of Public Information, Republic of Korea.

Rededication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the fact that our President and so many of our top people flew to Honolulu for a conference with South Vietnamese officials was important for two reasons: First, we made a rededication to our allies that we will not desert their cause, and second, we gave proof to the enemy that our will to resist aggression remains firm.

The New York Herald Tribune hailed the meeting of the heads of government as "a fresh and stronger demonstration of mutual confidence." It added that "on this basis they can now proceed to mount measures for dealing with the equally important military and civilian aspects of the war."

The Herald Tribune states that:

> It will not be easy, in time of war, to promote health, education and welfare. But in Vietnam they are as essential as arms, and must be pursued with the same vigor as we press the war on the battlefield.

With permission of my colleagues I am submitting this editorial for the Record, in the belief that it is an excellent summary of the importance of the rededication that was made in Honolulu.

Rededication at Honolulu

The sharp campaign of criticism at home, followed by President Johnson's intensive peace offensive, had had the unfortunate effect of creating confusion and misunderstanding among both enemies and allies in the Vietnam war. Hanoi and Peiping were deluded into believing that it would break Washington's will to resist. Saigon was haunted by the fear that President Johnson was looking for a face-saving retreat and surrender. The result was likely to be intensified aggression by our enemies and declining morale among our allies.

The top-level meeting of Americans and South Vietnamese at Honolulu should help lay these ghosts and misconception to rest. President Johnson has rededicated himself, his administration, and his country, in clear and forceful language, to the cause to which we are committed in Vietnam. His aim is to stand and fight—never to retreat—until Communist aggression has been halted and the independence of the region has been secured.

That is not inconsistent with the President's appeal to the United Nations to help find a peaceful solution, as Senator Morse so wrongly and foolishly charges. The solution sought through the United Nations or any other diplomatic channel was not to consecrate Communist aggression but to end it. If it is now necessary to look to arms, without abandoning diplomacy, it is only because the Communists have refused to parley and have insisted on continuing the war.

The meeting in Honolulu presents the prospect of our resuming the war in more favorable circumstances. The meeting of the heads of the American and South Vietnamese Governments is a fresh and stronger demonstration of mutual confidence. On this basis they can now proceed to mount measures for dealing with the equally important military and civilian aspects of the war.

The two are intimately related, especially in the guerrilla type of warfare which the Communists are waging. Our aim must be not only to score a succession of military victories but also to clear the Communists from an ever-widening area of South Vietnam. For that, the loyalty and support of the peasants in the interior are essential. President Johnson is bidding for them by offering some of the benefits of his Great Society program to the South Vietnamese.

It will not be easy, in time of war, to promote health, education, and welfare. But in Vietnam they are as essential as arms, and must be pursued with the same vigor as we press the war on the battlefield.

Address by Hon. G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Before International Relations Council, South Bend, Ind., January 28, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most valuable organizations in my congressional district is the International Relations Council, Inc. The council brings to Indiana outstanding authorities on international affairs to lecture on major foreign problems facing our country.

I once had the honor of serving as president of the International Relations Council and, therefore, am very familiar with the work of the group. The president of the council this year is an outstanding South Bend businessman, Jack H. Morrow.

Among the distinguished speakers being sponsored during 1966 by the International Relations Council are the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; Pierre Mendes-France, the former Premier of France, and television commentator Howard K. Smith.

On January 28, 1966, Mr. Williams, who, as former Governor of our neighboring State of Michigan, is widely known and admired in Indiana, discussed the present crisis in Southern Rhodesia.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of Assistant Secretary Williams' thoughtful address in the Congressional Record along with an account of his talk published in the January 29, 1966, issue of the South Bend Tribune.

The address follows:

Address by Hon. G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Before the International Relations Council, South Bend, Ind., Friday, January 28, 1966

The present Southern Rhodesian crisis is an important last chapter in the historic process of British decolonization. This has been an honorable and commendable history which has won respect and friendship from the former subject populations, not only for Britain but for the West. The American who hopes to gain cheap popularity by denigrating the British—in India or in many parts of Africa—quickly finds that, once Britain has shed the embarrassments of colonialism, former subjects and many of their friends hold the Crown, Britishers and English traditions in genuine esteem. Thus, Britain, as it comes toward the end of decolonization, has at stake both a proud tradition and practical assets of considerable value to her and to the Western world.

What is involved in Southern Rhodesia is the opposition by a few white supremacists to Britain's efforts to develop orderly and measured transition to majority rule for a country of 220,000 whites and 4 million blacks.

What is further involved is the position of Britain and the West in all of the rest of Africa north of the Zambezi and the continuation of the Commonwealth as a democratic force in the world.

Originally, under the Welensky umbrella of the now-defunct Federation of Rhodesia and Nyassaland and the Whitehead government of Southern Rhodesia (1953–63), a program of interracial partnership made some progress toward racial harmony. In 1962, however, reaction set in with the election of Prime Minister Winston Field. When he failed to move fast enough toward white-dominated independence, however, his party, the rightwing Rhodesian Front, ousted him and put Ian Smith in power in April 1964. On November 11, 1965, Smith led Southern Rhodesia into rebellion against the British and toward the establishment of a white-supremacy regime.

Since that time, we have supported the British Government in its efforts to depose the breakaway regime and return the colony to the path of constitutional progress toward eventual majority rule. We have done so because we believe the British sincerely are seeking the only just and sensible solution to this uniquely difficult problem. The British want to set in motion a peaceful and orderly transition toward self-determination, on a basis acceptable to the Southern Rhodesian people as a whole. Our support for this British goal remains firm.

WILSON STATES PRINCIPLES

The British policy was enunciated clearly and frequently to Mr. Smith—and to the world—by Prime Minister Wilson before the Smith regime broke off negotiations with the British on November 11 and seized power illegally. That policy can be summed up in five principles which, in effect, establish the conditions under which Britain will be willing to agree to independence for Southern Rhodesia. They are:

1. There must be unimpeded progress toward majority rule. This does not require one man, one vote tomorrow but it does mean just and reasonable progress in that direction;

2. There must be firm provisions against any retrogression by the Southern Rhodesia Government on constitutional guarantees for majority rule;

3. There must be immediate constitutional advance for black Africans;

4. There must be progress in reducing racial discrimination, including repeal of the Land Apportionment Act (the basis for both the inequitable distribution of land, as well as the cornerstone of the Southern Rhodesian system of racial segregation); and

5. There must be satisfactory evidence that the majority of the Southern Rhodesian population—not merely a majority of the whites or a majority of the Government-salaried chiefs—accepts the 1961 constitution as a basis for independence.

Last Tuesday, January 25, Prime Minister Wilson in Parliament added a sixth principle: "The need to ensure that, regardless of race, there is no oppression of majority by minority or of minority by majority."

It is hard to see at this point in the 20th century what policy could be more just, more practical or more democratic than this.

Let me also mention the constitutional and legal considerations in the British-Southern Rhodesian relationship at this stage. First of all, no nation in the world has recognized the Smith regime, and it remains a British colony. Britain reacted to the rebellion by having the Governor dismiss the entire Smith cabinet and by a parliamentary declaration invalidating any act passed by the Southern Rhodesian parliament after November 10. Thus, as far as the rest of the world is concerned, Southern Rhodesia remains under British sovereignty.

The British Parliament, therefore, is the only body which may now legally legislate for Southern Rhodesia. Acting for Southern Rhodesia, the British have enacted a series of Orders-in-Council banning the import of oil into Southern Rhodesia, banning the export of chrome from Southern Rhodesia, dismissing the board of the Southern Rhodesian Reserve Bank and creating a new board in London under which control of Southern Rhodesian foreign exchange reserves is placed. These Orders-in-Council at this point have the force and effect of the law of the land for all those affected by them.

With the cooperation of almost all nations in the world, these controls have proved to be remarkably effective.

Forty percent of the country's gross national product is dependent upon exports, such as tobacco, chrome, asbestos, lithium, pig iron, and other minerals. In a normal year, Southern Rhodesia earns 26 percent (about $87 million) of its foreign exchange from the United Kingdom and another 26 percent from Zambia.

Measures taken by the British and other major trading partners of Southern Rhodesia have cut the country's foreign exchange earning capacity by about 50 percent already. There is every indication that the screws will be further tightened.

American reaction to the illegal seizure of power by the Smith regime was immediate and positive. In the weeks that have elapsed since November 11, we have given many concrete evidences of our support of the British program of economic, political, and psychological countermeasures. We are encouraged by and pleased to acknowledge the widespread support our actions have received in the U.S. press, in American business circles, and from the general public.

UNITED STATES ENFORCES ARMS EMBARGO

At the present time, the United States is enforcing an arms embargo, announced in the U.N. Security Council last November 12, against the Southern Rhodesian regime. Under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, we have put anything in the munitions line under Government license to prohibit the export of arms and ammunition to the rebel regime.

Under the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, we have prohibited the export from the United States of all petroleum and petroleum products to aid the British oil embargo. As far as foreign oil operations of American companies are concerned, they are voluntarily respecting the British embargo, although export control regulations do not apply. Although we are not a major supplier of petroleum products to Southern Rhodesia, we did supply that country with about 15 to 20 percent of its heavy lubricants, and those can now be cut off. Under this act, we also are in a position to stay in step with the British as their sanctions against exports to Southern Rhodesia become tighter and tighter.

Although controls over U.S. exports to Southern Rhodesia are provided for by existing legislation, there are no comparable controls over imports from Southern Rhodesia. The President has, however, employed powers given him under the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965 to suspend Southern Rhodesia's sugar quotas for 1965 and 1966.

In fact, the entire Southern Rhodesian sugar quota for 1965 was turned back at sea in early December. But for the most part, the United States has had to rely upon the voluntary cooperation of American industry and for their recognition of British orders in council that apply to their operation in Southern Rhodesia. Such cooperation has been forthcoming in commendable fashion from American importers of Southern Rhodesian commodities.

We have managed to cut our imports from Southern Rhodesia almost in half through the elimination of sugar imports and by obtaining the voluntary agreements of U.S. importers of lithium and asbestos to find other sources of these materials. Last week, the British Government issued an order in council banning exports of chrome from their Southern Rhodesian colony. If such exports are cut off, it would be another blow to the Smith regime's remaining foreign exchange earnings. This would go a long way in tightening the economic noose around the Southern Rhodesian regime.

Let me express here our regard for the oil companies who were partners in the consortium that operated the Southern Rhodesian oil refinery at Umtali. Those companies responded cooperatively to the British order in council banning the import of oil into Southern Rhodesia.

Now, having mentioned some of the measures being taken against the rebel regime in southern Rhodesia, let me turn to some of their effects.

First of all, the oil embargo has proved to be almost completely successful, as far as we can ascertain. It will not be long before southern Rhodesians should have pumped their last tank dry unless they succeed in their efforts to find alternate sources of supply. No crude oil has been pumped through the pipeline from the Indian Ocean at Beira, Mozambique, to southern Rhodesia since December 31, and, as a consequence, the Umtali refinery has been forced to shut down.

SMITH MISCALCULATED

The Smith regime obviously miscalculated British determination to end the rebellion. Smith's planning was very poor in this regard—and, indeed, in many other regards.

For example, he counted on support from other nations, but such support, as he admitted publicly on a television program last week, has not been forthcoming.

Seizing power when it did, the Smith regime was caught with only 2 or 3 months of its normal supply of petroleum products inside the country. Smith waited a critical 6 weeks after the rebellion started before initiating gasoline rationing, and he has since twice reduced the very small amounts of gasoline people in the country are being allotted.

The British series of fiscal measures has resulted in the seizure or freezing of all official Southern Rhodesian foreign exchange reserves abroad. This has resulted in a drastic cut in the economy's available foreign exchange.

The Rhodesian pound, which has lost sterling backing, has fallen to nearly half its value in the free market.

By the end of January, nearly all major international airlines serving Southern Rhodesia will discontinue their service to Salisbury.

Imports, upon which the high standard of living of white Southern Rhodesians was based, have been reduced to about one-third of the former total and will have to be reduced even further. Taxes have been increased on many commodities.

While the Smith regime allowed the general public to have a good Christmas, within 3 days after Christmas many retail dealers began laying off their staffs and shortages of goods were noticeable in most shops with no replenishments in sight.

The only tire manufacturer in Southern Rhodesia has laid off 60 percent of its work force, and other large businesses and mining firms are similarly laying off their staffs.

Unemployment in the white community already is believed to be reaching 10 percent and there is perhaps an even higher percentage of unemployment among the black African work force. The regime is already talking of a public works program to give work to the unemployed of both races.

There are some indications of white Southern Rhodesians looking around for job opportunities in other countries. The black Africans have been hit proportionately harder by sanctions than whites, but their scale of living already was low and they can get subsistence living in their home villages. On the other hand, white living standards are going down sharply, and they face relatively greater hardship.

There will be a whole series of corporate and individual bankruptcies over the next few months unless the Smith regime steps in and meets notes for the following year.

All this is happening at a time of the worst drought in southern Africa in this century. It has become questionable whether Southern Rhodesia will be able to produce enough corn, which is the staple African diet, to feed its people this year. Cattle are reported dying by the thousands per week. The tobacco crop, which normally accounts for nearly 50 percent of Southern Rhodesia's foreign exchange earnings, will be less than two-thirds its normal size this year. It also is hard to see how any of it can be marketed abroad, as the United Kingdom and most other major importers of Southern Rhodesia tobacco have banned its import for the duration of the emergency.

MANY REMAIN LOYAL

Thousands of people have showed their loyalty to the Crown and to the beleaguered Governor, Sir Humphrey Gibbs, by signing his visitors' book.

As far as we can determine, the judiciary has all remained loyal to the Crown.

The various church groups have courageously stood up and announced their opposition to the rebel regime. A pastoral letter was signed by all six Catholic bishops in Southern Rhodesia. The Anglican Bishop of Mashonaland was the first churchman to take a public position against the regime from the pulpit.

There are indications that some anti-Smith groups within the country are beginning to make efforts to coalesce.

African efforts to organize strikes have had to be put down by Smith's police, teargas, and guns. On November 11 there were about 2,000 African nationalists held in detention—most of them without trial—for essentially political reasons. There have been hundreds of additional such arrests since that time.

Another indication of popular reaction is found in the regime's attempt to make all Government employees sign a loyalty oath. The regime started its effort with postal workers, the great bulk of whom are black Africans. When resistance was encountered, however, the whole project was dropped.

The stringent censorship the regime is enforcing has prevented people inside the country from learning about the full extent of the economic strictures being brought to bear on them, but the British are making an effort to enlighten Southern Rhodesian opinion by building a BBC relay transmitter in neighboring Bechuanaland. That station is now in operation.

Thus, the sum total of all these measures is that only a little more than 2 months has brought a drastic reduction in standards of living among whites in the country—and they have only seen the beginning. The British have promised to invoke an even wider range of sanctions and are expected to announce the next round shortly.

There is no question in our minds about the determination of the British to see this program through. I might point out that at the Lagos Conference of January 11–12, the British appear to have convinced all other Commonwealth members who attended that there were sufficient reasons to believe that these sanctions can be successful. This led to a decision to wait until July before the Commonwealth will reexamine the effectiveness of this attempt to bring down the Smith regime. We are sure that the British will use that time to good advantage.

Before and after the illegal rebellion, the British position has been that they would not use force in the Southern Rhodesia rebellion, except to restore law and order. Shortly after the rebellion took place, the British gave an indication that they were willing to send troops into neighboring Zambia, although agreement could not be reached with Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda on a mandate for such troops.

In the meantime, when the possibility that the Smith regime would cut off Zambia's power from the Kariba Dam became a specter on the horizon, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson publicly stated that the United Kingdom could not stand idly by and allow that to happen. Zambia's entire copper-based economy depends on Kariba power. Late last week, too, a British military mission arrived in Zambia for talks with the Zambian Government.

The United States and the United Kingdom are united in their determination that Zambia shall not be made to bear the brunt of the Southern Rhodesia crisis. As a result of their common colonial past, the economies of Southern Rhodesia and Zambia are rather intricately intertwined. All of Zambia's oil, for example, has been received from the refinery at Umtali. Thus, the announcement of the British oil embargo caught Zambia with less than 2 weeks' supply of petroleum products, although measures were already underway to meet Zambia's petroleum requirements by alternate overland methods. These, of course, take time to function fully.

NEIGHBORS HELP ZAMBIA

The help given to Zambia by its African neighbors has been vital to the success of the supply operation. Kenya and Tanzania have cooperated magnificently in making available their port, railroad, and airport facilities for the British segment of the airlift. Tanzania has greatly facilitated the overland flow of petroleum by helping to organize truck convoys.

The Congo has met every request of the United States and Canadian Governments to make a success of the airlift we have mounted from Leopoldville. Two great American overseas airlines, Pan American Airways and Trans World Airlines, deserve a hearty "well done" for their assistance with this airlift. Together, they are carrying a minimum of 180 tons of diesel fuel a day to Zambia.

By the first of March, the petroleum situation within Zambia should be sufficiently normal again for that aspect of the airlift to be discontinued, but we are prepared to continue the airlift for other vitally needed supplies. President Mobutu made a large gift of oil from his Government's own stocks to help tide Zambia over the most critical period of the oil shortage. The Portuguese authorities in Mozambique and Angola and the South African Government have shown a correct attitude. They have respected the British oil embargo and show every sign of continuing to practice their neutrality in what they see as a domestic British problem.

Let me close with a comment on the claim of the Smith regime that it is a bulwark against communism in Africa. We disagree. We believe the regime's policies and actions are designed to perpetuate minority rule. If those are left unchallenged and unchecked, they would create exactly the kind of situation in which the Communists could greatly extend their influence in Southern Rhodesia and which would encourage the Communists to renew their efforts elsewhere in Africa.

We have had some experience in helping responsible African governments resist Communist encroachments—far more experience, I might add, than the Southern Rhodesian regime. We believe the policies of governments in other African countries—policies looking toward social advancement, responsible majority rule, and political stability—are far more effective weapons against communism than any of the methods the Smith regime might devise.

We know of no Communist threat to Southern Rhodesia at present, but we fear one may well develop if the colony continues on its present course. We do not consider our support of British efforts to return Southern Rhodesia to legal, constitutional government inconsistent with our policy of resisting the Communist threat to genuine independence in Africa. On the contrary, we look on our opposition to the rebel regime as additional evidence of our determination to resist that threat.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, Jan. 29, 1966]

"AFRICA LAUDS PEACE STEPS" MENNEN WILLIAMS TELLS OF TALKS WITH LEADERS

Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams, who carried President Johnson's Vietnam "peace offensive" to Africa, said here Friday night that the African part of the peace effort was successful.

Williams, former six-term Governor of Michigan and now African affairs assistant in the State Department, spoke at a dinner meeting of the International Relations Council of St. Joseph County in the Morris Inn.

The "peace offensive" was well received by African leaders, said Williams, who traveled the length of Africa, visiting 14 heads of state in 7 days, to explain this Nation's Vietnamese policy.

Williams said African leaders were pleased to be consulted and praised the United States for efforts to open Vietnam peace negotiations.

PROMISE ACTION

Many of those to whom he talked promised to approach the Communist world and urge negotiations, Williams said.

"Even if the North Vietnamese refuse to negotiate," Williams added, "I am positive that we have convinced the leaders of black Africa of the sincerity of our intentions."

During a question period following his speech, Williams also said communism has lost its early impact on Africa and has settled into a status more like imperialism.

"Ideologically, communism hasn't made any headway in Africa," Williams said. "The number of card-carrying Communists in Africa is very small."

He said the only really successful effort by Red China and Russia has been Brazzaville, the Congo.

The main topic of Williams' speech was the Southern Rhodesian crisis resulting from the effort of the Ian Smith regime to obtain independence from the British Government and extend a white supremacy ruled.

PRAISES EFFORT

Williams praised the efforts of Britain to bring down the Smith regime. He said the efforts of Britain to use controls on trade rather than armed conflict in the Southern Rhodesian matter are proving successful.

"American reaction to the illegal seizure of power by the Smith regime was immediate and positive," Williams said. He praised American businessmen for voluntary cooperation in helping to make the trade controls successful.

Williams scoffed at the claim by Smith that the minority-rule government in Southern Rhodesia would be a bulwark against communism.

On the contrary, Williams said, Smith policies to perpetuate minority rule and hold down the advancement of the Negro majority creates "exactly the kind of situation in which the Communists could greatly extend their influence in Southern Rhodesia" and encourages Communists efforts elsewhere in Africa.

Communism and Crisis in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD and to commend to the attention of the membership of this body, an editorial entitled "Communism and Crisis in Italy," which appeared in the February 14, 1966, edition of the New York Times.

For many years I have spoken in this House about developments in Italy, expressing my growing concern about the influence of the Communist Party in the governmental affairs of this country.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, and as a great admirer of the Italian people, their contributions to our culture, and their positive and important role in the NATO structure, I have viewed with dismay the progress which the Communist Party of Italy has made over the years in various local, administrative, and national elections. The current government crisis in Italy is in part attributable to those developments.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the current situation in Italy—a situation which may provide the opportunity for the increase in power of the Communist Party of that country—will be resolved in such a manner so as to prevent any diminution of Italy's important role in the affairs of the free world.

The editorial follows:

COMMUNISM AND CRISIS IN ITALY

The failure of Aldo Moro, leader of the Christian Democrats, to form a government on his first try in the present Italian political crisis is bad news for everyone but the Communists. The possibilities now are a long crisis, a caretaker government, or a general election. The four-party coalition is displaying lack of unity just at the moment that the Italian Communist Party (PCI) has reorganized and unified its leadership.

The PCI, largest Communist Party in the West, is likely to continue on the relatively moderate line set for it years ago by the late Palmiro Togliatti. In its esoteric terminology, polycentrism—or autonomy from Moscow and Peiping—is the party's policy in international affairs. In internal affairs, it is democratic centralism, which calls for centralized strategy but diversity and even liberalism in tactics.

The intricate maneuvering that brought this result took place at the recent annual Communist congress, where Luigi Longo, ex-World War resistance leader and now secretary general of the party, asserted his dominance. In the process, he crushed the hard-liner, Pietro Ingrao, and got an apologetic retreat from the soft-liner, Giorgio Amendola, who wanted to see the Communists make a deal with the left-center.

The twists and turns inside the PCI are important only because the Italian Communists are important. Although party membership has shown a gradual drop in the last decade, the Communists have steadily gained popular votes and seats in Parliament. In the 1963 general election the PCI won 25.3 percent of the votes and 166 out of 630 seats in the Chamber of Deputies. Only the Christian Democrats—who lost votes and seats in the election—have a larger representation.

The paradox in Italy, as in France, is that the nation can absorb such a large foreign body in its political structure and remain a democracy. There is no reason to expect the Communists to weaken in the next 2 years, but neither is there any reason to expect them to gain power. Italy has proved that in a country which defends its free institutions, keeps the extremists more or less isolated while leaving them free, and adapts relatively advanced social and economic programs, neither communism nor fascism can win popular majorities.

A Vital Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, typical of many editorials praising the efforts being made by my longtime friend, Vice President Humphrey, on his swing to several Far Eastern capitals was one of February 10 in the Long Island Newsday, which declared that Mr. Humphrey, "an able assistant to his chief, is carrying on for President Johnson in implementing political, economic, and social progress for South Vietnam."

His trip is designed to inform several governments "of the magnitude of the Johnson program for help to the South Vietnamese as well as the corollary military program for expediting progress in the war."

The editorial sums up very clearly the importance of the Vice President's trip, and I, therefore, wish to include the article in the Record:

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Newsday, Feb. 10, 1966]

HUMPHREY'S VITAL TRIP

Vice President Humphrey, an able assistant to his chief, is carrying on for President Johnson in implementing political, economic, and social progress for South Vietnam. His trip will take him from that war-torn country to India, Australia, Malaysia, Thailand, and Japan, all of whose governments will be informed firsthand of the magnitude of the Johnson program for help to the South Vietnamese as well as the corollary military program for expediting progress in the war.

This is a vital trip, and a prompt follow-up to the Declaration of Honolulu, which succinctly restated the American position, reassured the Vietnamese that we seek only their right to self-determination, and advised those under the sway of Ho Chi Minh that we intend to stick by our ally until a truce or an American-South Vietnamese triumph has occurred. The Vice President has a task worthy of his mettle. We wish him the very best.

One Hundred Urban Affairs Experts Stress Importance of Funding Rent Supplement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that one of the first major actions of this session of Congress will be to fulfill President Johnson's request for funds to put the rent supplement program into effect.

Recently 100 experts in urban problems endorsed a letter to President Johnson emphasizing the great importance of the rent supplement program. The letter, from Leon Shull, national director of the Americans for Democratic Action, calls the rent supplement program "the most important new initiative in housing policy to aid low-income families since 1949."

I believe this letter and the list of endorsers will be of interest:

FEBRUARY 11, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We believe that the rent supplement program adopted by the Congress in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is the most important new initiative in housing policy to aid low-income families since 1949. If the rent supplement program is adequately funded, and is used in our metropolitan areas—cities and suburbs—it will be a basic tool to eliminate slum housing in which so many of our poor now live.

Regrettably the House of Representatives failed to appropriate funds for this program. While the Senate appropriated funds, the program was not funded. Until the rent subsidy program is funded it cannot aid low-income families in their housing needs.

The purpose of the rent subsidy program is to aid low-income families who are either physically handicapped, elderly, occupy substandard housing, or have been displaced by governmental action. The legislation assures that only low-income families will receive the program's benefits.

Since eligibility for the rent supplement program is limited to the maximum income permissible for public housing occupancy, to suggest that rent supplement is not a program to benefit low-income families, as the bill's opponents have, grossly distorts the real facts.

Low-income families invariably spend more proportionately per unit for housing than other families; a family earning a low income is often forced to spend as much as 35 percent of their income on housing. We believe that the rent supplement program is a valuable tool precisely because it lowers rent costs for low-income families while at the same time provides such families with decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

As important as funding the rent subsidy program is, it is necessary that the program be allowed to function as Congress intended it—without undue restrictions. In 1965, however, the House Appropriations Committee limited the use of the funds of the rent subsidy program by requiring that rent subsidy program projects must be "either part of a workable program or * * * have been officially approved by the local community concerned."

These restrictions are unwise public policy, and will severely cripple the rent supplement program. Many communities do not have workable programs. Also, since the rent subsidy program does not involve a matching grant, local officials should not be in the position of having a veto power over a program that neither involves local officials administratively nor financially.

Mr. President, the legislative solution is obvious. To end blight and increase decent, safe, and sanitary housing requires funding the rent supplement program, and without restrictions. We respectfully request your public support on this matter as a major administration priority. Its success will be a great victory in the war against poverty and an end to slum housing.

Attached is a list of endorsers of this letter. Their organizational and institutional affiliations are listed for identification purposes only.

Respectfully yours,

LEON SHULL,
National Director.

ENDORSERS OF RENT SUBSIDY LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

John Anderson, attorney, San Francisco, Calif.

Ellis Ash, administrator, Boston Housing Authority, Stoneham, Mass.

David Baum, assistant professor of law, College of Law, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Henry C. Beertiz, attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.

James Besheres, associate professor of sociology, MIT, Newton, Mass.

Richard F. Bolan, assistant to the director, Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, Cambridge, Mass.

Richard H. Buford, commissioner of licenses and inspection, Philadelphia, Pa.

Terry Chisholm, executive director, Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations, Philadelphia, Pa.

Carla Cohen, city planner, Washington, D.C.

Theodore Coggs, former president, National Bar Association, Milwaukee, Wis.

M. Todd Cooke, Jr., banker, Philadelphia, Pa.

Harvey Cox, associate professor, Harvard Divinity School, Boston, Mass.

Robert Craft, inner city development project, Milwaukee, Wis.

Louis Danzig, executive director, Newark Housing Authority, Newark, N.J.

Paul Davidoff, chairman, department of city planning, Hunter College, New York, N.Y.

Terry Dellmuth, public welfare consultant, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Cushing Dolbeare, managing director, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

James R. Dumpson, chairman, Hunter School of Social Work, Hunter College, New York, N.Y.

Edward Eichler, California homebuilder, San Francisco, Calif.

Maurice Fagan, executive director, Fellowship Commission, Philadelphia, Pa.

Bernard Farber, professor, department of sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Garham S. Finney, executive director, Council for Community Advancement, Philadelphia, Pa.

Edwin H. Folk, executive director, Philadelphia Citizens Committee on City Planning, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Frankie M. Freeman, attorney, St. Louis, Mo.

Bernard Frieden, associate professor of city planning, M.I.T, Cambridge, Mass.

James J. Gallagher, professor, institute for research of exceptional children, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Herbert Gans, associate professor, Teachers College, Columbia University; center for urban education, New York, N.Y.

Daniel Glaser, chairman, department of sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Arnold Greenberg, attorney, San Francisco, Calif.

Charles F. Grosser, associate professor of social work, New York University, Graduate School of Social Work, New York, N.Y.

Arnold Gurin, associate professor of social administration, Florence Heller Graduate School of Social Work, Brandeis University, Newton, Mass.

Chester W. Hartman, Samuel Stouffer Fellow Harvard-M.I.T. Joint Center for Urban Studies, Cambridge, Mass.

Philip Herr, lecturer on city planning, M.I.T., Newton, Mass.

Gerald Hill, attorney, former director of the Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing Problems, San Francisco, Calif.

Robert Hoyt, pastor, Education Ascension Lutheran Church, urban affairs consultant, Northern Missouri Synod, Milwaukee, Wis.

Lawrence Howard, Human Relations Institute, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.

Theodore Husted, Jr., vice-dean, University of Pennsylvania Law School; president, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

William W. Jeanes, attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marshal Kaplan, executive director, Institute for Planning and Development, San Francisco, Calif.

John Kearney, Mayor's Advisory Committee on Housing and Community Organization; executive director, Independent Voters of Illinois, Chicago, Ill.

John Langhorne, associate director, special services department. United Community Services of Metropolitan Boston, Brighton, Mass.

Jay A. Larkey, M.D., chairman, medical advisory committee, Planned Parenthood Association, Milwaukee, Wis.

Milton Lebowitz, professor and chairman, community organization division, Fordham University, New York, N.Y.

Thomas V. Lefevere, attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.

Phillip E. Lerman, president, Wisconsin State board of vocational, technical and adult education, Milwaukee, Wis.

Mrs. Frances Levenson, director, demonstration rehabilitation project, New York, N.Y.

Joan Ann Levin, assistant research professor, Florence Heller Graduate School of Social Work, Brandeis University, Cambridge, Mass.

Michael Lewis, assistant professor, department of sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Charles Liddell, executive director, United South End Settlement of Boston, Needham, Mass.

Milford Lieberthal, department of labor and industrial relations, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

David Liederman, assistant director, Roxbury Federation of Neighborhood Centers, Winthrop, Mass.

Joseph Litterer, professor of business administration, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

David Ludlow, director, American Friends Service Committee, housing opportunities program, New York, N.Y.

Kevin Lynd, professor and chairman of the faculty, Harvard-M.I.T. Joint Center for Urban Studies, Watertown, Mass.

John McDowell, dean, Boston University School of Social Work, Boston, Mass.

Herbert McLaughlin, architect, San Francisco, Calif.

Bertram McNamara, district director, U.S. Steel Workers District No. 32, Milwaukee, Wis.

Daniel Mandelker, professor of law, School of Law, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Seymour Mann, director of public administration and urban affairs program, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville Campus, Edwardsville, Ill.

Robert March, executive director, Roxbury Federation of Neighborhood Centers, Boston, Mass.

Roger Montgomery, director, urban renewal design center, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

William W. Nash, associate professor and chairman of the department, city planning and regional planning, Harvard Graduate School of Design, Winchester, Mass.

Troy R. Nestmeyz, assistant dean, Graduate School of Public Administration, New York University, New York, N.Y.

Eleanor B. O'Connor, board member, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rai Okamoto, architect and urban designer, San Francisco, Calif.

Robert Osborn, assistant professor of political science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Sue Osborn, League of Women Voters, Philadelphia, Pa.

James Pawley, executive director, Urban League, Essen County, N.J.

George Pazik, executive vice president, North Town Planning and Development Council, Milwaukee, Wis.

Walter Phillips, assistant professor, department of sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

P. W. Purdom, professor of environmental engineering and services, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lee Rainwater, professor of sociology, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Henry T. Reath, attorney, vice president, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

Janet Reiner, consultant, Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Carleton C. Richards, M.D., board member, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

Alan Sagner, Levin-Sagner Urban Redevelopment Corp., Newark, N.J.

George Schermer, human relations consultant, Washington, D.C.

Richard Scobie, director, tenant relations, Boston Housing Authority, Newtonville, Mass.

Malcolm Scott, Jr., director, Council on Equal Housing Opportunity, Philadelphia, Pa.

Joseph A. Singer, builder, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ann Louise Strong, acting director, Institute of Legal Research, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Michael L. Strong, attorney, vice president, citizens council on city planning, Philadelphia, Pa.

Adolph Sturmthal, professor, department of labor and industrial relations, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Phillis B. Taylor, coordinator, Housing Information Service, and Fair Housing Council, Philadelphia, Pa.

Richard K. Taylor, executive director, Fair Housing Council, Delaware Valley, Pa.

Morton I. Teicher, dean, School of Social Work, Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y.

Harry M. Tiebout, Jr., associate professor of philosophy, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Rev. Homer Tucker, chairman, Social Welfare Division of Greater Newark Council of Churches, Newark, N.J.

Wayne Vasey, dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Francois C. Vigier, assistant professor, city planning and urban design, Harvard Graduate School of Design, Cambridge, Mass.

Donald C. Wagner, research professor, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

William Wainwright, associate professor of philosophy, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

David A. Wallace, professor, city planning, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

John Williams, antipoverty community action representative, Philadelphia, Pa.

James Q. Wilson, director, Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, Cambridge, Mass.

Nochem Winnet, attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mildred Fairchild Woodbury, board member, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

Arnold Zander, retired president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Washington, D.C.

Frank Zeidler, past mayor of Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.

Wakefield Item Garners Prizes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege and pleasure to inform my colleagues here in the House of the recent recognition given to the Wakefield Item of Wakefield, Mass., at the recently held annual meeting of the New England Newspaper Association. With some 600 entries entered in 13 different categories, the Item won first place for general excellence among the New England dailies. The same paper also took a second-place award for the best individual news story of 1965 for papers in its circulation classification. The story which garnered this latter prize was composed by the very well known and capable reporter of the Item, Mr. Dick Baker.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring these achievements to the attention of the Congress. I need not stress to this body the very great role which responsible journalism plays in the democratic tradition of this country. This Nation was founded upon the belief that an informed citizenry is an essential ingredient of effective responsive government.

I have been privileged to learn firsthand, Mr. Speaker, the dedication to these principles that is shared by the president of the Wakefield Item Co. and his very able and talented staff. They have maintained a constant, high standard of excellence despite the frequency of their publication, for which I am sure my colleagues here in the House share my very great and genuine admiration.

I want to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate the Item and its president and his staff and to extend them my best wishes for continued success.

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate considered military procurement authorizations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 2893–3006

Bills Introduced: Six bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2925–2930; S.J. Res. 137; and S. Res. 221–225. **Pages 2897–2898**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. Res. 207, to print additional copies of hearings held by Committee on Public Works on the Water Quality Act of 1965 (S. Rept. 993);

S. Res. 208, to print additional copies of hearings held by the Committee on Public Works on the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (S. Rept. 994); and

S. Res. 219, to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Report on the Five-Year Record of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and Its Future Role" (S. Rept. 995).

The following four bankruptcy bills were reported by Committee on Finance, with recommendations (for details on the four reports see Senate Report 996 on S. 976):

S. 976, to limit the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy (S. Rept. 996);

S. 1912, respecting statutory liens in bankruptcy (S. Rept. 997);

H.R. 3438, to limit the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy (S. Rept. 998);

H.R. 136, respecting statutory liens in bankruptcy (S. Rept. 999); and

H.R. 5831, providing for free entry of certain stained glass and cement windows for Our Lady of Angels Seminary of Glenmont, N.Y. (S. Rept. 1000);

H.R. 11006, extending statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability (S. Rept. 1001);

H.R. 11007, providing statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of the Administrator during his absence or disability, or during a vacancy in that office (S. Rept. 1002);

H.R. 11747, restricting conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care (S. Rept. 1003);

H.R. 10625, relating to the tax treatment of certain amounts paid to servicemen and their survivors (S. Rept. 1004); and

S. Res. 222–223, payments of gratuities to survivors of deceased Senate employees (no written reports). **Page 2897**

President's Message—National Capital Transportation Agency: President transmitted First Annual Report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, which was referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. **Page 2896**

Bankruptcy: Authority was granted for filing minority views with the reports of Committee on Finance on S. 976, 1912, H.R. 3438, and 136, having to do with bankruptcy matters, the titles of which may be found under item above entitled "Bills reported." **Page 2897**

Military Procurement: Senate considered S. 2791, fiscal 1966 supplemental authorizations for military procurement, pending question at adjournment being adoption of committee amendment (in the nature of a substitute for the bill). **Pages 3006–3033**

Authority To Report: Committee on Finance was authorized to file until midnight tonight certain reports, with individual, supplemental, or minority views. **Page 3033**

Condolence Resolution: S. Res. 225, expressing condolences on the death of Representative Albert Thomas, of Texas, was adopted. **Page 3034**

Treaty Received: Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States was received (Ex. A, 89th Cong., 2d sess.)—referred to Committee on Foreign Relations. **Page 3033**

Nominations: The following nominations were received: Elmer Boyd Staats, of Kansas, to be Comptroller General; Dixon Donnelley, of D.C., to be an Assistant Secretary of State; Lee C. White, of Nebraska, to be a member of FPC; Timothy J. May, of Colorado, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department; R. D. Pennewell, of Missouri, and A. Lars Nelson, of Washington, to be members of Federal Farm Credit Board,

Appendix

The Job Corps in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Job Corps program in Idaho has recently become a subject of national interest. To assure that the membership is kept fully informed on current developments, I offer for publication in the RECORD the following three newspaper articles:

[From the Owyhee (Idaho) Nugget, Feb. 10, 1966]

Marsing Job Corpsmen Graduate From Center

Two corpsmen, Roland Bland and Jeffery Bolden, Jr., received certificates of completion February 7, 1966 at the Marsing Job Corps Conservation Center.

ROLAND BLAND

Roland Bland, 17, is from Petersburg, Va. and was transferred to the Marsing Center from Curlew Job Corps Conservation Center, Curlew, Wash., on October 25, 1965. He originally entered the Job Corps program June 10, 1965. Roland was promoted to assistant corpsman leader while at Curlew and was promoted to corpsman leader when he arrived at Marsing. He was sent to our center to assist us by providing corpsman leadership at our initial stages.

While at Marsing he was assigned duties of teacher's aid and as work leader. He performed these duties in an excellent manner. He previously completed the education program while at Curlew Job Corps Conservation Center. Roland was transferred to Kilmer Job Corps Urban Center in Edison, N.J., to further his training in his desired trade skills of machinist and welding.

This Urban Center has a maximum enrollment of 2,500 corpsmen and Roland will be able to stay up to a maximum of 2 years at this center starting from the time he entered the Job Corps in June 1965

JEFFERY BOLDEN

Jeffery Bolden, Jr., 20, is from Mount Vernon, Ala., and came to this center November 23, 1965. Jeffery excelled in the education and work program and progressed rapidly. He advanced from the Job Corps fourth level to the ninth level in approximately 3 months and has completed the basic education program. He also has learned and practiced basic work attitudes and skills.

His qualifications were discussed with the employment service at his hometown and they stated that with his basic knowledge, work habits and attitudes, he can have a choice of several jobs at the present time. Because he has completed the basic education-work program and has been assured of job placement, he has fulfilled the purpose of the Job Corps program and was graduated to become a taxpayer.

[From the Owyhee (Idaho) Nugget, Feb. 10, 1966]

Marsing Job Corps Center To Expand to 168 Corpsmen

Enrollees at the Marsing Job Corps Conservation Center will be increased by 56 corpsmen by June 15, from the 112 now at the Center, reported Daniel Weir, regional Job Corps coordinator, Bureau of Reclamation, and Cleve S. Bolingbroke, Center director. This will make a total of 168 corpsmen, and the staff will be increased from the present 31 to 47.

"By expanding the Center," the men said, "it will mean a far better vocational training program in automotive maintenance, heavy equipment operation, concrete and brick work, carpentry, welding, and many more vocational trades. More and better equipment will be brought to the site.

Over $150,000 will be spent at the Center between now and June 15 for expanded facilities which will include a new 56-man dormitory, a 1,000-square-foot dispensary, a new gym 90 by 96 feet, and a new shop building.

Plans are being formulated to develop the corpsmen's social abilities and help them find a better place in society.

Wednesday morning Mr. Weir, Mr. Bolingbroke, E. R. Indreland, deputy director of the Marsing Job Corps works program, met with Marsing Mayor Dave Haken, and Harold Curt, president of the Marsing Rod and Gun Club, to discuss plans on beautifying the Marsing Island Park. The Center plans to spend several thousand dollars on the island project, which should make a beautiful place for all to enjoy.

[From the Cottonwood (Idaho) Chronicle, Feb. 10, 1966]

The need for better communication between citizens of Cottonwood and the surrounding communities and the Job Corps Conservation Center at Cottonwood has been recognized since the opening of the camp and the arrival of the corpsmen at the Center.

In November, a group of public-spirited citizens of Cottonwood from social-action groups and churches met with the staff at the Center and established a coordinating council. This council has now become a point of contact between the town and the camps.

On February 1 the group met for the first time in the new year, to continue discussions of ways and means for interesting other organizations of the community in the work at the Job Corps Center, and especially to devise methods for establishing more points of contact between the two groups.

It was felt that one of the important ways in which men and women of Cottonwood could observe the educational facilities and the accomplishments of the Job Corps conservation crews was by actual visits to the camp. During these visits, the staff and various counselors and instructors could answer questions and explain the educational and vocational facilities open to the corpsmen. The boys, themselves, would be available for answering questions about their life at the Center and in the forest "spike camps" to which they go voluntarily for ranger training and experience.

Another effective form of communication, it was felt, would be having some of the young men attend open meetings of the social-action groups in Cottonwood to observe how these function—especially how various community projects are proposed, carried out, completed, or tabled. They also hope some of the women's organizations might participate, so a broader understanding of the aims and objectives of the program of the Job Corps might lessen the communication gap between the town and the Center.

Attending the meeting were Len Kuther, chairman; Cletus Uhlorn for the business community, Bud Walkup and Ladd Arnoti; Center Director Robert R. Lusk, Margaret Raymond, VISTA Volunteer; Sam Jordan, and Otto H. Ost.

An Important Warning for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Samuel F. Pryor has just returned from a tour of all of our bases in southeast Asia and has made some very important observations which should serve as a warning for the future.

Some of his conclusions are given in the following column by Ruth Montgomery which appeared in the New York Journal American of February 11, 1966:

Capital Letter: What if Red China Had Our Muscle?

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—A nongovernmental aviation expert who directed the development of 50 overseas military airfields during World War II has just returned from a comprehensive tour of all U.S. bases in southeast Asia. His conclusion: President Johnson has been right every step of the way in his Vietnam policy.

Samuel F. Pryor, longtime executive of Pan American World Airways, made the trip in company with our Air Force Pacific Commander in Chief, Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr.

Having convinced himself of the rightness of our policy—both the lull and the resumed bombing—Pryor reserves his scorn for those who say that America should pull out of the area. He has this word of warning for the doves, and for the fence-sitting nations of the world:

"Add together our guided missile program, our ICBM's and nuclear capacity, our Air Force, Polaris submarines, Navy, Marines, artillery and Army, and you have the greatest military strength in the history of mankind. Couple this with our productive capacity, which is half of the entire world's, and imagine what would happen if the Red Chinese possessed this strength.

"They'd be in Moscow and Paris, Africa and South America right now, and half of our American cities would be bombed out. Let's face facts. Do we want this to happen to our children, or do we want to stop the Red Chinese now? Do we want them to overrun southeast Asia and Thailand, and then pick off sparsely settled Australia? That's our choice."

Pryor visited every U.S. base in South Vietnam, Taiwan, and Okinawa, plus all the "military assistance" places in Thailand. From long experience he says that no war is kind, but that we are "fighting a kind war in Vietnam." He explains that during the recent bombing lull, the Presdent was in effect saying to the Vietcong: "Now you see what's happening. Please stop. We don't want to hurt you."

When the Reds refused to listen to the voice of reason, Pryor thinks the President had "no alternative but to give them another taste of our strength." He also assures the hawks that the lull was by no means wasted on our side.

We were using that period, he says, to build up "tremendous strength," and through intelligence and flyovers to gage the capability of the enemy in rebuilding its bombed-out bridges and supply roads.

As a narcotics expert, Pryor looked into the smuggling problem during the Asian tour. The contraband drugs are moving out of Red China into the black markets of the world, and Pryor says: "Heroin is the stuff you would only want your enemies to use. Red China has a strict ban on its use by its own people, but it is moving out for sale in the free world."

Pryor, despite his conviction that the President is right in stepping up the pace of the war, is anything but a saber rattler. Returning here only long enough to make a private report to the Bureau of Narcotics, he is now off to the Holy Land in company with Bishop Walter Gray of the Connecticut Episcopal diocese.

"We will visit every spot in Jordan and Israel that was trod by the Prince of Peace," he says. Pryor and the bishop even have rare permission to pass both ways through the Mandelbaum Gate which separates the two warring nations.

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy—Training School for Our Nation's Seagoing Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., which is located in the congressional district I have the honor to represent in this distinguished body, has been a steady source of stalwart men of the sea. That the Academy produces men is evidenced by the fact that three Kings Point alumni have been cited for bravery and outstanding service in Vietnam. I would like at this point to include in the Record a newspaper story about the most recent Kings Point graduate, Navy Comdr. Alexander C. Kuegler, Jr., and his service to our Nation:

THIRD KINGS POINT GRAD CITED AS VIETNAM HERO

Navy Comdr. Alexander C. Kuegler, Jr., of Sea Cliff is the latest of three graduates of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point to be cited for outstanding service in Vietnam.

Kuegler was recently awarded the Vietnamese Medal of Honor and the Navy Commendation Medal for bravery under gunfire while U.S. military adviser to the Commander, River Force.

CLASSMATES IN 1944

Previously, Lt. Comdr. Harvey E. Rodgers, of Smithtown, was awarded the Vietnamese Medal for Gallantry for his part in sinking a Vietcong armored vessel in Vung Ro Bay and Comdr. Paul C. Ewing, of McLean, Va., received the Navy Commendation Medal for establishing and operating a complex maritime advisory program.

Kuegler, a member with Ewing of the class of 1944, was cited for his service between July 4, 1963, and July 4, 1964, which "provided advisory assistance which proved combat readiness of Vietnamese Navy in support of counterinsurgency of effort against Vietcong."

Water Pollution in Michigan—A Way to Its Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to commend to my colleagues the very excellent speech delivered by our good friend John Dingell at the Clean Water Conference of the Michigan State Association of Supervisors on the subject of water pollution:

WATER POLLUTION IN MICHIGAN—A WAY TO ITS SOLUTION

(Address of Hon. John D. Dingell, Democrat, 16th Congressional District of Michigan, to the Michigan State Association of Supervisors, on January 18, 1966, at their Clean Water Conference in Lansing, Mich.)

My dear friends, I want to express my gratitude to you for the privilege of being here today and for the opportunity of discussing one of the most pressing resource problems of our day. I want to commend both my valued friend, Ed Connor, one of our outstanding public officials, for his expression of confidence in me, and the association for its interest in this desperate problem of water pollution.

The title assigned to me was, "Water Pollution in Michigan." I would like to take the liberty of adding to that title the words, "A Way to Its Solution." Briefly that solution is Federal, State, and local cooperation, large expenditures of funds, and vigorous enforcement of our antipollution laws.

Before I observe any of you going to sleep, I want to make it very clear that it is not my purpose to commence a doleful recitation of contamination of our State's once pristine waters. Nor do I intend to descend to a lugubrious recital of the effects of this contamination on health, welfare, and recreational opportunities of our people. Neither will I go into its devastating effects upon fish and wildlife and on the attracting of new industry to our State.

Certain of my comments will necessarily touch on these matters but only as incidental to a calm discussion of our water problems.

Michigan, like all other States, has been a bit like the farmer who was approached by the county agent and offered new advice on the latest and best ways to farm. The farmer replied, "Thank you very much for your help, but I am not farming right now as well as I know how." I say this with due deference to Mr. Loring F. Oeming, the executive secretary, and to the other members of our Michigan Water Resources Commission, who over the years have done one of the best jobs in the United States of managing water resources.

I can well recall that for a long time I used to receive a visit during just about every Congress from either Milt Adams, former executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission, or from our able assistant attorney general, Nick Olds, two of my very dear friends. Both of these men are among the most able officials and public-interest oriented individuals anywhere, and I think that all three of us looked forward to these visits. They initiated a regular tilt dealing with legislation sponsored by me which each of these good gentlemen sincerely felt would put our State agencies out of business, a calamity desired by none of us.

Our contacts started back in 1956 when Congressman John Blatnik first began the fight for meaningful water pollution control with the introduction of what was to become Public Law 660, the fundamental Federal water pollution law. This was enacted after the opposition of the States, some communities, and most industries, as well as the dedicated opposition of the Eisenhower administration, was overcome. All of the opponents of this legislation; industrial groups, State agencies, and the administration, stressed what to them were valid reasons for opposition. Industry pleaded the problems of compliance and cost increase; State agencies feared that the proposed legislation impinged upon their treasured jurisdiction; and the Eisenhower administration argued that "water pollution was a uniquely local blight," and of course worried that the legislation would provide $50 million a year to assist communities in construction of desperately needed sewage abatement works.

Ultimately the differences with the State administrators were resolved by limiting the Federal activity to areas of pollution originating in one State and affecting health, life, and welfare in other States. The objections of the polluters and of the executive branch were simply battered aside, or compromises were made which resulted in garnering of a vote here or there, sufficient unto the need for passage of the legislation.

To their great credit, the Michigan Water Resources Commission, and my old friend, Milt Adams, recognized the wisdom of that legislation and fought valiantly for it at the end.

I saw my two beloved friends at the time I introduced a draft of the bill permitting communities to request the assistance of the Federal Government in the abatement of pollution coming from their upstream neighbors. This bill was changed to provide that the Governor of the State could request the Public Health Service to commence proceedings for the abatement of intrastate pollution. It then became law and was supported by my two friends and Michigan's State agencies. Parenthetically, it was this legislation which was utilized to initiate the Federal cleanup now taking place on the Detroit River at the request of former Governor Swainson.

I was again visited by my two old friends when I introduced legislation to establish Federal standards for the abatement of pollution of interstate and navigable waters and to establish a Federal agency to handle pollution of our waters.

It has been a remarkable experience to me to observe the continuing opposition of

State agencies to the upgrading of Federal water pollution control endeavors on grounds that it is not needed, it costs too much, and it impinges upon State responsibilities.

Happily, this legislation also became law. The Water Quality Act of 1965 is applauded even by its former critics, one of the most active of whom now seeks to run the new agency he so vigorously opposed. Through this law, a Federal Water Pollution Control Agency has been established, and provision has been made for workable Federal standards to abate pollution of our interstate waters. More importantly, these several legislative fights have brought about an increase in the level of Federal expenditures to States and communities for abatement of water pollution from $50 million to a figure today in excess of $230 million, with the possibility of an expenditure of $300 million in the next fiscal year, commencing July 1.

Since these Federal expenditures have generated local expenditures at the rate of about 4 to 1, we can reasonably anticipate that total expenditures in the field of water pollution in the coming year may be increased from $1.2 to $1.6 billion.

The best indication of national need is shown by the vast number of new plants which must be constructed and obsolete plants which must be upgraded.

The cost of cleanup can be conservatively estimated at anywhere from $20 to $40 billion.

We recently had opportunity to observe the attitude of the Michigan Water Resources Commission in connection with two Federal proceedings, the first on the Menominee, an interstate proceeding, and the second on the Detroit River, an intrastate abatement action.

Essentially the reaction was the same—opposition to Federal cleanup; although in the second case the opposition was muted by the fact that the Federal proceeding was begun at the request of the then Governor of our State, the Honorable John Swainson.

What opposition was lacking on the part of the State government to clean up the Detroit River, its tributaries, and the Michigan waters of Lake Erie, was certainly abundantly supplied by the general manager of the Detroit Board of Water Commissioners, who characterized Federal cleanup of the Detroit River as unnecessary and an act of gross intrusion into the affairs of the State and the Detroit Water Board.

I would be fair to point out to you that the Detroit River is recognized by all who dwell near it or who use it, as a greatly defiled body of water. Succinctly put, some 540 million gallons of municipal waste containing an oxygen-consuming capacity equal to the raw sewage from a population of over 3 million, innumerable coliform bacteria, over 25,000 pounds of iron, 600,000 pounds of suspended solids, almost 300,000 pounds of settleable solids, some 16,000 gallons of oil, 1,200 pounds of phenolic substances and many thousands of pounds of ammonia, phosphates, and chlorides are deposited there daily. In addition to this, a total industrial waste volume of 1.1 billion gallons is discharged daily into the Detroit River containing among other things, wastes that have an oxygen-consuming capacity equal to raw sewage from a population of over 1 million, 3,000 gallons of oil, 800,000 pounds of suspended solids, 1,400 pounds of phenol, 80,000 pounds of iron, 8,000 pounds of ammonia, 200,000 pounds of acid and over two million pounds of chlorides. My friends, I repeat, these are daily discharges.

An ancient combined sewer system permits raw sewage discharges about 45 times a year, and Detroit's main sewage treatment plant contributes 95 percent of the municipal wastes going into the Detroit River.

Without reading them to you by name, other streams in Michigan have reports of fish kills, phenol and cyanide escapes, and similar spectacular examples of pollution. We constantly read complaints in the newspapers of rivers like the Rouge, the Huron, the Grand, the Red Cedar, and of course the Kalamazoo, which life the fabled western river are too thick with pollutants to drink but too thin to plow.

It is passing strange that we who live in a State whose auto license plates, by State statute, bear the motto "Water-Winter Wonderland" are faced with a Public Health Service report which indicates Detroit and Michigan hold unchallenged last place in regard to water pollution control in the Lake Erie abatement proceedings.

Primary treatment systems remove from 30 to 35 percent of the solids involved in the waster, and secondary treatment systems remove from 80 to 85 percent of the oxygen-consuming organisms present in the solid components of the waste.

One hundred percent of Indiana's and Pennsylvania's drainage into Lake Erie is served by secondary treatment plants. Cleveland has switched all its waste treatment to secondary plants, and 60 percent of Ohio's drainage into Lake Erie will have secondary treatment. The figure for secondary treatment in the whole State of Michigan is only 15 percent. Still the general manager of the Detroit Water Board protests that Detroit does not need to go to secondary treatment, and that the Detroit River is not polluted.

If all the communities in these other States have been able to finance and build the plants, why can't Detroit? If the other States have been willing to insure that their cities and communities abate pollution, why has not Michigan done so?

Our society, our economy, and the unique productivity of our area, are based upon the Great Lakes, their tributaries, and in a very large measure, upon our inland lakes.

The beneficent presence of the Great Lakes moderates the temperature extremes. This magnificent supply of fresh water, the largest in the world, and our splendid climate and scenery make our tourist industry. Our industries are dependent upon our waters for cooling, washing, and other purposes. From Lake Erie alone industries take 4.7 billion gallons of water a day, including 3.85 billion used for power production. Municipalities along Lake Erie shore draw another 619 million gallons of water per day.

By using these figures to project water usage on the other lakes, the enormity of the dependence of our people on the Great Lakes takes on its proper and unbelieveable proportions. The abundance of our water resources has created an economy of incredible productivity.

Prospects for continued expansion of industry and prosperity of the Great Lakes region are bright. Production in our Detroit area alone, measured in value added by manufacture, could increase from about $5.8 billion in 1960 to something over $13 billion in 1980. Population in the Detroit area will probably approach 5.5 million by 1980.

Yet with population and industry growth come ugly results. Every species of game fish that thrived in Lake Erie had declined greatly, and Detroit and other Michigan communities and industries are major contributors to the contamination of Lake Erie.

The clear blue water of that lake is steadily being transferred into something thick and ugly. The shores are lined with debris of all types; decaying organic matter, and waste from ships, cities, and industries. The same situation is found at the south end of Lake Michigan.

Hardly a mail delivery comes to my office that I do not find a complaint about the condition of our Great Lakes or our inland lakes. Our people complain of declining water levels and filth and contamination that result in noxious odors, and ruin swimming, fishing, and water skiing opportunities.

The manager of the Wyandotte waterworks complained to me that he was being forced to run a waste treatment plant, not a municipal water distribution system. The Detroit Water Board suggested Wyandotte place its intakes on the Canadian side of the river, outside the "Water-Winter Wonderland."

A warning of new wastes appeared in the Michigan Municipal Review. In an excellent article in that publication, Donald M. Pierce, chief, Waste Water Section, Division of Engineering, Michigan Department of Health, points out "new wastes create new hazards," and continuing the quote, "technological developments of industry in recent years have produced many new substances whose characteristics have introduced new and complex problems in water treatment and in waste water treatment and disposal. At the same time, medical science has raised new questions yet unanswered on the public health significance of many of these products.

"The toxicologist has gone just far enough in practical research to begin to recognize the long-range toxic potential on man, animal, fish, and birdlife of the thousands of known toxic substances manufactured today and in common use by the public. A wide array of these substances reach our streams, flowing through waters used for recreation and entering water supply intakes. These include synthetic detergents, organo-insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, certain classes of both inorganic and organic substances, and even radioactive substances. Many of these may also reach the ground water resource, through percolation from industrial waste lagoons, sewage lagoons and oxidation ponds, and even solid absorption systems from septic tanks and cesspools."

Twenty-five years ago water pollution was a problem of the heavily populated areas of the northeastern United States.

Today it is a crisis in all parts of our country.

An editorial in one of the major Maryland newspapers described one of the principal recreation areas of that great State as being a peninsula surrounded by silt and sewage.

A Federal official brought two jugs of water along with him into a congressional hearing recently, one of which was a sample of the drinking water supply of a community and the other treated waste water. He pointed out to the committee that there was no earthly way to tell the difference by taste, odor, or color.

At low water, the bacteria count in the Cuyahoga River flowing into Lake Erie from Akron and Cleveland is four times as high as in a stream of raw sewage. The central portion of the Delaware Bay estuary has been ruined by refuse of cities and plants on the Delaware. Its oxygen content has fallen almost to zero and present are scum, black sludge, dead fish, noxious odors, gas bubbles, and floating debris.

Recently, the Willamette River near Portland, Oreg., was turned into a giant septic tank and to flush it the Secretary of the Interior had to order release of water from Fededal dams. When water is low, rivers such as those in New Jersey consist largely of undiluted sewage, and the Connecticut, Merrimack, and areas of the Potomac have been unsafe for as long as 50 years.

Dr. Luther L. Terry, recently retired head of the Public Health Service, declared not long ago, "We are by no means sure that at least some viruses are not slipping through our present water purification and disinfection processes and entering our water mains. Hepatitis may be an example." Dr. Terry cited in connection with this the rather noticeable increase in hepatitis cases in many parts of the United States.

In 1900 waste from our cities and towns was the equivalent of raw sewage from 24 million people, and organic waste from industry equaled the raw sewage of 15 million people. City-born wastes flowing into streams in 1960 equaled the raw sewage from 75 million people, and industrial waste the raw sewage of 160 million persons. In 1970, just a few short years hence, municipal wastes will equal the raw sewage of 85 million people, and industrial waste will equal the raw sewage of 210 million people.

The population growth in Michigan, projected by the Census Bureau through 1985, gives an idea of the increase in water demands which can be anticipated by our people. In 1960 the population was 7.8 million. In 1970 our population will be 8.6 million. By 1985 Michigan's population will be 10.5 million people, using prodigious amounts of water for industrial and municipal purposes.

The problem is spread across the continent. It will get worse, in Michigan and elsewhere, unless most vigorous action is taken. While Michigan has performed better than most States, and while much has been done, vastly more remains for us to do.

On a statewide basis there are only two municipalities with populations in excess of 5,000 without treatment works. But many of these treatment works are not now adequate for the demands upon them, and are still less adequate for future requirements.

Only a few of Michigan's communities have secondary treatment systems. Many small towns and communities in our State lack any treatment facilities at all.

It would be fair to say that many Michigan industries have established treatment plants. It would, however, be equally fair to say that there are others which need treatment plants or which have inadequate or even hopelessly obsolete treatment plants. Many which do have treatment plants, fail to properly operate those plants, or have been found not to operate them at all for substantial periods from time to time.

Michigan's legislature is to be praised for its enactment of good water quality legislation. The statute enacted by this legislature during its last session offers more promise than anything Michigan has yet seen, and more promise than the legislature of almost any other State. It shows that our great State is beginning to move forward.

From the foregoing we can arrive at some conclusions. Michigan has become increasingly aware of its responsibilities. Although the citizenry of Michigan have not been sufficiently aware of the needs of abatement of pollution, they have been ahead of their officials. In like manner, our people have not been aware of the need to make their will known to their public servants. Our officials on all levels need new awareness of the need, and the enormous pool of latent support, which exists for cleanup.

A striking comparison is New York, whose fiscally responsible Governor rammed through a water quality program, probably better than that possessed by any other State in the Union, involving substantial State funding by loans and grants of municipal projects, and involving remarkable expansion of State enforcement powers. These programs passed the legislature unanimously and were adopted by the people of the State when presented to them by referendum with better than a 4 to 1 margin.

Certainly this shows the willingness of people to support proper action by States and municipalities for cleanup of our waters.

More immeditaely, a program of cooperation based upon mutual trust and common purpose between State, local and Federal Government is required.

Substantial expenditure of funds by State and local agencies will be required.

Increased funding on the Federal level is required. The $280 million for matching grants to States and communities for water pollution abatement works is less than half the amount needed. For this reason, last session I introduced legislation to increase Federal expenditures under Public Law 660 to $500 million and to increase fourfold the size of grants to communities.

The State of Michigan should be prepared to participate in the funding of local endeavors, and active consideration should be given to tax benefits for industrial waste treatment works by the State.

Secondary treatment plants should be regarded as mandatory for all municipal systems, except for the very small and isolated communities. High standards of treatment on a local and State level for septic tanks and similar private treatment works are a must.

Disinfection of municipal waste effluent must be practiced to reduce coliform densities to below 5,000 organisms per 100 milliliters. Combined storm and sanitary sewers must be prohibited in newly developed urban areas and eliminated in existing areas wherever possible. Urban renewal must be used as a vehicle for accomplishing this purpose. Alternative methods, less complicated and more economical than actual physical separation, are now being developed and should be applied as soon as they are successfully demonstrated.

State, county, and city officials should determinedly embark on a course of action to encourage combined treatment of municipal and industrial wastes in the same treatment plant. This spells economy of operation and savings for both the public and industry. Where industry locates on the city's environs, it will still pay the community to install an interceptor sewer to bring that industry's wastes to the city plant for treatment.

All new sewage facilities must be designed to prevent the necessity of bypassing untreated waters, something which is a major contributor to the pollution of the Detroit River.

The operation of waste treatment plants should be entrusted only to trained and skilled operators, who should be required to obtain state certification of their competency.

Great emphasis must be given to prevention of accidental spills of waste materials into Michigan's waters. Inplant surveys to prevent accidents should be utilized by State and local officials.

An appropriate system of reporting of unusual increases in waste output and accidental spills to the appropriate State and local agencies must be instituted. Use of waters of the State for disposal of trash, garbage, and other noxious refuse must be prohibited.

Existing dumps along the waters of our State must be eliminated. Industrial plants must be required to improve practices for segregation and treatment of waste to effect maximum reductions of acids, alkalies, tarry substances, oils, phenols, ammonia and nitrogen compounds, phosphorous compounds, and all other wastes with a special emphasis on oxygen-demanding substances.

Federal agencies must be forced to conform to high standards in the discharge of their wastes. The President has issued an Executive order which squarely places this requirement on all Federal installations. Federal water quality standards under the Federal statute just passed under sponsorship of Congressman BLATNIK, Senator MUSKIE and myself must be fixed at the highest feasible levels.

More adequate funding of State programs, and indeed of local programs, must take place to provide for an adequate ability to analyze, trace and prevent sources of pollution. More enforcement personnel on the State and local level must be available to combat pollution.

Since 1956 the Federal Government has increased its expenditures in all areas of water pollution almost sixfold and has assisted generously State programs for prevention of pollution and abatement of this terrible hazard. Communities have bettered this record, yet an enormous construction backlog remains. There is, as New York has shown, reason for State participation in funding projects.

Michigan and other States must have a more realistic system for appraising and reporting needed waste treatment facilities. For example, Michigan's three largest cities report needs for $98 million for construction; Detroit indicating needs of $45,300,000. On the other hand, the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers came up with a figure for the whole State of $4.7 million. The Public Health Service Conference on cleanup of the Detroit River estimates Detroit's needs for secondary treatment to be on the order of $500 million; whereas, the Detroit Water Board says that secondary treatment alone, which is badly needed on the Detroit River, will cost $750 million. It appears that some better way of reporting present and future needs must be devised.

A Senate committee study will shortly show National and State needs and expenditures are vastly larger than any present source indicates.

Local officials must insist on this adequate reporting to enable enactment of adequate State and Federal aid programs.

All State and municipal agencies must require sewerage or water use charges sufficient to finance construction and operation of adequate collection and treatment works.

The Federal Government has been drawn into water pollution abatement by failure of the States to preserve our waters and to abate pollution. If the several States, Michigan included, intend to preserve their ancient right and responsibility in water quality control they must display new vigor and effectiveness.

There must be a full understanding that there is place for Federal, State, and local activity in pollution abatement. The Federal Government neither desires nor has the ability to handle every single source of pollution and every improperly managed and operated cesspool and industrial or municipal treatment works. If the States and communities will accept the invaluable skills and tremendous resources of the Federal Government; if they will support Federal activities to abate pollution by understanding it is a cooperative endeavor; and if they will carry out their own great responsibilities in this area; prospects are good that when we see "water wonderland" it will mean just that, not only for Michigan, but for all America.

Declaration of Honolulu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's decision to dispatch Vice President HUMPHREY to several Asian countries is seen by the Milwaukee Journal as a sign that "while the war continues, the quest for peace goes on."

The Journal noted that the Honolulu declaration is "another vigorous reaffirmation of broad U.S. policy in Vietnam: resisting Communist aggression while continuing to pursue every path toward honorable peace."

The newspaper also found it encouraging that the declaration reemphasized that "the purpose of the United States remains a purpose of peace."

Mr. Speaker, I request that the entire editorial, as follows, be included in the Record:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Feb. 9, 1966]

DECLARATION OF HONOLULU

Shorn of the pomp and circumstance that attended its birth, the declaration of Honolulu appears as another vigorous reaffirmation of broad U.S. policy in Vietnam: Resisting Communist aggression while continuing to pursue every path toward honorable peace.

Although unstated in the official communique, the Honolulu gathering clearly served another function. It committed the United States more firmly than ever to the support of the present Saigon government. The pledges of more intensive efforts to revive the battered Vietnamese economy and to provide a better life for the people are evidence of this. Of course, such goals can never be fully realized when a war is raging.

Significantly, the declaration ignored the publicized demands of the Saigon leaders to step up the war, particularly with wider air operations against the North. Also, another basic difference is signaled by the silence on the issue of recognition of the National Liberation Front, the parent political organization of the Vietcong, as one precondition for any possible negotiation. Prime Minister Ky insists on total nonrecognition. The United States has said that the Vietcong would have no difficulty in having their views represented at any conference.

It is encouraging that the declaration reemphasized that "the purpose of the United States remains a purpose of peace." President Johnson's decision to dispatch Vice President Humphrey again to several Asian countries seems to be a sign that, while the war continues, the quest for peace goes on.

Policy Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we know from experience that frequently it is not easy for either a parent—or a nation—to take a stand, to be firm. But it is sometimes necessary.

We all recall Hitler's aggressive steps, and the great world conflict it took to stop him.

The New York Journal American, recalling this and other aspects of aggression, has commended the administration for its stand in Vietnam.

In an editorial which I thought particularly apropos, the paper stated that in Hawaii President Johnson "has emphatically restated the unassailable case for the American presence in Vietnam," and it adds:

> Perhaps the most striking point made by the President was his comparison of the Vietnam war to American foreign policy decisions of the 1940's, and 1950's when "we took our stand in Europe to protect the freedom of those threatened by aggression."

The editorial asserts that President Johnson's Hawaii speech is a "reemphasis of the 'so far and no farther' outlook which has been a cornerstone of American foreign policy in the post-World War II years." And the paper concludes:

> The policy has worked, and to depart from it would court disaster, shame, and inevitably world war III.

While I have quoted from the editorial, I am certain that many will want to read it in its entirety and, therefore, with permission granted I insert it in the Record at this point:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Feb. 8, 1965]

L.B.J.'s REMINDER

Speaking in Hawaii, President Johnson has emphatically restated the unassailable case for the American presence in Vietnam. The speech provides a fitting rebuff to opponents of his Vietnam policy who, regardless of their motivation invariably fail to offer a logical and honorable alternative.

Perhaps the most striking point made by the President was his comparison of the Vietnam war to American foreign policy decisions of the 1940's and 1950's when "we took our stand in Europe to protect the freedom of those threatened by aggression."

The firmness of such stands—for example, in Greece and during the Berlin airlift—has apparently convinced Soviet Russia that America means business when it says it will not stand idly by and watch communism prey on small and relatively defenseless regions. This determination was, of course, also strikingly and grimly illustrated during the Korean war, at great cost in American life and treasure.

The taking of such a stand, moreover, evokes sad memories of the pre-World War II era when democracy allowed Adolf Hitler to prey in precisely the same fashion on his neighbors. It took a great world conflict to stop him, or don't the administration's Vietnam opponents recall this?

The Hawaii speech is a reemphasis of the "so far and no farther" outlook which has been a cornerstone of American foreign policy in the post-World War II years. The policy has worked, and to depart from it would court disaster, shame, and inevitably world war III.

Marcellus M. Murdock: 68 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 15, 1966, Marcellus M. Murdock, a distinguished Kansan and great American, was honored in Wichita, Kans., on the occasion of 68 years of service in journalism, his community and State. It was my privilege to be present with other citizens from Kansas and other parts of the Nation to pay tribute to Mr. Murdock.

Mr. Murdock remains active as president and chairman of the board of the Wichita Eagle and Beacon Publishing Co. The Murdock name has been synonymous with newspapers and with progress in Kansas for many, many years.

Marcellus Murdock is one of the pioneers of aviation in our State and he has assumed a leading role in making Wichita, Kans., the air capital of the world. At 83 he is a man who is young at heart, and an inspiration to all who have sat with him to discuss personal problems, business, politics, or the future in general.

Britt Brown, vice president and secretary of the Wichita Eagle and Beacon Publishing Co., Inc., presided at the luncheon honoring Mr. Murdock. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following excerpts of Mr. Brown's informal presentation concerning Mr. Murdock:

> As I told you in my letter of invitation, this is in no way to be construed as a retirement party. To the contrary, he will continue his very active participation in both the management and the setting of editorial policy for the newspapers.
>
> In addition to thanking each and every one of you for taking time from your busy schedules and in some cases to come from as far away as Los Angeles and North Carolina to help commemorate this auspicious occasion, I do want to say a few words about my great- (and I do mean "great") uncle that may be of interest to you.
>
> "One fine old stud horse of the Murdock line who still proudly stands, pawing the gravel and sniffing the breeze," as William L. White stated it so well in his editorial honoring "The War Horse" published today in the Emporia Gazette. I commend it to your reading. Though of course Bill is very, very prejudiced in this instance.
>
> Marcellus' professional life in the field of journalism began in 1898, when as a high school boy of 15, he began working for the Wichita Daily Eagle, established by his father, Col. Marshall M. Murdock, April 12, 1872. In 1907 when he was barely 24 and when growing Wichita had a population of 47,000, Marcellus M. Murdock succeeded his father as publisher of the Wichita Eagle. In 1927, he established the Evening Eagle to supplement the morning paper. In 1960 the Wichita Eagle purchased the Wichita Beacon. Three years ago Mr. Murdock became president and chairman of the board of the Wichita Eagle and Beacon Publishing Co., a position he holds with active interest and distinction. For many years he was also vice president and general manager of radio station KFH. You know, that other media. In 1961, Marcellus M. Murdock received outstanding recognition in the field of journalism when he was awarded the Kansas citation for journalistic merit by the William Allen White Foundation.
>
> Many of you present today were also present at that award on February 10, 1961, when our good friend Clyde M. Reed, Jr., wrote a presentation entitled, "The Man Who Did Not Run".
>
> You will remember the presentation talk was prepared by Clyde M. Reed, Jr., publisher of the Parsons Sun, and delivered, because of the illness of Mr. Reed, by Fred W. Brinkerhoff, publisher of the Pittsburg Sun and Headlight. The response by Mr. Murdock, who also was ill, was read by Rolla A. Clymer, past president of the foundation and editor of the El Dorado Times.
>
> Mr. Murdock, who recently purchased a new Beechcraft Bonanza, is still active as a pilot at the age of 83, even though his close friend, the late Walter Beech, said to him in 1928, when Murdock was 45 years old, "Murdock, you're too old to fly."
>
> "I will show you who is too old," retorted Murdock. "Get me an airplane and an instructor, and I'll show you." And so it was that Beech secured for Murdock an instructor and in 1929 sold him an OX-5 powered open-cockpit Travel Air. Many of you OX-

5'ers here today probably remember this well. Receiving his private license (No. 5964—mine is 1062536 and I have been at it some 20 years) and a certificate signed by none other than Orville Wright in April 1929, Murdock became aviation's most enthusiastic booster in a town that was then beginning to consider itself the air capital of the world.

Using his airplanes extensively for news gathering and picture taking for his newspaper, he was one of the real pioneers in the development of aviation.

Flying in those early days without the benefit of such now-taken-for-granted items as navigational aids, dependable engines and prepared airfields, Murdock had his share of catastrophies. But since there are FAA people present, it will suffice to say that during his first few years in aviation, he permanently retired two Travel Airs and a Cessna. Yet, in six unorganized landings, the only injury he ever sustained was a broken tooth. This occurred when, having flipped a Travel Air on its back landing on a rough field, he unbuckled the seat belt and fell out on his head.

Always a spokesman for aviation interests in Kansas, Murdock was instrumental in establishing airfields all across the State. In Wichita alone he took an active part in developing three municipal airports, including the present $10 million-plus facility.

During World War II, he served as a captain in the Civil Air Patrol and flew his Cessna C–3 on practice missions. In 1947 he purchased the fastest 4-seat airplane on the market, a Beechcraft Bonanza. Fascinated by the new lightweight (for those days) navigational and radio equipment being made available to general aviation, Murdock determined that he would become an instrument pilot and began taking instrument instruction early in 1954. In July of 1955, at the age of 72, he passed the CAA instrument written test with a perfect score of 100. Up until that date no one had ever done this and to date only two others have. This is the only thing in our close and personal association for which I have never forgiven him. It took me three attempts to pass the written and I finally did with a score 1 point above passing. I will say that I have logged more actual instrument time than he, but this is merely a monument to monumental lack of judgment. You know the saying quoted among us birdmen, "There are old pilots and there are bold pilots, but there are no old, bold pilots." Marcellus Mayberry Murdock was 83 yesterday. At the age of 82, he received his multiengine rating in the corporation's Beechcraft Baron and today at the age of 83, flies not only his 1963 model Beechcraft Bonanza almost daily, but the twin Baron, and wears proudly his mach buster pin on his lapel, having exceeded the speed of sound in a F–100 Super Sabrejet. Further, he is still passing his FAA physicals with what must seem to many younger men, a disgusting regularity.

When asked if he has any regrets about his long career in aviation, this intrepid open-cockpit veteran of engine failures, bird collisions, forced landings, ground loops, and a multitude of other close shaves and near misses too numerous to catalog, replies, "Only one, that I didn't start flying 20 years sooner."

He was a member of the first board of directors of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce, and for 10 years headed the aviation committee of the chamber. His many activities in State and municipal organizations which have promoted the educational, social, and cultural life of the State, and of this community, are numerous. He has found time to serve on the Community Chest from its beginning in 1923 and still serves on the United Fund board of directors. He received the first honorary degree conferred by the University of Wichita since 1944 when Milton Eisenhower was similarly honored (the first since 1932) on August 18, 1963, when they conferred upon him the degree of doctor of humane letters during Wichita University's summer commencement ceremonies. During 83 years of vigorous living in a period of phenomenal growth and expansion for Wichita and Kansas, he has, through organizational connections and professional journalistic activities, been an integral part of the development of the culture of our community and our time. His life span, which began in Wichita on February 14, 1883, covers all but 22 years of the life of the State of Kansas.

He has served the city of Wichita and the State of Kansas with integrity and distinction. His career reveals a long and enviable tradition of progress and foresightedness. He possesses, moreover, the personal qualities of humility, courage, and intelligence.

It is indeed most fitting and proper that we here assembled today should seize the privilege of doing ourselves the honor of commemorating this 68 years of service to our area and the Wichita Eagle and Beacon, the newspapers that serve it.

Daylight Saving Time Uniformity Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent statement in support of national uniformity in starting and ending dates for daylight saving time has been made by Lloyd Brandt, manager, legislative department of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Brandt testified before committees in both the House and the Senate. S. 1404 passed the Senate and soon we will be considering the question in this body.

I am sure the problems raised in Minnesota by the lack of time uniformity are typical of many States. Many of my colleagues will recognize the type of confusion described in Mr. Brandt's testimony before the Senate committee as follows:

Statement of Lloyd Brandt, Manager, Legislative Department, Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce—Hearing Before the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate on S. 1404, April 26, 1965

Mr. Chairman, we are happy to have the opportunity to read a short statement from our organization.

The Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce by resolution of its board of directors, supports S. 1404.

After years of experience in our State legislature, it is our conclusion that a national bill is the only way to bring order out of chaos. This bill has definite limitations, but it is a step in the right direction.

This is the situation in Minnesota. The time statute in Minnesota orders daylight saving time from the fourth Sunday in May to Labor Day. However, communities along the Wisconsin border such as Duluth, Winona, and a host of smaller towns moved their clocks forward the last Sunday in April to conform to daylight saving time being observed in Wisconsin. On the fourth Sunday in May, the rest of the State will go on fast time except certain communities along the Dakota border. The same procedure will be followed in the fall—some cities remaining on daylight saving time while the State goes back to central standard time.

As a result of this confusion, for 6 months all Minnesota clocks are the same. During the remaining 6 months various combinations of time can be found in the State depending on what month or day it happens to be.

I don't need to tell you what kind of problems are presented to the transportation companies, radio and television, and others by this confusion. These are isolated industries, however, and if only they were affected, it might be a tolerable situation.

Such is not the case; the efficiency of every major company if affected. We are a grain, finance, and electronics center and for the most part, our community of interest is with the East. The great majority, 80 percent of long-distance telephone calls originated in the Minneapolis area are with the eastern connections. During the period that we are on central standard time and the East is on daylight saving time, our time for telephone contact with the eastern offices is reduced to less than 2 hours per day.

Gentlemen, we are traditionally a conservative organization. We don't usually look too favorably upon Federal solutions to local problems. In this case, however, we feel justified in requesting your intervention in what has heretofore been a local matter. This does involve commerce across State lines and it is a problem that cannot or will not be satisfactorily resolved by the States.

In Minnesota, I am sure that after reapportionment, our problem will be solved as we get heavier dominations from the urban areas and we will go into conformity with the East. But I would call your attention to the fact that there are many other States that are then going to be faced with the same problem that we have had for the last 8 years—in the Dakotas, in Nebraska where there has been rural domination, and as the urban areas are more heavily represented in their legislatures, they are going to start struggling with this problem of if they have daylight saving time, how long, and arriving at some kind of compromise.

So we urge the passage of S. 1404. We think it is a step in the right direction since we are one of the few communities of our size in the country that isn't on the standard 6 months daylight saving time.

Blessings After Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, although I cannot say that I relish the postponement of some of the tax cuts we made last year, nor do I ever really enjoy paying taxes, I think that a column from the files of the Pomona Progress-Bulletin of December 15, 1965, written by Joseph H. Firman, has a succinct message in this regard. The article follows:

Blessings After Taxes

(By Joseph H. Firman)

Having coffee—and in my favorite greasy spoon the other morning, I was afflicted by sense of despondency such as comes over every thinking man from time to time, and I heaved a deep sigh as I sloshed a chunk of doughnut about in the coffee.

An elderly over-easy-and-bacon next to me glanced my way.

"Whoosh." I said, in answer to his unspoken invitation to unburden my soul "Taxas. I mean, taxes."

"Pretty tough," agreed over-easy. "Still, you think of what you get for your taxes—police protection, roads, good schools, water."

I stared at him. "You some kinda nut or something? Sure these things are good, but do I have to carry practically the whole burden of the State all by myself?"

Short-stack-and-sausage on my other side joined the discussion.

"Property taxes pretty high?" I nodded glumply. "So you must have a pretty nice home, eh? Nice part of town?"

"Well, sure," I said. "Sure, it's a pretty good home, I guess. And in a good section. But still, man, that's a lot of dough. And income tax time still ahead."

"If you're not making much money you don't have to pay much income tax," said a heretofore unheard-from ham-and-scrambled two stools away. "I'd say you're pretty lucky to have a good paying job right now."

I was surrounded. "Well of course I'm glad to be working and all," I said. "But what I pay for the privilege. And car license fees—ouch."

"Well, you got a car," said overeasy. "Lots of people don't."

"Yeah, and I've got a few teenagers in the home who make my car insurance something like the national debt."

Short-stack nodded soberly. "I know what you mean. If you could just get rid of your children, your auto insurance would go way down."

I gaped. "Get rid of my——"

"Sure," said ham-and-scrambled, "and I'll bet with those kids your grocery bill is something to see."

"Oy veh. Don't mention grocery bills. Know what it cost me last month, not counting milk? Two——"

"There you go. If you didn't have all that family, your car insurance would be down and your food bills down. There's a lot of juvenile delinquency now; maybe your boys will get sent to prison—let the State support 'em for awhile."

"Hey, wait just a darn minute." I was indignant. "I can support my family, all right. And I don't begrudge them what they cost me. It's just that——"

"Taxes are a lot lower in Nebraska," suggested a coffee-and-bearclaw at the end of the counter. "You could move there and not have——"

"You ever spent a winter in Nebraska?" I snorted. "No, thanks. I'll take southern California, even if the smog is strangling us."

"They got air conditioning in the hospital," said overeasy. "If you were laid up there for 6 months or so, you wouldn't even notice the smog."

I slid from my stool. "Boy what a bunch of gloomy guys you guys are," I said. "Hospitals, prisons, wow. So we got smog and high taxes and insurance and grocery bills. You guys never had it so good, and you better know it."

And I squared my shoulders and marched briskly out.

Antique Dealer Richard Gordon Scores Dodd Gun Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, every week, the Plymouth Record of Plymouth, N.H., carries a column called Local Viewpoint. Authored by different writers each week, this column gives interested citizens of the community an opportunity to air their comments and opinions in the local press.

The February 3 issue carried a column by Mr. Richard L. Gordon, of Holderness, proprietor of Gordon's Antique Shop on Route 3 near Little Squam Lake.

Mr. Gordon, who has been in business many years, writes with feeling and knowledge about the proposed gun control legislation. He expresses the opinion of the vast majority of my fellow citizens in New Hampshire and I am pleased to have the column reprinted at this point in the Congressional Record. I recommend it highly to my colleagues.

Relative to Antigun Legislation

It is indeed most disturbing to realize that so many intelligent citizens are of the opinion that disarming the American citizen will prevent criminal acts by those intent on so doing. Needless to say, improvements as to the use of firearms are most desirable and needed to improve and overcome the problems at hand. However, the emphasis should and must be placed where it justly belongs, and that is on the use of firearms and not on firearms themselves.

Disarming or in any significant way making ownership and proper use of firearms unavailable to the citizen would only tend to induce and give added courage to those individuals who will use them for illegal and undesirable purposes. Crooks and criminals will always find ways to procure firearms and when they realize that the average citizen is no longer in a position to protect himself and his property because of the results of antigun legislation, the amount of crime will increase considerably beyond its present state. Prohibition did not accomplish anything and neither would restrictions on our gun ownership. As for the registering of firearms or allowing any particular authority, local or otherwise, to decide who shall and who shall not be allowed ownership and use of same, would be only a first step toward later and eventual legislation to completely do away with guns.

Aside from the criminal aspect, there is that of the sportsman and collector, who number in the millions in this country and the world over. These people or this group is comprised and always has been of people of all walks of life from honest, everyday, hardworking citizens to executives, senators, judges, presidents, and kings. Because of the misuse of firearms by a minority group such as criminals, is it in any way fair or otherwise just to outlaw this privilege, pleasure, and sport which has been in existence for hundreds of years?

It is furthermore a most substantial part of our American heritage, as well as a right granted by our Constitution to own and bear arms, and it is due time that more of these principals and documents were preserved and enforced and enjoyed rather than being ridiculously reduced, reinterpreted, and overruled by people now lacking in pride, red blood, and guts and a lack of determination and desire to do things for themselves, rather than have the Government or the State do it for them. There is altogether too great a tendency to become soft and meek instead of facing up to situations requiring a firm stand.

With further reference to guns in sport and collecting of antiques, it is today a very substantial part of our economy and of our recreational program. Any unwise curtailment of gun ownership will have very adverse effects on both of these as they are so closely related in their function. There are millions of privately owned, very valuable collections of antique firearms all over the country. What would become of these if the laws and restrictions of these antigun cranks became effective? Would they be put into the melting pot or dumped into the ocean along with other Government surplus? I have a few that won't be so disposed of.

Firearms as such, are no more deadly than automobiles or airplanes. It is their misuse that is the problem to be overcome. More stringent legislation against those offenders, such as stiffer penalties, jail sentences, etc., and a reversal of the trend in present day courts of protecting the criminal instead of the offended, would be a great accomplishment indeed and worthy of high praise.

Hysteria and decisions made by those who do not know which end of a gun that the bullet comes out of, will only add to confusion and make matters worse.

An attempt to remove guns from stable law-abiding citizens could result in a revolution of no small proportions.

It is realized, however, by responsible gun owners, that certain new legislation is necessary to improve present circumstances relative to availability of firearms to criminals, delinquents, and unsupervised teenagers and also to prevent further dumping of foreign military and other cheap arms in this country. Present legislative bills such as presented by Senator Thomas J. Dodd and the administration in Washington advocating restriction of firearms or disarmament are not the answer to the problem. Congressman Robert Casey, of Houston, Tex., does present a far more sound and sensible approach and one that most blinking Americans would be inclined to accept.

In conclusion, I ask that you support Congressman Casey and not the Dodd bill.

A High Ideal and a Stern Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the President has appointed the members of the National Council on the Humanities, an impressive group of talented Americans. Until July 1 the Chairman will be the distinguished scholar, Dr. Henry Allen Moe, who set the "high ideal" of the Humanities Council in an address recently to the American Council of Learned Societies. Under leave to extend my remarks I ask that his address be included at this point in the Record.

Address by Dr. Henry Allen Moe, to American Council of Learned Societies at Washington, D.C., January 20, 1966

This seems to be an occasion for self-congratulation; and I think that's fine. Congratulations are indeed, in order, even self-congratulation by the American Council of Learned Societies. This, all recognize, or should recognize. What was not reasonably imaginable in the forties has come to pass in the sixties; and, for this, the ACLS and its constituent societies deserve a measure of credit.

Yet, let us not be too stuck on ourselves. I may, I think, include myself among "ourselves"; for I am president of the American Philosophical Society, the oldest of your constituent societies, represented here by Prof. Albert Baugh, a distinguished member of the philosophical society as he would be of any learned society.

I said, "let's not be too stuck on ourselves," nor indulge in too much self-congratulation. We should remember what Mr. Justice Holmes used to admonish, even before he was a judge, that the laws that govern us, at any given time, are dependent on "the felt necessities of the time, the prevalent moral and political theories, intuitions of public policy, avowed or unconscious, and with the prejudices which judges (and Congressmen, if I may add a word to Mr. Justice Holmes' saying) share with their fellow men * * *." Mr. Holmes, of course, used the word prejudice in its primary, not its invidious, sense.

In the line of Mr. Holmes' thought, you should have no doubt that the law which sets up and governs the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities and which controls us, was enacted to meet the felt necessities of the present time. In the seeing to it that the necessities became felt, the ACLS surely had a major part. For the ACLS took the lead in the formation of the Commission on the Humanities, under the chairmanship of Barnaby Kenney; and it was the report of this commission that focused the attention of Congress on the legislation we celebrate.

That this necessity, brought to a head by the ACLS, was a long time developing is true. But let us not forget what John Adams wrote in the 18th century—that he had to study politics and war, so that his sons might study the useful arts and philosophy, so that his grandsons might study the arts. The second President of the United States had historical and political sense.

So did Thomas Jefferson, the third president of the American Philosophical Society, as he was of the United States. And it is to be noted, too, that Mr. Jefferson was president of the Philosophical Society twice as long as he was President of the United States; and, I dare say—because Julian Boyd told me so—enjoyed it twice as much. For the American Philosophical Society did then, as it does now, consider all knowledge to be within its province. The society and its presidents have made no exclusions, then or now, among the sciences and the humanities as is commonly done nowadays. And so it was that Mr. Jefferson, as President of the United States, in his second inaugural message of 1806, delivered when he was president of the American Philosophical Society, declared that all areas of learning in the United States should be "placed among the articles of public care, all part of which contribute to the improvement of the country." So said Mr. Jefferson; in short, he urged the development of all learning as a Federal responsibility.

One could follow the development of John Adams' and Thomas Jefferson's "felt necessities" through a century and a half, and see them develop, in an up and down kind of way, taking account of "prevalent moral and political theories" until the felt necessities became "intuitions of public policy."

And this brings us up to the Bush report, "Science: The Endless Frontier," published in 1944. Then, as Prof. Don K. Price, dean of the Graduate School of Public Administration at Harvard, wrote in his recent (1965) book "The Scientific Estate," "the traditional policy of the United States" was reversed in two ways: "it (the Bush report) persuaded universities and private research institutions that they had to ask the Government for support and persuaded the Government that basic science, as well as applied research, deserved support." "But * * * hardly anyone," continues Dr. Price, "stopped to ask the fundamental question: How is science, with all its new power, to be related to our political purposes and values, and to our economic and constitutional system?"

But there was one questioning voice, and in the self-congratulatory spirit that prevails here today, I shall remark that the questioning voice, asking the fundamental question, was mine.

For as chairman of one of Dr. Bush's advisory committees, I wrote the report's chapter on the discovery and development of scientific talent. You may read on pages 142 and 143 of the Bush report what I said, in 1944, about the fundamental question, stated by Dr. Price. Here, I shall quote only a few sentences, as follows:

"The statesmanship of science * * * requires that science be concerned with more than science. Science can only be an effective element in the national welfare as a member of a team * * *. We could not suggest to you a program which would syphon into science and technology a disproportionately large share of the Nation's highest abilities without doing harm to the Nation, nor, indeed, without crippling science. The fruits of science become available only through enterprise, industry, and wisdom on the part of others as well as scientists. * * * There is never enough ability at high levels to satisfy all the needs of the Nation: we would not seek to draw into science any more of it than science's proportionate share."

You may think, in the year 1966, that these are reasonable and quite innocuous statements. Yet in 1945 and into 1946 I was told, with a good deal of violence, that I certainly had gummed the works. Nevertheless, I persisted and in 1946 I told the American Association for the Advancement of Science, meeting in Boston, that unless science desisted from its then purpose to hog it all, free science might well be something that their successor scientists would read about but did not have.

The denouement is pleasant to record: the voice of science now pleads eloquently for humanistic learning.

So much for history, with just the remark that we shall forget it at our peril.

The peril would come from forgetting Mr. Justice Holmes' guides, "the felt necessities of the time, the prevalent moral and political theories, intuitions of public policy, avowed or unconscious."

In government one should be out in front, but must not be too far out in front. I do not regard this as counsel of timidity: I do regard it as counsel of wisdom. The wisdom of it lies in this: Considering the 6,000 3-year fellowships, chiefly for humanistic studies that the Office of Education plans to award in 1966 for graduate studies, rising to 7,500 in 1967–68, and considering the funds now available to the National Endowment for the Humanities, the prospect for humanistic studies is bright, financially brighter than it ever has been. For 1966–67, the Office of Education's commitment for its graduate fellowships is $55 million.

To continue to merit such support by the taxpayers' money we must put ourselves into position to demonstrate some impact of our efforts on our total American culture. To put it more bluntly, what the Humanities Endowment does with the taxpayers' money must, to merit continuing support, make some impact—visible, recognizable impact—upon the lives of people outside the academic community. In Mr. Justice Holmes' language, what the National Endowment for the Humanities does, must become one of the felt necessities of our time.

Saying what I have just said, decidedly does not mean that works of scholarship should not receive support. There's no question that they should; for they are basic to advance in thought, in morality, in political theory, in taste, and even in manners. The formal education of the Founding Fathers and their lifelong studies show this to be true beyond a doubt. We should not expect too much of history, but neither should we think that what is commonplace to us has always been so. As the Founding Fathers were, those responsible for the operations of the National Humanities Endowment should be, or at least must try to be, men of the past, present, and future.

This is a tall order; and my saying, so far, has been much too generalized.

So let me go on to say something more, and thus, no doubt, get myself labeled, by I hope only a few, as somebody who should not be allowed to be loose in the land. What I shall add now is simply this:

The curse of humanistic scholarship in my time has been pedantry: you all know what I mean and I needn't define it. Sometimes when viewing what passes for fine scholarship and what I regard as its excesses of picayune malaise, I have seen in it a new scholasticism, with a more than alexandrine twist. But we must strive to make the so-called humanistic learning humane—that is, human. Otherwise it is just a sterile business, without any impact that's worth a tinker's dam on American culture, on the good life, on the pursuit of happiness, on the rights of men, on political liberty on freedom of the mind. The study of literature, to adduce only one example, should cultivate human judgment, developing both taste and moral feeling.

The National Endowment for the Humanities will not in my time, nor in Barnaby Keeney's, encourage, support, stake or grubstake what we and our Council deem to be pedantry.

The classics, yes; medieval and renaissance studies, certainly; philosophy, of course, but not logomachy; history, my best love, but not dessicated antiquarianism; law, which in some aspects is fertile humanistic territory, but not pettifoggery; linguistics—but I have enumerated enough to give you the general idea of the way my mind runs.

And lest there remain any doubt about the way it runs, I shall say that I agree with what George Steiner, of Churchill College, Cambridge, wrote recently ("The Listener," October 21, 1965: "A man would have to be an outright optimist or gifted with self-deception to argue that all is well in the study and teaching of English literature. There is a distinct malaise in the field, a sense of things gone wrong by default."

Well and good, you may say; you might even say, OK. But in either case, you will ask, "What's to be the determiner?"

To that I can only respond by making a personal statement: I am a lawyer and I am, in what I regard as the best of legal systems, a case lawyer, in the Anglo-American legal tradition. I believe that justice and equity are best done by deciding the particular case; that no man has good enough brains, or a large enough vision, or enough wisdom, to pronounce a generalized proposition applicable to all cases. I distrust the builders of complicated systems of thought about human affairs supposed to be universally applicable; I detest the glorifiers of abstractions who write their abstractions in a lingo mostly private to themselves; and the same goes for artists who say nothing to my favorite human characters, Tom, Dick, and Harry, or, as Lord Bowen, a great English judge, used to put it, to "the man on the Clapham omnibus."

They are great persons, are citizens Tom, Dick, and Harry, and so are citizens Anne, Jane, and Sue: and no matter what bus they ride, they are anxious to learn and are capable of much more learning than they are usually credited with, as Barnaby Keeney has said often. The act under which we operate declares "that democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens and must therefore foster and support a form of education designed to make men masters of their technology and not its unthinking servant."

That's what the law says we must do. We shall do it by fostering such scholarship as has a concern—and here again I quote from the act—for "a high civilization," with "dedication and devotion" to the end that the vision and imagination in our fellow citizens may make them masters of their technology and their fates.

This is at once a high ideal and a stern command.

The high ideal and the stern command, both, are in the act that created us. For both we thank President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, and the Congress. To them, not to ourselves, congratulations should flow in the fullest measure.

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, recently a young lady who I am privileged to represent here in the Congress submitted the first place entry in the Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the S. Sgt. A. F. DeFranzo Post 2346 VFW and its ladies auxiliary. She is Miss Elaine Manoogian, the daughter of Peter and Anna Manoogian of Saugus, Mass. Elaine wrote on the subject "Democracy: What It Means to Me."

Qualities of thoughtfulness and of obvious sincerity are readily apparent in this young lady's prize-winning essay. Her remarks show a maturity and a clarity of thought that is uncommon in one on such relatively tender years.

In this day and age, Mr. Speaker, where men in the free world have every good reason to conduct their search for national purpose, I find Elaine's expression of her thoughts indeed inspirational, not only for their content, but also as testimony of the fact that there are many young citizens like Elaine in our country, who see the great value in our democratic way of life and are depending on us to help preserve it.

At this point I should like to introduce the text of Miss Manoogian's essay into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the Congress may have the benefit of this young lady's well-expressed thoughts:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

The hands that built America belonged to people of more than 60 nationalities. They were working hands and artistic hands. The minds that moved those hands had one great idea in common: Democracy, and all the decent principles of life for which democracy stands.

These people left their homes, families, and familiar surroundings because they wanted to provide freedom and opportunity for their children. Out of their toil and labor a democratic way of life was established; one which gives man the opportunity to make as much or as little of himself as he wishes.

For many people today, democracy is no more than a popular government by which life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness may be gained.

For me, democracy is the faith that I have in my fellow man.

I feel that democracy recognizes that something in man is divine.

Today, democracy has that same appeal to man's imagination and emotion as it did in the past. Each day, many Americans dedicate their lives to democracy, to preserve the fundamental idea on which democracy is based—the development of the individual, and his creative powers.

To me, democracy is precious because it is an achievement and not an inheritance. The consciousness of being an American is always with me. It is a wonderful feeling to be able to help people in my own community where there is a need, and to take part in civic drives, but all this would not be possible if there wasn't liberty and justice. However, liberty and justice are just words. If I do not put life into them by living out their meaning in my daily life, I am not living the American idea.

The trouble, today, is too many people want to accept these freedoms without contributing or participating.

We must all deal with democracy in order to make it work, for we are the Government in the United States.

We must accept responsibilities; democracy is not merely a privilege to be enjoyed, it is a trust to keep and maintain. The democratic way cannot prevail against the organized force and propaganda that assail it, unless those who enjoy its benefits have a burning enthusiasm for it, unless those who believe in it are willing to be evangels, patriots and, if necessary, martyrs. Such patriotism will unify our diverse elements facing us today, and enable us to present a united front to the regimented forces that challenge us.

We must discard our apathy and cynicism. Each citizen should take a fair share of responsibilities so that we are able to live and work in peace, and contribute a full measure to the common goal of national greatness. Only through renewed devotion to democracy can we maintain the national unity that is so essential.

Let us prove to the world that true democracy, rationally appraised and cherished, can be both effective and triumphant.

Secrecy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, newspapers throughout the country have been urging for many years the enactment of a freedom of information bill as vital to the interests of their industry and of the public in general. Representatives of the American Newspaper Publishers Association testified in support of the bill passed by the Senate last October, and together with other organizations in the field of newspaper publishing are calling for action by the House.

The Day of New London, Conn., recently added its voice to those urging House passage of a freedom of information bill. The following editorial, decrying secrecy in Government, appeared in a recent issue of that newspaper:

SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT

The U.S. House of Representatives soon will have an opportunity to consider legislation intended to define areas of secrecy on Government information, and rights of access to other facts in Government possession. It will be asked to consider S. 1160, a bill passed in the Senate and quite similar to H.R. 5012, introduced by Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, and 18 other House Members.

Over the years U.S. Government sources of information of vital concern to taxpayers have slowly been drying up. More and more excuses have been found in innumerable bureaus, agencies, and departments, to conceal facts through some trumped-up label, suggesting that the information is confidential.

The freedom of information bills proposed would, in general, set up court-enforced means of access to information, list categories of Government information which must be safeguarded for security reasons or in the general interest, and clarify requirements on publication of official material in the Federal Register.

All of this is delightfully vague at present—trying to find the means of persuading cagey officials, often enough interested mostly in concealing the ineptitudes and mistakes of their own agencies, to release information that rightfully belongs to the public in the first place. Often officials act as though doing the ordinary citizen a great favor to tell him selected portions of background operations of his own Government.

S. 1160 spells out in specific terms what facts are to be available, not just to news media but to any person, which is as it should be. Failure to adopt this or some simi'ar bill at this session would mean that the slow progress of fencing in more and more Government background, and departmental facts, will be strengthened.

Recommendations to Congress on Rhodesia

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent privilege to visit the newly independent nation of Southern Rhodesia. Next week, I will present a full report on the observations which Ralph DeToledano, Dr. Max Yergan, and myself have after our visit, along with our recommendations. Specifically, however, I would like to make two of my own recommendations to the House of Representatives.

First, I believe we should authorize a special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to visit Southern Rhodesia and get a first hand look at what is going on there. I ask this because it is my belief that we are getting the whole story or the true from our State Department. This request has been forwarded to the able chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Second, I believe this Congress should take a serious look at our State Department policy regarding Rhodesia. We should specifically consider, at minimum, a congressional resolution which would urge the State Department and the administration to withhold any cooperation in the British sanctions and boycott until that nation ceases its shipping into North Vietnam. It is a travesty of justice and offensive to commonsense that we should aid them in their boycott against Rhodesia, a questionable policy in the first place, when they give no reciprocity to our position in South Vietnam where we are fighting a Communist enemy and they are currently the chief free world shipper to North Vietnam.

Africa is in ferment. We failed in Asia because the people—indeed, as the late

President Kennedy once pointed out, even the diplomats and the Congress—failed to understand the dimensions of what was taking place, the relative position of the contending forces and our policy therein. To make sure this does not happen in Africa we need the piercing light of public and congressional inquiry not the paper curtain of the State Department with its handed-down press releases and positions. We can do no less.

Confrontation With China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, at last the Congress is beginning to debate the administration's policy in Vietnam. The hearings conducted by Senator FULBRIGHT before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the report of the Ad Hoc Congressional Conference on Vietnam which eight of us sponsored, Senator RIBICOFF's proposal—all contribute to a better understanding of the problem. Yesterday Walter Lippmann writing in the New York Herald Tribune pointed out that the issue is between a limited war and an unlimited war. He warns that the United States is facing a potential confrontation with China in a land war on the mainland of Asia. He reminds us of 1950 when the Chinese intervened in North Korea. I hope all of my colleagues will read and ponder Walter Lippmann's article.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 15, 1966]

CONFRONTATION WITH CHINA

(By Walter Lippmann)

The televised hearings, at which General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, have done an inestimable service to our people. For they broke through the official screen and made visible the nature of the war and where our present policy is leading us. On the rule that if you cannot beat them, join them, which in its modern form is that if you cannot debate with them, say you agree with them, the President takes the position that there is not much difference between the Gavin-Kennan thesis and the Rusk-McNamara policy.

There is in fact a radical difference—the difference between a limited and an unlimited war. The President may not want to fight an unlimited war. I have no doubt myself that he does not want to do so. But the promises he made in Honolulu, which the Vice President is now broadcasting so lavishly in Saigon and Bangkok, are—if they are to be taken seriously—an unlimited commitment of American soldiers and American money. It is this unlimited commitment which those of us who belong to the Gavin-Kennan school oppose. For we see that as the numbers of our troops and the range of our bombing are escalated, and as the theater of the war becomes widened, it is highly probable, indeed it is well nigh inevitable that the United States will find itself confronting China in a land war on the mainland of Asia.

Last week's hearings made visible that this is where the course we are taking leads. Congress and the people would be frivolous if they did not examine with the utmost seriousness how real, how valid, how significant is the hypothesis that the kind of war the Johnson administration is conducting is leading to a confrontation with China.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, who since 1961 has played a leading part in our military intervention in South Vietnam, has recognized that the prospect of a land war with China is today our greatest worry. In an interview published in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, General Taylor is asked about the danger of "a military confrontation with Communist China." He replies that "one can never rule out the possibility. But I would list the probability quite low in terms of percentage."

This has an ominous resemblance to the colloquy in 1950 between President Truman and General MacArthur. (Compare Lawson, the "United States in the Korean War," p. 79.)

"In your opinion," President Truman asked General MacArthur, "is there any chance that the Chinese might enter the war on the side of North Korea?"

MacArthur shook his head. "I'd say there's very little chance of that happening. They have several hundred thousand men north of the Yalu, but they haven't any air force. If they tried to cross the river our Air Force would slaughter them. At the most perhaps 60,000 troops would make it. Our infantry could easily contain them. I expect the actual fighting in North Korea to end by Thanksgiving. We should have our men home, or at least in Japan, by Christmas."

At the very moment that President Truman and General MacArthur were talking there were already more than 100,000 Chinese Communist troops in North Korea, and another 200,000 were ready to cross the Yalu. By mid-November at least 300,000 Chinese would be poised to strike—and the ROK, the Americans and other U.N. forces would not even be aware of their presence. Before the war was over the Chinese Communist armies in Korea would reach a peak strength of more than a million men.

On the question of the need to contain the military expansion of Red China, there is virtually universal agreement in this country. The containment of Red China today, like the containment of Stalinist Russia after the World War, is necessary to the peace of the world and is a vital interest of the United States. What is debatable is the diplomatic policy we are pursuing in order to contain Red China. If we compare what Mr. Rusk and Mr. William Bundy are doing with the diplomatic policy by which some 15 years ago Stalin was contained, the differences are very striking.

The cardinal difference is that our Chinese containment policy is a unilateral American policy whereas our Stalinist containment policy was shared with and participated in by all the Western allies. It is often said officially that in the Far East today we are repeating what was done so successfully in Europe. If this were what we are doing, there would be an alliance to contain China in which Japan, Russia, India, Pakistan, the United States, Great Britain, and France were alined in a Far Eastern Marshall plan and NATO. Instead, owing to the miscalculations and blundering of the Vietnamese war, we have alienated and indeed neutralized all the great powers of the Asian mainland.

The difference between the two containment policies—in Europe and in the Far East—is the difference between realism and verbalism, between professionalism and amateurism. Our present policy is as if we had set out to contain Stalinist Russia by ignoring the British, the French, the Italians, and the Germans, and had decided to make our stand against communism by the defense of—let us say—Bucharest.

U.S. Broiler Industry Comes of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to share with my colleagues my distinct impression that the U.S. broiler industry has come of age. I want also to review some of the work of the National Broiler Council which has borne a large responsibility in the growth of this industry.

Broilers today are a billion dollar business, an industry producing 7½ billion pounds of chicken meat annually. My own State of North Carolina ranked fourth among the broiler-producing States last year, producing over 200 million broilers for a gross income of about $100 million. Chatham County, which is in the Fourth Congressional District of North Carolina which I am privileged to serve in the Congress, is one of the leading broiler-producing areas in the world.

I remember when broilers were little more than a backyard business. The industry has changed significantly in the last decade, and today broiler production is an organized business. Vertical integration—or the contract system—has brought many efficiencies into the broiler business. As the system develops, I trust that the broiler grower will always realize a fair return for the capital and labor he invests in his end of the business. I think the trend is in this direction.

Mr. Speaker, anyone would agree with my statement that the American broiler industry has come of age, if he had been privileged to attend—as I was—the National Broiler Council's Annual Conference in Atlanta last fall.

Mr. C. W. Paris, then president of the council said in his address to the conference:

> I feel in a very strong sense that the National Broiler Council, like the broiler industry itself, has now moved from adolescence to maturity—that, by and large, we've quit flying by the seat of our pants. Management decisions are now being made based on facts.

Mr. Paris commended the council's executive vice president and his staff for the orderly manner in which the headquarters office was moved from Richmond to Washington in early 1965, with "literally no interruption of service."

It was my privilege to address the conference and, as near as I can recall my exact words, I said:

> I want to pause here to compliment the National Broiler Council upon all the help that they have provided for us on our Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, which it is my honor to serve as chairman, and I want to compliment the board of directors for arranging to transfer your headquarters to the city of Washington

> which, after all, is not only the Capital of our country, but, for all intents and purposes, is the capital of the free world. There we are in constant communication with each other. When you are in trouble, we can call in people who represent you. It isn't possible for all of you to come to Washington; it isn't necessary for all of you come to Washington. We can always count on Frank Frazier (NBC executive vice president), who is held in high esteem by Members of both Houses of Congress, to bring forth the facts and information which will be helpful and valuable to us.
>
> I want to assure you that you will always be welcome in the House Committee on Agriculture.

Those of you in the House who are familiar with my work on this committee over the past 30 years know that I have maintained the position that our farmers have been subsidizing the consumers of this Nation for many, many years. Certainly, in like manner, the American broiler industry today is giving unparalleled value to the consumers of the Nation. Broiler prices to the consumer have been coming down in recent years, while many other consumer prices have been rising.

I have championed Federal farm programs for certain commodities. I am proud of these programs. I think they have brought righly deserved benefits to American farmers over the years, beginning with the depression-ridden 1930's. I said to the Broiler Council Conference:

> We hear a lot of people say, "Keep the Government out of agriculture." That's all right, if you want to stay out. We must give up these (Government) programs at some time in the future, but we cannot abandon them all at once. We must work together. You are a vital part of agriculture. You may not need a program now, you may not want a program now, and certainly it will not be our purpose in our committee to force any sort of a program on you. We've only tried to provide the tools which would enable farmers to control production and keep production in line with consumer demand.

During the annual conference, I was impressed to hear Frank Frazier report that, in the National Broiler Council's program of consumer education, features on chicken reached 936 million readers in the first 10 months of 1965, compared to 700 million for the same period in 1964, an increase of 34 percent. He reported on the excellent work the Broiler Council is doing in educating journalists in the taste appeal and nutritive values of chicken.

In 1965, NBC conducted an industry tour of Arkansas for leading food editors, a tour of the Delmarva producing area for farm editors, and a refresher course in New York City for top food editors. The Council also distributed to more than 1,600 food experts an attractive publication called "Chicken Little." Mr. Frazier reported that, according to figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, between 1956 and 1964 homemakers serving chicken at least once a week increased from 50 percent to 64 percent.

With the aggressive marketing and public affairs programs being conducted by the Broiler Council, I foresee broiler consumption rising at an even more rapid rate in the years ahead.

Speaking of public affairs, the National Broiler Council, in cooperation with other poultry organizations, conducted a well-planned and vigorous campaign during 1965 aimed at defeating proposed Government loans for establishment of a huge integrated broiler complex in New Castle, Pa.

I was pleased to cooperate with the Broiler Council in fighting these loans because, to me, they would do nothing but shift poverty from one area to another. This would happen because Government-subsidized production in Pennsylvania would compete with already established, privately financed production in broiler areas such as my own State of North Carolina. I scheduled a public hearing on the matter in the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee last fall, and many Members of both Houses of Congress came and testified, most of them in opposition to the proposed loans. It is a tribute to fine work by many Members of Congress that the Economic Development Administration finally rejected the New Castle loan applications.

The National Broiler Council was also most active last year in fighting the proposal to shift the $20 million annual cost of poultry inspection from public funds to the poultry industry. I oppose the proposed transfer because poultry inspection is primarily a consumer protection service; therefore, the cost should not be saddled on the industry. The issue is before us again this year, and I am sure than the Broiler Council is ready, willing, and able to do battle again.

Among the many public affairs programs of the National Broiler Council last year was their work in connection with activities of the National Commission on Food Marketing. As Mr. Frazier reported to the annual conference:

> NBC cooperated with the Food Commission in arranging for witnesses to appear at a hearing in Atlanta last May. NBC presented a brief at this hearing, describing the industry and its organization structure. NBC representatives conferred with the Food Commission on the development of the questionnaire that was sent to processors. NBC arranged for Dr. Paul Farris from the Food Commission to meet with members of the NBC Grower Advisory Committee.

Three Members of Congress participated in the Broiler Council's annual conference. Senator THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, addressed the conference as did Representative PRENTISS WALKER, of Mississippi, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture and, I believe, the only member of our committee who is a poultryman himself.

Mr. Paris concluded his address at the annual conference with these remarks:

> When I reflect on the predicted population explosion to take place in the years ahead, and when I consider that we are in better shape to feed the extra population than most other segments of our agri-business economy, I can only conclude that our future is very bright indeed.

Frank Frazier likes to say of the industry he represents that broiler production today is a system of coordinated economic efficiency. At the annual conference he called it the world's most advanced system of food production—a system that can result in upgrading diets of millions around the globe.

Mr. Paris and Mr. Frazier have their eyes on the larger food problems that are confronting us as a Nation blessed with what we used to call food abundance. In the light of world food needs, we do not have an abundance of food at all. Rather, there is a shortage. That is why I have—this week—convened public hearings on extension of—and possibly new directions for—our food-for-peace program or, as the President called it last week, food-for-freedom.

Yes, the broiler industry has come of age. But we are now moving into an age in which we must fight—in the words of legislation I have introduced—"A World War on Hunger."

I note that next month Mr. Frazier, along with Mr. Ted Cameron, of Little Rock, Ark., president of the National Broiler Council, will go to Japan to participate with representatives of the U.S. Feed Grains Council in a trade seminar where world food problems will be among the topics under discussion.

It is quite evident that America's broiler industry is preparing to join the agricultural rollcall of commodities and commodity groups and go to work on the larger challenges ahead.

Bank Merger Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12173) to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity of the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly favor assuring the banking community of this Nation fair and even application of the antitrust laws, and surely favor assuring expeditious resolution of antitrust actions arising out of bank mergers.

Bill H.R. 12173 before us today purports to produce these benefits. But this bill, unless improved by amendments, will create more problems to all concerned than benefits.

In critical paragraphs, the phraseology of the bill is so imprecise that years of litigation, costly to both the banks and to the taxpayer, will become inevitable in order that the sterile words of the bill can be given practical meaning.

Why pass legislation ostensibly drafted to clarify and define standards for judicial decisions, but which in fact first invalidates well-established case law guidelines, without then providing any equivalently useful replacement?

Furthermore, I object that the bill unnecessarily interferes with the functioning of the Justice Department, as the sole and responsible legal agent before the courts of the executive branch of this Government.

This bill has had a bizarre history. An article in today's edition of the Wall Street Journal entitled "The Bank Merger Bill's Zany Journey," tells the story well. I commend this article to my colleagues. The second paragraph of the article summarizes the situation well:

> And now, after months of comic parliamentary pratfalls and fishwifely invective, the bank merger bill is about to pass. Sure enough, it reasserts congressional authority over the subject. But that reassertion is so vaguely worded that the Supreme Court inevitably will be asked to define what Congress really meant.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against this bill, as now drafted, in the hope that the committee will introduce an improved version.

Time for a Federal Daylight Saving Time Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed S. 1404 to set uniform dates for the beginning and end of daylight saving time each year. It is now up to the House to act.

Hearings have been held before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the House earlier this month. I trust that the committee will soon report a bill that will let us have an end to the spring and autumn periods of time confusion we have had in recent years.

A recent editorial in a Minneapolis newspaper sets out the hope of the people of my State for effective action by Congress to bring time uniformity.

TIME FOR A FEDERAL DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME LAW

It was Ground Hog Day, a curious, and somewhat early, juncture for a congressional committee to be considering daylight saving time legislation. But let the scene shift into late April, when most Americans advance their clocks an hour, and the subject of daylight saving time will assume a real urgency.

Then, unless Congress acts to guarantee order, we shall be moving into another period of hopeless confusion in which even neighboring communities suffer the inconveniences of operating on different times.

Most States with daylight saving time set the clock an hour ahead in late April, turn it back late in October. Minnesotans must be content with a schedule running from late May to early September. We enjoy the sunlit pleasures of daylight saving time during the 3 summer months when we need it least and deprive ourselves of those pleasures during the shorter days of May, September, and October.

This makes no sense at all and the folly of it is compounded by the inconveniences of being out of step with many other States and by the time chaos which results when communities within Minnesota set their clocks capriciously to suit their own convenience.

A bill passed by the Senate would require all States having daylight saving time to start it on the last Sunday in April and end it on the last Sunday in October. The resulting uniformity would be a boon to millions of Americans, not to mention the headaches which would be dispelled for the transportation industry and for innumerable businesses.

Secretary Weaver Speaks Before the National Press Club

SPEECH

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to hear the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, deliver a highly informative address before the National Press Club. The topic of the Secretary's address was "Creative Federalism and Great Cities."

In his remarks Secretary Weaver pointed out that creative federalism stresses local initiative, local solutions to local problems, with the Federal Government assuming a more active role in providing support of various types for these locally initiated and locally administered activities. There is no doubt that a new and bolder approach to the problems of urban America must be launched if we are to find solutions to the growing problems of our great cities.

The new approach outlined by Secretary Weaver calls for a dynamic partnership between Federal, State and local governments—a partnership which harnesses our public and private resources behind forward looking and workable programs to meet the urban challenge.

Mr. Windsor Booth, president of the National Press Club, and Mr. John Cosgrove, chairman of the speakers' committee, deserve credit for arranging this first and timely public address by our new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. They have performed a real public service.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident Members of Congress will be impressed by the grasp of and the practical approaches to our urban problems set forth by Secretary Weaver and under leave previously obtained, I include the text of his address.

CREATIVE FEDERALISM AND GREAT CITIES

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Housing and Urban Development, Before the National Press Club, Washington, D.C.)

Not quite 2 years ago, President Johnson made an historic speech at Ann Arbor, Mich., when he introduced two fresh concepts: creative federalism and the Great Society.

The first was cast as a path to the second, rather than an end in itself. And the President defined creative federalism as embodying "new concepts of cooperation between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities." And, as we have seen subsequently, he meant private leadership as well as public leadership.

Both concepts are, at once, a reflection of and guideposts for this Nation. Both recognize the key characteristics of the Nation at this point in time: It is urban. It is affluent. It is relentlessly innovative.

Today I would like to talk about the implications of these aspects of our society, the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, and how the Department both responds to and affects the many forces at work in this increasingly pluralistic culture. In this context, I will mention both the new programs which the President forwarded to the Congress a few weeks ago and the new structure and direction of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which is charged with the basic responsibility for carrying out these programs and a major share of the responsibility for responding effectively to what the President has called our most critical domestic problem—improving the quality of urban life.

The forces of growth which are shaping our cities must be mastered, and the new Federal Department is only one instrument in the greater effort. Every level of government is faced by the urban challenge, and every unit of government must effect an appropriate response or face physical and economic anarchy.

The sum of these responses is what is meant by creative federalism. In the budget message a few weeks ago, the President put it this way:

"Many of our critical new programs involve the Federal Government in joint ventures with State and local governments in thousands of communities throughout the Nation. The success or failure of those programs depends on timely and effective communication and on readiness for action on the part of both Federal agencies in the field and State and local governmental units."

The sort of "joint ventures" which the President has in mind represent a significant break with more traditional forms of governmental enterprise. Through the early years of our constitutional system, we operated under a concept of dual federalism—the conviction that Nation and State were divided by impenetrable walls of separate jurisdiction. The power struggle between those advocates of strong States rights and those who favored more Federal centralization resulted in a peculiar sort of stand-off. Problems which did not fall readily within one jurisdiction were swept under the rug.

But the Nation developed and older antagonisms became subjugated to the need for solving new problems of economic and social growth. And so a new sort of federalism evolved—a cooperative federalism. This pattern brought together programs and activities of shared responsibility through the device of Federal grants-in-aid. These in turn meant a measure of collaboration on a number of fronts. But precincts of power were still staked out and jealously guarded as under dual federalism.

The conviction remained that expansion of power in one level of Government worked to lessen power in another, and the spheres of cooperation were largely restricted to policy execution and administration—not mutual development of new activities. Thus, the New Deal was essentially a national inspiration—a limited response to an emergency, not a fundamental change in the processes of government.

Today, and only very recently, a third interpretation of federalism has emerged, more suited to our times, more sensitive to the rapidly changing pressures and powers in an increasingly pluralistic society.

Creative federalism, unlike earlier brands, does not conceive of power as a static commodity, to be transferred from private to public sectors or State to national levels at the expense of the earlier possessor of power. Public policy, rather, arises in response to new needs and conditions and changes as pressures change. And the energies of the creative response from all levels and sectors in turn galvanizes the Federal sector into positive action.

Today, concern over issues has given way to concern for broad problems. As contemporary problems such as poverty, social disorganization, civil rights and rampant urbanization become readily identified, creative federalism responds with solutions instead of ideologies.

This approach involves the initiation and shaping of new responses to urban and other domestic problems through a complicated interplay of many forces, public and private. In terms of urban problems, the major responsibility for such responses rests with government, as the public welfare is the focus.

Yet private enterprise and private institutions are increasingly being called upon, in this new form called creative federalism, to play key roles not only in program execution, whether as homebuilders or campus developers, but in policy formulation as well.

This development, still in its early evolution, parallels what is happening in the defense and space industries. These are today vast complexes of private and public enterprise, contiguous in their operations at many different points but ordered systematically within the context of specific problems to be solved.

But let me first indicate the broader framework. Creative federalism streeses local initiative, local solutions to local problems. The Federal role as a partner in creative federalism will continue to be one of support for locally initiated and locally administered activities. But this is not a passive role. Where the obvious needs for action to meet an urban problem are not being fulfilled, the Federal Government has a responsibility at least to generate a thorough awareness of the problem.

The goals we have set for urban America are the most ambitious in our history. The times call for inventiveness and ingenuity to match the welter of change boiling in and around our great metropolitan areas. Indeed, none of our institutions is likely to be the same by the time this century draws to a close—by the time we have built another urban America.

Thomas Jefferson suspected and even feared the city. He was a gentleman farmer at heart, although certainly the most urbane farmer in this or perhaps any nation's history. But Jefferson understood change, and the necessity for adapting to it. And he once described change in a democratic society in terms which come strikingly close to defining what we now call creative federalism:

> "Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

And so creative federalism and the approaches which evolve from its conceptual framework will, indeed, change our institutions. It must, if these institutions are to survive.

Our approach today stresses innovation and the breaking of customary ineffective patterns. We intend to do this through experiment and demonstration.

Last year, a striking innovation in providing housing for low- and moderate-income families was proposed. The President called the program, for rent supplementation, "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city." It would bring the strength of the private building market to bear directly upon our greatest unsolved urban problem—the construction of decent housing for low-income families. This program involves mortgage insurance offered by FHA at market rates of interest of nonprofit, limited dividend and cooperative sponsors. The housing is privately owned, managed, and privately financed.

Although the Congress has not yet funded this critically needed program, interest has built up terrifically in the past several months. We have already received preliminary proposals from sponsors for the construction of nearly 70,000 low-income units. These proposals have come from 265 different localities in 43 States, and sites are already available for 40,000 of the units. There is no disputing the need for or the interest in this program.

Now we have pushed into the most dramatic form of experimentation this urban nation has ever seen—striving to demonstrate that whole chunks of cities, large and small, can be reborn in the image of this Nation's promised urban greatness.

Yesterday, I spoke to a group of 400 municipal leaders from Connecticut. I outlined how this new demonstration cities program will work. I stressed that its failure or success rides principally upon their own inventiveness and ability for effecting the changes so badly needed to make their cities viable systems for human development. Their response gives me as much confidence as anything I have yet heard in the capacity of the American city to adapt to change. Most important, even while understanding that not all Connecticut cities can be in at the beginning of this experimental program, these officials realize that the solutions and approaches which will be developed, throughout the Nation, will help them in their own problem solving. For while we have come to see that the city holds a myriad of facets to every major problem, there are solutions which can be developed and tailored to fit every individual situation. That is what we are looking for in this program.

This is, in a very real sense, where it all comes together. The President's message shows the way. It indicates that this new program has three major thrusts:

To concentrate all available resources in planning tools, in housing construction, in job training, in health facilities, in recreation, in welfare programs, in education—to improve the conditions of life in urban areas.

To coordinate all our available talent and skills.

To mobilize local leadership and private initiative, so that local citizens will determine the shape of their new city freed from the constraints that have handicapped their past efforts and inflated their costs.

Solutions will be tailored by local officials, with a minimum of Federal direction but a maximum of Federal assistance and technical aid. Those cities developing the most imaginative solutions and energetic leadership will be the first aboard. This is, perhaps more than anything else, a time for the testing of the ingenuity and resiliency of the American urban intellect.

These demonstrations, and indeed all our programs, will be operated from a new context which in itself reflects the creative federalism of which I have been speaking.

As most of you know, we have been in the midst of drastic reorganization, aimed at making all of our programs—including demonstration cities—most effective. At the same time, we are developing new management techniques, under the so-called planning-programing budgeting system, for getting the maximum impact from Federal expenditures, as well as the fullest measure of administrative efficiency.

The new organizational structure we are developing is facilitated by the legislation which created the new Department. That legislation places in the Secretary the authority to administer and effectively supervise all the programs now in, and to be assigned to, the Department. With such new powers, we are rearranging functions. In the organizational structure that will soon be announced responsibilities for supervision and direction of the major activities of the Department will be delegated to Assistant Secretaries. The grouping of activities, however, will be oriented to broad problem solving rather than on the basis of bureaucratic identification. For we are resolved that traditional agencies must be integrated to meet total objectives.

Consistent with principles of sound public administration and responsive to the needs of urban America, we shall place greater decisionmaking authority closer to the problems and the people. For those programs which are established, the decisionmaking authority will be in the regional offices. And in the new demonstration cities program, much of the decision authority will be at the local level centered in Federal coordinators.

These novel officials will be located at the local level. They will not, as has been affirmed, look over the shoulders of the mayors. Rather they will serve the local communities by coordinating HUD programs, assisting in the coordination of other Federal programs, aiding local officials in securing cooperation on the part of State agencies, and generally expediting Federal activities in the locality. Their usefulness has been recognized by many mayors in the Nation. Speaking for a group of them, Mayor McKeldin of Baltimore recently said that they had been disabused of the fear that the Federal coordinator would be a czar dictating local policies.

Thus, in this new Department we are beginning to give form and substance to the new federalism. Our efforts will be supported by a continuing program of research, demonstration, and experimentation. Not the least of our concerns will be to assert leadership for, and encourage, the development of techniques to solve the administrative problems which emanate from the long-existing proliferation and overlapping of local governments. We shall, with continuing careful evaluation of results, attempt to utilize and apply the newer tools of systems analysis to urban problems.

Two weeks ago, President Johnson called for vigorous support so that 1966 could indeed be, in his words, "the year of rebirth for American cities."

This rebirth, this rebuilding of our great cities will start against the backdrop of the strongest economy in U.S. history. This year, the gross national product is expected to total over $722 billion, representing a rise of 5 percent in real growth, after accounting for possible price changes. Perhaps most important, this great and growing economic strength provides us with the opportunity to utilize as fully as possible our manpower and to direct a maximum effort at relieving those dislocations in our labor market which have particularly afflicted cities with pools of unemployed.

The economy is strong and the temper of the Nation is, as I have already indicated, for change and continued striving toward a better life. This might seem surprising because it has often been assumed that in times of prosperity, democratic peoples are content to sit and live off the fat of the land. This is hardly true today. Not only is there widespread support for a major campaign against poverty, both in cities and rural areas, but the Nation is even exercised about beauty. And if you don't believe that,

I refer you not only to the tremendous enthusiasm generated by last year's White House Conference on Natural Beauty, but also to what happened recently in the Kentucky Legislature, which just passed a pioneering law restricting strip mining in the State. This action opens the way for seven other nearby and adjacent States to enter into a compact which would halt the ravages of this wasteful practice, which has so brutalized the landscape.

So we move into the second half of this decade with a most fortunate combination of circumstances: A nationwide concern with the environment and the economic wherewithal to translate this concern into action programs.

Last year, the Congress provided great impetus to this situation, with both the Housing and Urban Development Act and the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The President also delivered a special message on developing goals for natural beauty. The latter pricked the conscience of almost every American community and has stimulated a growing preoccupation with the shape and condition of our total environment.

In closing, there are a couple of important aspects of our whole approach which I want to emphasize. First, I cannot stress strongly enough that every effort will be made to see that what are perhaps the two most enduring characteristics of the city—diversity and opportunity—are greatly enhanced through all our programs.

Diversity is what makes the city exciting and vital. We recognize that it must be fortified and made to thrive. There must be room for all peoples, of many incomes and with many different notions about what constitutes the good community. Hopefully, these will continue to be aired, in democratic fashion, and out of the continuing consensus will come the sort of urban environment which can continue to make the democratic city the chief symbol of civilized men.

Diversity is a hollow virtue without opportunity, and the President has emphasized that the demonstration cities program will aim squarely at creating new opportunities not only for employment and training, but also in the choice of housing available and the use of community facilities. While we demonstrate new ways to achieve maximum opportunity, I trust we no longer need demonstrate that this is the essential element of the democratic city. That is what the rest is all about.

Another key aspect of this new program is an emphasis upon quality which will pervade every element of every project. This means not only the highest regard for architecture and design, but also for the critical interplay of building and spaces, for the strategic positioning of open green spaces and plantings, for the opening up of those areas long congested by rubble-filled alleys and junkyards, and for the development of community vistas which can make a lasting contribution to a spirit of pride and spiritual enrichment.

The words I have been using today fall into easy sequence:

The opportunity for a better life, and to demonstrate workable solutions toward that goal through the carefully geared workings of our flexible constitutional system—creative federalism.

In the months to come, you will see the things I have been talking about coming to life. A major instrument to achieve this will be the demonstration cities program with its equally important companion proposal for demonstrations in comprehensive metropolitan planning.

In any case, our urban programs will be carried forward with a greater sense of purpose as our system evolves more effective solutions to problems plaguing our cities and metropolitan areas. In that process, our constant concern will be to lift the horizons of hope and expectation of urban America. For we are convinced that there can and must be a better America. We are dedicated to make a significant contribution to that objective. And we know that it can be achieved only through a partnership between government at all its levels and society, with all its elements involved.

Statement of George F. Kennan Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, former Ambassador George Kennan is one of the men most qualified to give advice on our foreign policy and our outstanding expert on communism.

His statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should be read by every American.

I am therefore entering it into the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE F. KENNAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the subject on which I am invited to give my views this morning is, as I understand it, the complex of problems connected with our present involvement in Vietnam. May I explain, in undertaking to speak to this subject, that southeast Asia is a part of the world for which I can claim no special knowledge. I am not familiar with the official rationale of our policy there, except as it has been reflected in the press. I cannot recall that I have ever, either during my service in Government or subsequently, been consulted by the executive branch of our Government on the problems of our policy in southeast Asia or even been made privy to the official discussions in which that policy was decided. I am sure there are many data relevant to any thoroughly founded judgment on these matters which are not available to me. This being the case, I have tried not to jump to final conclusions, even in my own thoughts, and to remain sympathetically receptive both to our Government's explanations of the very real difficulties it has faced and to the doubts and questions of its serious critics. I have not been anxious to press my views upon the public; but I gladly give them to you for whatever they are worth, claiming no particular merit for them except that they reflect an experience with Communist affairs running back, now, for nearly 40 years, and that they flow from the deepest and most troubled concern that we should find the right course at this truly crucial juncture.

The first point I should like to make is that if we were not already involved as we are today in Vietnam, I would know of no reason why we should wish to become so involved, and I can think of several reasons why we should wish not to. Vietnam is not a region of major industrial-military importance. It is difficult to believe that any decisive development of the world situation is going to be determined by what happens on that territory. Were it not for the considerations of prestige that arise out of our existing involvement, even a situation in which South Vietnam was controlled exclusively by the Vietcong, while regrettable and no doubt morally unwarranted, would not present, in my opinion, dangers great enough to justify our direct military intervention. Given the situation that exists today in the relations among the leading Communist powers, there is every likelihood that a Communist regime in South Vietnam would follow a fairly independent political course. There is no reason to expect that such a regime would find it either necessary or desirable, in present circumstances, to function simply as a passive puppet and instrument of Chinese power. And as for the danger its establishment there would unleash similar tendencies in neighboring countries, this would depend largely on the manner in which it came into power. In the light of what has recently happened in Indonesia and on the Indian subcontinent, the danger of the so-called domino effect of a limited Communist success in that area seems to me to be considerably less than it was when the main decisions were taken that led to our present involvement.

From the long-term standpoint, therefore, and on principle, I think our military involvement in Vietnam has to be recognized as unfortunate—as something we would not choose deliberately if the choice were ours to make all over again today; and by the same token I think it should be our Government's aim to liquidate this involvement just as soon as this can be done without inordinate damage to our own prestige or to the stability of conditions in that area.

It is obvious, on the other hand, that this involvement is today a fact. It creates a new situation. It raises new questions, ulterior to the basic long-term problem, which have to be taken into account. A precipitate and disorderly withdrawal could represent in present circumstances a disservice to our own interests and even to world peace greater than any that might have been involved in our failure to engage ourselves there in the first place. This is a reality which, if there is to be any peaceful resolution of this conflict, will have to be recognized not only by the more critical of our friends but by our adversaries as well.

I have, at the same time, great misgivings about any deliberate expansion of hostilities on our part directed to the achievement of something called victory—if, by the use of that term, we envisage the complete disappearance of the recalcitrance with which we are now faced, the formal submission by the adversary to our will, and the complete realization of our present stated political aims. I doubt that these things can be achieved even by the most formidable military successes. There seems to be an impression that, if we bring sufficient military pressure to bear, there will occur at some point something in the nature of a political capitulation by the other side. I think this is a most dangerous assumption. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have, between them, a great deal of space and manpower to give up, if they have to, and the Chinese can give them more if they need it. Fidelity to the Communist tradition would dictate that, if really pressed to extremity on the military level, they should disappear entirely from the open scene and fall back exclusively on an underground political and military existence, rather than accept terms that would be openly humiliating and would represent in their eyes the betrayal of the political prospects of the causes to which they are dedicated. Any total rooting out of the Vietcong from the territory of South Vietnam could be achieved, if it could be achieved at all, only at the cost of a degree of damage to civilian life, and civilian suffering generally, for which I should not like to see this country responsible. And to attempt to crush North Vietnamese strength to a point where Hanoi could no longer give any support for Vietcong political activity in the south would almost certainly have the effect of bringing in Chinese forces at some point, whether formally or in the guise of volunteers, thus involving us in a military conflict with Communist China in one of the most unfavorable theaters of hostility that we could possibly choose.

This is not the only reason why I think we should do everything possible to avoid the escalation of this conflict. There is another one which is no less weighty. This is the effect the conflict is already having on our policies and interests further afield. Not only are great and potentially more important questions of world affairs not receiving, as a consequence of our preoccupation with Vietnam, the attention they should be receiving, but in some instances assets we already enjoy, and hopeful possibilities we should be developing, are being sacrificed to this unpromising involvement in a remote and secondary theater of activity. Our relations with the Soviet Union have suffered grievously as was to be expected—and this at a time when far more important things were involved in those relations than what is involved in Vietnam, and when we had special reason to cultivate them. More unfortunate still, in my opinion, is the damage being done to the feeling entertained toward us by the Japanese people. The confidence and the good disposition of the Japanese is the greatest asset we have had—and the greatest asset we could have in east Asia. As the greatest industrial complex in the entire Far East, and the only place where today the sinews of modern war could be produced on a formidable scale, Japan is of vital importance to us and indeed to the prospects generally of peace and stability in east Asia. There is no success we could have in Vietnam that could conceivably warrant the sacrifice by us of the confidence and good will of the Japanese people. Yet we abuse that confidence and good will in the most serious way when we press the military struggle in Vietnam, and particularly when we press it by means of strategic bombing.

I mention Japan particularly because it is an outstanding example, both in importance and in the intensity of the feelings aroused, ow the psychological damage that is being done in many parts of the world by the prosecution of this conflict, and that will be done in even greater measure if the hostilities become still more bloody and tragic as a result of our deliberate effort. It is clear that however justified our action may be in our own eyes, it has failed to win either enthusiasm or confidence even among other peoples normally friendly to us. Our motives are widely misinterpreted; and the spectacle of Americans inflicting grievous injury on the lives of a poor and helpless people, and particularly a people of different race and color, no matter how warranted by military necessity or by the excesses of the adversary of our operations may seem to us to be, produces reactions among millions of people throughout the world profoundly detrimental to the image we would like them to hold of this country. I am not saying that this is just or right. I am saying that it is so, and that it is bound, in the circumstances, to be so. A victory purchased at the price of further such damage would be a hollow one in terms of our world interests, no matter what advantages it might hold from the standpoint of developments on the local scene.

These are the reasons, gentlemen, why I hope that our Government will restrict our military operations in Vietnam to the minimum necessary to assure the security of our forces and to maintain our military presence there until we can achieve a satisfactory peaceful resolution of the conflict; and why I hope that we will continue to pursue vigorously the question for such a resolution of it, even if this involves some moderation of our stated objectives and if the resulting settlement appears to us as less than ideal. I cannot, of course, judge the military necessities of our situation; but everything I know about its political aspects suggests to me that General Gavin is on the right track in his suggestions that we should, if I understood him correctly, decide what limited areas we can safely police and defend, and restrict ourselves largely to the maintenance of our position there. I have listened with interest to the arguments that have been brought forward in opposition to his views, and I must say that I have not been much impressed with some of them. When I am told that it would be difficult to defend such enclaves, it is hard for me to understand why it would be easier to defend the much wider areas which expanded hostilities, if successful, would presumably bring under our norminal control. Nor do I understand the argument that our allies will lose confidence in us if we fail to press forward aggressively in Vietnam. In the first place, I am not aware that any serious commentator has been pressing for anything like a total and immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. But even if that were the case, it seems implausible to me that we should suffer much loss of confidence on that account at the hands of a Britain which has wisely and tolerantly liquidated great portions of its former colonial empire since the recent war; of a France which has only recently, in an impressive exhibition of statesmanship, withdrawn from its former north African possessions; or of a Netherlands which, under our urging and encouragement, has had the generosity to give up the great territories in Indonesia. In matters such as this, it is not, in my experience, what you do that is decisive; it is how you do it. I would submit there is more respect to be won in the opinion of the world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than in the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or unpromising objectives.

And finally, when I hear it said that to adopt a defensive strategy in South Vietnam would be to rat on our commitment to the Government of that territory, I would like to note what that commitment really consists of and when and how it was incurred. What seems to be involved here is an obligation on our part not only to defend the frontiers of a certain foreign political entity but to assure the internal security of its Government in circumstances where that Government is unable to assure that security by its own means. Now any such obligation is one that goes, obviously, considerably further than the normal obligations of a military alliance. If we did not really incur it in any formal way, then we should not be inventing it for ourselves, and assuring ourselves that we are bound by it, today. But if we did, then I fail to understand how it was possible for us, in entering into any such commitment, to bypass the processes of senatorial advice and consent which were meant to come into play when undertakings of even lesser import than this were entered into.

Now just two concluding observations:

First, I would like it understood that what I have said here implies nothing but the highest respect and admiration for the fighting qualities of our forces in the field. I have the greatest confidence in them men and commanders alike. I have no doubt that they can and will, if duty requires, produce military results that will surprise both our skeptical friends and our arrogant adversaries. It is not their fighting qualities but the purpose to which they are being employed that evokes my skepticism.

Secondly, let me say that I am not looking at this whole problem from the moral standpoint but from the practical one. I see in the Vietcong a band of ruthless fanatics, partly misled perhaps by the propaganda that has been drummed into them, but cruel in their methods, dictorial and oppressive in their aims. Their claim to represent the people of South Vietnam is unfounded, arrogant, and outrageous. A country which fell under their exclusive power would have my deepest sympathy. And I would hope that this eventuality, at least, can be prevented by our present effort.

But our own country should not be asked, and should not ask of itself, to shoulder the main burden of determining the political realities in any other country, and particularly not in one remote from our shores, from our culture, and from the experience of our people. In saying this, I am only paraphrasing, and very poorly, words once uttered by one who had at one time been a Member of the U.S. Senate and who, had a Foreign Relations Committee existed in his day, would certainly have been a member of it. This was John Quincy Adams, and I would like your permission to recall, before I close, the words of his that I have in mind. They were spoken in this city 145 years ago, on the Fourth of July 1821. Some of you may be familiar with them, but they will stand repeating at this moment.

"Wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or shall be unfurled, there," Adams said, "will be America's heart, her benedictions, and her prayers." "But she goes not abroad," he went on, "in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own. She will recommend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and by the benignant sympathy of her example. She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication, in all the wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standards of freedom. The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force. * * * She might become the dictatress of the world. She would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit."

Gentlemen, I do not know exactly what Adams had in mind when he spoke those lines; but I think that, without knowing it, he spoke very pertinently to us, and very wisely.

TV and America's Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Oklahoma editor, publisher, author, and syndicated columnist, never misses a chance to prick America's conscience. He points out:

> History is endless repetition of the truth that the most glittering civilizations collapse if the central core rots out with corruption, crime, and license.

When he lectured publishers on the subject several years ago, he stated the case so colorfully that reprints of his speech were immediately exhausted, and new ones ordered. The speech made a hit in Congress, too. I believe a dozen Members, besides myself, asked permission to put it in the RECORD.

Now he has turned to the television industry with both praise and needle. He applauds proposals within the industry for turning the cathode tube on the problem of "patching the slow leak in America's moral values" and for "pumping up some pride and spirit in the business of citizenship and prosocial behavior."

Inspiration for his column in the Washington Star last Saturday is a proposal filed recently with the National Association of Broadcasters by its new Ad Hoc Committee on American Values.

Like Mr. Jones, I am hopeful that the committee's call for programing which counterbalances the present path of least resistance, the featuring of violence, mayhem, and passion will meet with prompt action.

The ad hoc committee accents something most of us have known a long time, first, that there is a positive side of American life—for every criminal there are 1,000 law-abiding people—and second, that the positive does not have to be made dull on television.

Columnist Jones refers to some television attempts to be positive as perfunctory wastage of prime time by amateur sermons produced by the office boy, and urges the industry to use its best genius to remind America that good living is good living and that national survival depends upon national behavior.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the Record at this point the column, "TV and America's Conscience," by Jenkin Lloyd Jones from the Washington Star of February 12.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TV and America's Conscience

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

There is a lot more to selling the good life in America than depicting the good guy felling the bad guy with a kick in the stomach and a karate chop.

And to start selling the good life in America over the powerful medium of television is the self-appointed task of a new Ad Hoc Committee on American Values headed by Charles H. Crutchfield, president of the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co. of Charlotte, N.C.

In a report to the board of directors of the National Association of Broadcasters on January 28, Crutchfield and five leading TV executives came up with specific proposals toward turning the cathode tube on the problem of patching the slow leak in America's moral values and pumping up some pride and spirit in the business of citizenship and prosocial behavior.

Crutchfield and his committee indict the broadcasting business on two counts. First, its preoccupation with the lawless, the abnormal, and the sleazy in American life.

"For every criminal," says the committee, "there are 1,000 law-abiding people; for every juvenile delinquent there are 20 constructive kids; for every member of an extremist group there are 180 members of moderate philosophies. While the featuring of violence, mayhem and passion is the path of least resistance, it is the legitimate task of an American values committee to call for the addition of programing which counterbalances them."

Second, the Crutchfield committee tackles the plea by broadcasters that seminars or documentaries on social problems cause most viewers to twist the station knob. The positive can be made dull, but it doesn't have to be. As Crutchfield puts it:

"If we can sell soap, we can sell sanity. If we can sell cigarettes, we can sell citizenship. If we can sell hardware, we can sell honesty. If we can sell razor blades, we can sell responsibility. We can sell American values to the American people. And it is a product they need."

Crutchfield's group points to a recent survey of 45,000 people published in This Week magazine on a choice of 15 national goals. The majority placed the control of inflation as No. 1, the raising of human standards—moral, religious, intellectual, and physical—as No. 2, and the control of crime and labor racketeering as No. 3.

The committee admits that a lot of uplift programs are horribly dull. On crime, for example, an inarticulate police chief appears on the screen to bumble through a ream of statistics. But, says Crutchfield, consider the impact on a youngster if a hard-hitting professional TV personality looked straight into the camera and unloaded something like this:

"Ever thought about robbing a bank? Do you want to be an idiot? The average bank robber makes $75 for every year he spends in prison. Seventy-five dollars a year. You could make a better salary every week, and in freedom. Nine out of ten bank robbers are promptly caught. Would you walk across an expressway if you had 9 chances out of 10 of being hit before you got to the other side?"

The pitfalls of teenage marriages, the ultimate agony of dope addiction, the lifetime millstone hung around the neck of the youth who gets a criminal record, the long dark tunnel of alcoholism, the bitter taste of promiscuity—all these have lent themselves to high and absorbing drama in literature, and in the hands of experts they can make high and absorbing drama on TV.

A hedonistic nation, ever more dedicated to the quick satisfaction of appetites, has no uncertain future. History is endless repetition of the truth that the most glittering civilizations collapse if the central core rots out with corruption, crime, and license. The road down which the movie moguls are currently taking as bears the wheel ruts of ancient Rome, Egypt of the Ptolemies, Constantinople, and Imperial France.

The power of popular TV should have a higher mission in modern America than the chasing of rustlers, the leering dropout, and the exposure of cleavages down to here.

It is time for the television industry to shoulder this responsibility, not by the perfunctory wastage of prime time by amateur sermons produced by the office boy, but by using its best genius to remind America that good living is good living, and that national surivial depends upon national behavior.

What We're Fighting For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of a local radio station in San Diego, KSON, set a realistic example of community and national service for the country's broadcasters to take note of. KSON president, Dan McKinnon, son of our former colleague Clinton D. McKinnon, has sponsored a "Why We're Fighting in Vietnam" contest and the results attracted exceptionally thoughtful reaction from KSON listeners.

Dan McKinnon's creative and catching contest produced three winning statements from San Diego listeners and under unanimous consent I include them as a portion of my remarks:

What We're Fighting For

(By Herb Travis, San Diego, Calif.)

The reasons for the war in Vietnam are many and varied.

The most important reason is communism has got to be stopped, somewhere, somehow. The United States has decided that Vietnam is where it must end. If communism is not stopped there, it will spread to here. That must not happen.

Our boys are giving their all, so that we at home can enjoy this Christmas and many more to come.

The war is being fought to show the world and those who wish to control it, that we will not and that we are tired of other countries being overrun, stepped on, beaten, starved, raped, murdered, and Vietnam is the place where the United States of America has decided that communism has to end.

And remember all the freedoms we enjoy and the life we are accustomed to, and all the things which we take for granted, are at stake.

Maybe my reasons aren't the best, but these are the things that run through my mind.

There are five more reasons, personal ones, for the war in Vietnam: So my wife, Donna, my sons, Jimmy and Billie, and my little daughter, Debbie may live, grow, and work as they please. Freedom to do as they please.

What We Are Fighting For

(By Bernard Wewer, El Cajon, Calif.)

In Asia, in the whole of this planet for that matter, we are fighting for many things, including our own freedom. Communism is a greater threat to us than the Nazi Party was some 25 years ago.

Adolf Hitler tried taking over the world in the same manner as Alexander the Great and the Romans did thousands of years ago—by brute force. This way of doing it—Hitler's way—arouses anger, hatred, and a will to fight back in the people the aggressors try to conquer. In Vietnam and all over the world we are fighting for countries, freedom, and human beings. With lies, empty promises, and sometimes by force if need be, Red China and Russia make America look like a horrible monster in the eyes of the people in other countries.

Their aim is to get a strong grip on the minds of the people in Africa, Asia, South America, Central America, and Mexico, so they could choke the United States to death. With America out of their way, they could go on to England and the rest of Europe. If they succeed in their takeover in Vietnam, that will make so many more men for their army, more land upon which they can build army and navy bases. That strengthens them and weakens us—so we can't afford another Laos, Korea, or Hungarian revolt. Russia and Red China seem to respect power and a country that steps forward, not back, when its toes are stepped upon.

The late President Kennedy proved this when he began to push back when Russia tried to bluff its way through the Cuban crisis. President Eisenhower didn't back up the Hungarian people in their revolt as he had promised. What made Russia think that America wouldn't back down again? If America did, it would make us appear afraid in the eyes of the world. South America and Asia, along with other parts of the world made up of smaller and weaker countries, will give up to communism sooner if they think America isn't going to back them up. After all, how can such small countries hope to stand up under the huge, powerful Soviet Union without outside help? Russia made a bluff, J.F.K. called it, and Russia backed down. This made a few people think that the great Soviet Union isn't such hot stuff after all.

Russia failed with their mixture of psychology and bluffs, so now Red China is trying to back Johnson in a corner. Now that the United States came out fighting, Red China can't give up just like that. If they do, they lose face. If they keep fighting and lose, they'll have to try something else or feel humiliated. If they fight and win, we, as Americans, lose. We lose what respect we have in Asia, and it'll make it harder to put in more and bigger bases in the yet free countries there.

What I've said hasn't made much sense, but one thing should be as plain as a smog-free day. Every inch of land lost to communism is that much closer to conquering the whole world. It is only a buildup to their all-out attack on the United States and their attempts to strip us of everything from our 10 cent cigars to our minds themselves. We would just be another country with no free enterprise, no churches, no personal freedom of any kind, and no right to even the shirts on our backs. If we let other countries fall one at a time, no matter how small that country is, as far as we know, America may be the next to fall. That's what I think we are fighting for in Vietnam, no matter how mixed up it sounds.

WHAT WE'RE FIGHTING FOR

(By Donald Biddy, San Diego, Calif.)

Since the Red Chinese came into power they have left a crimson trail of blood in the wake of their conquests and aggression. To establish their government in China required a blood purge of millions of their own people. Everyone, who in the opinion of the Red leaders, represented a threat (whether real or imaginative) to their government were either imprisoned or brutally murdered. Should they take over our Nation today, tomorrow could very easily be your last day on earth—especially if you are over 30 years old, of religious inclination, or just plain patriotic to the American way of life.

The Red Chinese extended their aggression into Vietnam, and North Vietnam fell to them becoming their satellite. The South Vietnamese, like the South Koreans, did not want to come under Communist rule. They wanted to remain free and independent, but were not strong enough to withstand the Communist aggression—armed terrorists, political and civil agitators, guerrilla activity, and all types of scientific aggression inspired, governed, and implemented by the Communist political machine now solidly established in North Vietnam.

The South Vietnamese had a decision to make. Either submit to a Communist takeover with its subsequent blood bath or engage them in a war for which they were totally unprepared. Either way meant the loss of numerous lives and eventual Communist takeover. They decided to fight for their freedom. If they were to lose their freedom, they would at least go down fighting.

They made an appeal to the United States for help. Not being a military nation they needed not only arms and ammunition, but technical assistance and expert advice as to how they might successfully resist the Communist aggression. To have looked the other way and made excuses or to have refused to help them, would have been a wanton act of inhumanity on the part of the United States.

Our initial role in the conflict was that of military advisers, but when the Vietcong, the internal South Vietnamese faction, began to receive help from North Vietnam., Red China and Russia in not only the form of arms and ammunition but armed troops from the north, we were forced to either get out and let them have South Vietnam or beef up our troops there and render physical as well as technical assistance.

To withdraw would be to let the Communists take over. This would be a great moral victory for them and only fan the fires of their dedicated determination to conquer the whole world—including us.

If we can beat them over there we can not only preserve the freedom of the South Vietnamese but seriously curtail the steady stream of Communist aggression and bloodshed flowing out of Red China.

We are in South Vietnam for the following reasons: First and foremost we are there on an errand of mercy helping a free people to retain their freedom. Next, we are there in our own interests (and of the entire free world) to stem the flow of Communist aggression which they have made no qualms about their intentions to extend unto the uttermost parts of the earth—a sort of crime preventive measure.

Sure we could turn our backs and peacefully watch the rest of the free world gobbled up around us by the blood-letting Communist machine. But what will we do when we are the only free nation left? You can't fight the whole world, and we don't intend to.

A stitch in time can still save nine—maybe more.

Small Business Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Mr. Irving H. Dale delivered a presidential address to the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies at their seventh annual meeting held at the Plaza in New York City, on November 30, 1965.

I know Mr. Dale as an outstanding citizen of my city and State; I have also worked with him in matters affecting small business. I know the fine record made by him during his year as president of the trade association which represents SBIC's. During his tenure he set high standards of conduct and lofty goals for the industry.

I believe his remarks worthy of review and ask unanimous consent to have the text of Mr. Dale's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS BY IRVING H. DALE, NOVEMBER 30, 1965

Four years of service as a member of the board and as an officer of NASBIC are drawing to a close tonight. Even if I were to harbor some romantic illusion that this entitles me to come before you to make speeches, to reminisce, and to act pontifical, I have come to know you well, and you to know me, and we both know that you won't abide any such nonsense. Furthermore, you owe me nothing, not even an obligation to listen. Although the work has been time consuming and often taxing, you know that I have enjoyed every minute of it and am really in debt to you for giving me the opportunity to make whatever contribution I have made.

Let's talk first and briefly about the past year, not as historians, but only for whatever light it throws on the future.

Our SBIC's have done better. They continue to make more and more investments. They have started to reap some of the rewards from their good investments. Some marginal SBIC's have left the industry, and others are planning to leave. Those that remain are becoming stronger. The prices of the stocks of the public companies have moved up and their stockholders are faring better. In some cases they are getting dividends and profit distributions.

Our reputation has improved. Other sectors of the financial community have come to know us better, and unless my senses and observations are deceiving me, their opinion of us is growing more favorable with every passing day. Our public relations programs, thanks to the near-unanimous support you gave it, is well launched, and will enhance our stature.

Our relationship with the Government continues to be excellent. Perfect? No. Our legislative program, though absolutely sound and well conceived and strongly supported, was not enacted during this past year. Our tax bill has still not been introduced, and is still awaiting final approval in the Bureau of the Budget. Our capital bank bill is likewise being studied, and will, I hope but do not promise, be introduced in the next session of this Congress.

Businessmen continued to seek our financing and counsel. Our investment opportunities improved in quality. It was proved beyond any doubt that American small business needs the SBIC industry.

That's a brief but fair summary of last year. Now let's look ahead, and let us start with our relationship with the Small Business Administration. Never in the history of our industry has this relationship been as mutually respectful, as constructive, and as productive. I have no thought of recounting tonight the numerous changes that have taken place in the regulations. We will be hearing about them at our various business sessions and you have been reading them as they crossed your desks. I had a fond hope that I might be able to tell you tonight that every proposal we made was approved and has been put into effect. I cannot. The administrative process grinds slowly. If speed alone were the problem, the answer would be easy to find. There are other problems, however, and they reveal what I believe to be an issue of principle. This issue of principle is so basic that I propose to make it thé central theme of this address.

My dear Milton Stewart uses an expression about the SBIC program; he harkens us to look at "the grand design." Consider those words. They can mean something quite pedestria[illegible] "Grand" can mean, for instance, "overall"; and "design" can mean "pattern," and "grand design" can, therefore, mean "overall pattern" or "structure" or any other words which would allude to the laws, the rules, the regulations, and other formal matters. But "grand" can also mean "high," and "design" can also mean "purpose," or "social objective," and that leads us to think of "high purpose" and the social goals of the SBIC program. If we lose sight of our high purpose, we cease to be of importance in our society. Yet, as craftsmen, we must never forget that high purpose is not achieved only with fine words and noble demeanor; it takes a well conceived set of rules and regulations to make the high purpose achievable.

What is our purpose? Why were we created? Our Government correctly determined that small businessmen were not able to get the kind of long term capital that they needed to grow strong. It determined also that small businessmen need not only capital, but seasoned help and advice to achieve success in this complex society of ours. High purpose No. 1, therefore, is to see to it that small businessmen get this financing and this help. Whatever fosters their getting it is consistent with this high purpose; whatever blocks it is contrary to public policy.

But this high purpose cannot be achieved in a vacuum. We can't do our job unless we too are successful and confident enough to remain venturesome and to take the risks involved in backing independent business. If we are weak, if we don't prosper, if we grow timid or uncertain, if our activities are unduly obstructed, we won't perform our function. Whatever removes these hindrances is, therefore, consistent with the high purpose; and whatever perpetuates them is contrary to public policy.

In that simple basic context, what is the responsibility of our industry, and what is the responsibility of SBA, our regulator?

It is never to lose awareness of the high purpose, and to foster a practical pattern of regulation within which it can be achieved. We respect SBA too much, and I think they respect us too much, to permit ourselves to get bogged down in trivial details; but some of the most important things in life are an agglomeration of details, and the art of the skilled leader is to know what is trivial, and what is really part of the grand design.

There are many examples I could recount here of a running dialog on various issues that has been going on with people at the SBA. There is no need tonight to document my point. I just want to be sure that our eyes are always on the same goal, that we place a high value on that goal, and that we don't permit ourselves to be diverted from it. The crossing of t's and the dotting of i's is a function of pattern, not of high purpose.

The question should always be, will this or that regulation make it more likely that small businessmen will get more financing and more help. If the answer is yes, then everyone must move forward to fashion the words and details to bring it into being, and argumentation about clauses should be tolerated with only as much patience as a detail deserves in the light of the grand design.

No one should forget that small business is 90 percent in number of all American enterprise. Small businessmen are a major foundation in our society for the preservation of true democracy. They keep the large businessmen lively and alert and competitive; they keep open the door of opportunity to all young people starting out on their own careers, they police a real anti-trust program simply by creating a constant pressure of competitive talent and energy. They employ hundreds of thousands of people, render innumerable services, pay billions in taxes, and keep the basic dream of our society true. So long as small business survives, grows, and succeeds, men will know that in this country there is no elite society of managers, there is no elite group of economic power. There will be no position to which competent people cannot aspire and no measure of success for which they cannot hope. And this, in large part, is what democracy is all about.

I give you another issue to examine in the same perspective. Once again we are faced with the problems that arise with a change of administration of our program.

Gene Foley, that brilliant dynamo who contributed so mightily to our progress the past 2 years, has left us. This is but one in a repetitive series of changes over the years in either the Administrator's or Deputy Administrator's position. This necessarily creates doubt, confusion, and concern within the Agency, and, in turn, in our industry. This must affect adversely the rendering of the services we are expected to give to small business.

I suggested last year that it was a matter of important public policy to see to it that the SBA and the Investment Division in the SBA were headed at all times by outstanding men who would welcome it as a suitable career for a long period of time, and who would participate in the highest councils of Government. If the grand design is to help small business, then what is happening now and what has happened in the past and will continue to happen, hurts small business. It's against public policy. Why does it keep on happening? Is our governmental partner facing up to its responsibilities?

Let us, you and I, fellow SBIC'ers, now look at our responsibilities. Our task is supplying American independent business with the funds which history teaches it could not otherwise get and to give all the other aids we can to help it prosper.

I know that it may seem childish and unsophisticated to be talking of social responsibilities. After all, are we not money men, hard boiled, knowledgeable, intent only on profit? Should we not let the philosophers write the theses about responsibilities to society? Let's just make money. Don't label me an idealist; such a reputation could destroy me. But surely hard headedness, overdone and unbalanced, removed from all feeling of what men owe men, is not sophistication; it is intellectual and emotional jaundice.

Let me say quickly that I do not mean that we must serve without profit to ourselves. Businesses that do not profit do not survive. What this adds up to, therefore, is that we are an industry charged with a vast public responsbility; that we intend to meet that responsibility with honor, with wisdom, and with profit both to those we help and to ourselves. In this goal, we should be joined by the executive and legislative arms of government.

The relationship between us is and should be a partnership. We should support them, and they us, to achieve the high purpose. If there are errors and malfunctions, let us press for their elimination.

When we need help, let us not be chary about asking for it. Remember that we go not as supplicants, not to win some tawdry private advantage, but as worthy and indispensable members of our economic society, who made a compact with our Government and they with us, and who simply call on our partners to do their share of the job so that we can do ours. We can afford to be, and have the duty to be, frank, outspoken, and untiring in our efforts to make our program increasingly effective.

This grand design, this high purpose, obliges us to exert our every joint effort to procure the enactment of the tax bill which we so urgently need in order to make us more effective instruments of public policy, and of the capital bank bill and of other legislative matters to which we have not yet given sufficient attention. From the very bottom of our hearts, we thank Gene Foley and Dick Kelley for taking on this major task and bringing it to the point of development where it now rests, but it would be both unfair and unwise to expect them to do it by themselves. It is up to us to go directly to our partner, to remind him of the high purpose of the program and to ask that support which partners ought to give to each other. That we shall achieve success in these goals is undoubted. I don't doubt it, because I know how stanch you are and you can be sure beyond a shadow of a doubt that your officers and governors are as firm in their dedication to this task as you could wish.

And now, at the risk of appearing insatiable in my appetites for this industry, let me make clear my personal conviction that when we have finally gotten the regulations into harmony with the grand design, when we have finally gotten the tax bill, when the capital bank has been organized and is functioning, we can then, and perhaps without even waiting for that moment, address ourselves to some truly basic problems that will challenge our strength and our talents.

Consider, for instance, the need for liquidity on the part of our own investors. The public companies are only part of the picture. What of the investors in private SBIC's who either because of discouragement, personal reasons, impatience, or personal need, desire to liquidate all or part of their investment? Of what meaning is the overly touted tax loss provision to a man who can't sell? Can you expect increased capital to flow into an industry when that capital will become rigidly locked in? And with all the irrelevant and unintended complications thrown upon our public companies by provisions of the 1940 Investment Company Act which were never intended to apply to them, how can smaller companies afford to think seriously of becoming public? Does this mean that there is no way to give some measure of liquidity to their stockholders? I refuse to accept this hopeless conclusion. No one can persuade me that in this audience of intelligent and knowledgeable human beings, we can't find, if not a final answer, at least a vast improvement.

And what about liquidity in our investments in portfolio companies? Is the only recourse sale, merger, or going public in some limited regional market?

What does it mean for a small company to go public when the over-the-counter market is 100 or 200 shares a day and sometimes those shares are traded back and forth by the same brokers just to create the illusion of a market. Are we incapable of developing some instrumentality which will provide some measure of liquidity to our investment?

One day soon we must face up to the problem of valuing our portfolios. A balance must be struck. True, we can't permit overoptimistic Boards, or those influenced by questionable motives, to exercise an unfettered judgment in valuing things that have a limited market. But if truth is the objective, is it any less misleading to understate value than to overstate it?

In finding the answers to these problems we shall need the support and sympathetic understanding of SBA, SEC, the Congress, and the White House, and I am undismayed about getting this support if we do our homework and develop sound programs; I have this confidence because this liquidity will free funds and time and talent for small business, will increase the success of SBIC's, will multiply their usefulness, and will contribute to the forward march of American independent business. It fits in precisely with the high purpose for which we were created, and so long as our objectives are attuned to this purpose we can expect and will get all the aid and support we need.

Let us give thanks for the unwavering support of Senators SPARKMAN and PROXMIRE, to Congressman PATMAN, and many other legislators in both Halls of Congress on whose help we can count with complete confidence.

And am I not fortunate to be given this opportunity to express publicly the gratitude I feel and which I know I express on your behalf to Walter Stults, Charlie Noone, Al Hattal, and Eileen Biermann. There are no more capable association executives, and to this I can bring testimony not only from myself but from the people in Washington who have gone out of their way to tell it to me.

As I pass my nonexistent gavel on to my successor, I may be pardoned the human frailty of wondeirng whether what's happened this year at NASBIC has made an impact, and whether our labors and efforts will be remembered. I'm just vain enough to hope they will be. But there is one thing I don't have to wonder about. When our contributions to America have become sufficiently important that sensible historians will feel some urge to make a record of them, they will not fail to remember me for one thing, and that is, the part I played, however small, in helping to select the wonderful group of men who will follow me in the leadership of NASBIC, and in persuading them to serve. I'm in goodly company when I am succeeded by Grogan Lord, and after him, given good fortune, by Milton Stewart and Elliott Davis.

Those of you who know them well know how true is the assurance I give to the rest of you, that your interests could not be in better hands, and that our greatest accomplishments lie ahead.

Address by Hon. John E. Horne, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, to the U.S. Savings and Loan League, January 31, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, John Horne, has devoted many years to the service of his country.

On January 31, 1966, he addressed the annual legislative conference of the U.S. Savings and Loan League here in Washington and made several points which are of great interest to the Members of the Congress. Of particular interest to me, were his comments in support of Federal charters for mutual savings banks, a proposal which I have been introducing in bill form since 1957.

At the present time, the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance of the House Banking and Currency Committee, is actively considering H.R. 11508, which would authorize the granting of these charters. We hope to be able to report a bill to the full committee in the immediate future.

Chairman Horne's remarks follow:

SPEECH OF JOHN E. HORNE BEFORE THE ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE U.S. SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1966

I am pleased to be with you again at your legislative conference. Last year, in my first speech as chairman, I attempted to point out some broad principles which the Board thought should guide our joint efforts. Today, it seems appropriate to attempt to apply these principles to an environment characterized by change.

When I first came to the Board, it was apparent that the Agency already recognized that the industry was in a new environment and that further adjustments would be required. Not long after I became a member, the Board took one of the most important steps on record in adopting the present reserve regulation. I say with some pride that I vigorously supported the regulation and participated in determining its provisions. Other Board actions have been taken from time to time, designed to take account of the changed environment.

Several elements have changed in our environment in recent years, but two of them seem most appropriate for discussion. First, is the mortgage and housing market, and second, is the savings market.

As recently as the late 1950's there was a backlog of housing demand that provided major absorptive capacity for most additions to the housing stock. The mortgage market, as a consequence, posed few risks. Since then, supply and demand have come into much better balance. Except for a few areas where there have been important economic disclocations or overly enthusiastic construction, it has not been a bad market. It was one, however, in which greater skill and care have been required. Other important factors to be remembered are that other mortgage lenders have become more active, mortgage interest rates have been and are lower than they were 6 or 7 years ago, and risks generally are greater. However, the market in general has been good. Nevertheless, some markets have been overbuilt because of unwise decisions and practices.

On the savings side, commercial and mutual savings banks have become increasingly stronger competitors for funds than they were in the late 1950's. Sometimes, let me caution, there can be overreaction to competition from other institutions. For example, as regards the recent increase in permissible ceilings on certificates of deposit there is evidence that some associations have responded when little or no response was required.

However, these two developments, a less bouyant mortgage market and tighter competition for savings, have produced some effects that we must recognize. Profit margins are slimmer, maneuverability is more restricted, and risks are clearly greater. It is this pattern of development with which the Board was endeavoring to cope that resulted in a series of new policies.

These policies exist for your protection. What the Board has done is not merely an attempt to satisfy some abstract principle. It can be said quite fairly that we would be derelict in our performance if we did not take appropriate measures to preserve the integrity and posture of all institutions. So while we engage in fulfilling our legislative responsibility and serving the public interest, we protect you from those few who do not engage in the necessary self-discipline to stay out of trouble.

To achieve this mission the Board embarked on a course which emphasizes performance in terms of adequacy of reserve allocations, soundness of assets, and conditions in an association's market. The steps we have taken are well known and repetition here would serve no purpose. It is enough to say that these measures have anticipated and probably facilitated the adjustment process. When conditions have changed, we have revised appropriate policies as we did last month. But the key point is that these steps are essential to giving you the proper environment in which to operate.

There are some developments of the past few weeks that deserve comment. One such development is the performance of the industry with regard to advances in December. You recall that the Board asked members not to borrow in anticipation of withdrawals and to attempt to meet a part of the withdrawal drain from their own resources. Your officials of the U.S. Savings and Loan League urged your cooperation with our request. We can report now that generally this request was reasonably well observed by a large percentage of the members. Advances rose only $270 million in December 1965 compared with $540 million a year earlier.

I should like to extend to each of you who made this performance possible our sincere thanks for your cooperation. This procedure demonstrates that a flexible approach can work if all of us recognize our mutual interest in conducting an effective and appropriate credit mechanism. It demonstrates, too, the probability that not all rules must of necessity be put into a fixed regulatory form. Adherence to a procedure of this type can make both your performance and ours more successful.

Another point of interest is the change in the movement of the reserve ratio last year. You may recall that in previous years the reserve ratio declined steadily. Between 1963 and 1964 it fell by one-tenth of 1 percent. It is pleasing to note that apparently this ground was recovered last year. To those of you who contributed to this reversal of an adverse trend, again our sincere compliments. Perhaps this improvement will induce all of us to think about the need for protecting reserve positions even when gross earnings are hard to convert to net. We hope in the light of the next few years it does not prove to be just a momentary job but marks the beginning of a sustained upward movement.

As to the future, no one would suggest that the increased competition for savings is likely to abate very soon. Furthermore, in periods of economic growth like that we most likely will experience in 1966, people tend to put less into liquid savings in relation to income. They usually spend more on durable goods and invest more in stocks and even bonds. This may mean a somewhat smaller inflow of savings in 1966 than in 1965.

However, panicky conclusions about dire consequences are not appropriate. In 1966, the industry will probably have repayments on loans of close to $17 billion and an inflow of savings of $8 billion. In terms of mortgage investment, you should have about $25 billion at your disposal. Based on the immediate outlook for mortgage demand this year, it will be a challenge to place all of these funds. It seems wise, therefore, to examine most carefully the need for pursuing a more vigorous flow of savings and the costs associated with it.

As for the mortgage market itself, it is likely to be a highly competitive market for sometime yet to come. The prospects for increased residential construction are not very strong. Most authorities, including your league's economist, do not look for significantly if any more new housing this year than last. Yet, there are signs of increasing household formation.

This may, in time, exert some upward pressure on the need for additional housing. Even if that date is not far off, we must take into account the still substantial surpluses that exist in some areas and in some types of structures.

The main point really is a need for all of us to recognize that we face a basically healthy situation. It may not provide all the zip or vim and vigor for the housing segment of the economy we would like, but it does afford ample room for sound, thoughtful operation. On the other hand, we must all endeavor to avoid over enthusiasm. Of course, a strong economy and some increase in household formation are likely to bring about some strengthening in housing demand, but if we attempt to convert this into an immediate housing boom, we may be sorely disappointed.

The essential ingredients of the present situation require that we evaluate matters realistically. We should not accept or adopt views of gloom because some dimensions of the situation are a bit tighter. Nor should we proceed to swing into high gear simply because the road ahead looks a bit smoother. Our key ought to be judiciousness and flexibility.

At this point, I want again to reemphasize the joint interests of the Board and the industry. We should truly have a common goal—a sound industry with meritorious practices in which those who are inclined to wander into dangerous or improper activities are brought back to the mainstream of performance. We can talk about the public interest and our responsibility under law. These are proper and overriding principles, but they are abstract. Plainly, your own interest requires that the Board act so as to make certain that the overwhelming majority is protected from the misdeeds of the few. In the absence of such action, your economic position and your standing with the public will suffer.

While we must act to protect your interests, it is essential that you support our efforts. I appeal to you to do so, and particularly in the field of needed legislation. In my address to this Conference a year ago, I outlined the legislative program that I envisioned for the Board, mentioning three bills. Two of these have now been introduced in the current Congress: the holding company bill and the Federal savings bank bill.

There remains for introduction the supervisory bill, to amend section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act and section 407 of the National Housing Act. In his budget last Monday the President informed Congress that:

"Legislation is being recommended to provide the Federal Home Loan Bank Board with effective remedies, in the relatively few cases where required, to preserve the soundness of our savings and loan institutions without confining the Board to taking over an institution or terminating its insurance."

Again in his economic message a few days ago, the President stated his recommendation for congressional action on legislation to "arm regulatory agencies with a wider range of effective enforcement remedies." I expect the transmittal to Congress and introduction of the Board's supervisory bill very shortly, and I appreciate the fact that the President has twice given this measure his endorsement in major messages to Congress.

I have discussed aspects of this bill with you on other occasions, but I want to make it completely clear why the Board attaches so much importance to its enactment. Our recent experience has made the members of the Board feel keenly the need for some improvement in our capacity to try to prevent losses in this industry. The Board's present sanctions are principally those of last resort—the takeover of a Federal association under section 5(d) of the termination of insurance of a State association under section 407. The ultimate nature of these remedies makes it inappropriate, in the view of the Board, to use them lightly or prematurely. We have found, therefore, that we need ways to correct practices or to resolve controversies without waiting so long or having so much at stake.

The dilemma confronting the Board is particularly acute in the case of section 407. Termination of insurance is a drastic remedy; as a means of protecting the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, it is also a futile remedy if it actually has to be used. The progress of a termination proceeding through notice, correction period, hearing, recommended decision, and decision by the Board consumes many months and may be further prolonged through court appeals. In its entirety, the process can consume years. And if at the end of the line a termination order becomes effective, then the Insurance Corporation remains liable on existing accounts for 2 more years, no matter what happens to the association or how badly its affairs are mangled.

That, stated briefly, is why the Board believes there is definite need for the provision of new intermediate remedies, more limited in impact and more readily employed. As you are already aware, the Board's supervisory bill would provide such lesser remedies of two sorts: first, cease-and-desist authority and second, provision for removal or suspension of an officer or director.

The new general purpose remedy would be the cease-and-desist authority. The ground for a cease-and-desist order would be violation of law or regulation or the commission of unsafe or unsound practices. Following notice and the holding of a full hearing on the record before an independent hearing examiner, an order could be issued by the Board which would become effective after 30 days. If during that 30-day period an association wished to appeal to a court of appeals, it could do so, and obtain judicial review of the Board's action.

The grounds for removal or suspension of an officer or director are more closely hedged, and I have little doubt that this remedy would be less often employed. Even though there were a violation of law or regulation by the person in question or the commission of unsafe practices, the Board could not commence such a proceeding unless it also found that the association would incur substantial loss or damage from such violation or practice.

In other words, only where the officer or director had inflicted substantial financial injury on the institution as a result of his misconduct would this remedy be available to the Board. What we are seeking here, as many of you know, is some answer to the devastation that can be visited upon an institution by a faithless manager. For that reason, we also provide for suspension of an officer or director who is indicted for commission of a felony involving the affairs of an insured bank or savings and loan association, and for his removal if convicted. We have seen such situations as these in some of our cases in recent years, and we feel an obligation to do whatever we can to prevent such scenes in the future.

The supervisory bill contains some lesser provisions which we hope will be helpful, such as a requirement for notification of change of control of an institution that is along the lines of the bill passed in 1964 relating to banks, and the provision of better examination authority for those performing this vital task. But the essence of our bill lies in the two measures I've described, with which we might try to prevent or lessen losses rather than being confined to the grim chore of taking over or canceling the insurance of institutions ruined beyond repair.

You, as responsible members of this industry, have an equal stake in what we are trying to accomplish. The Board, of course, has the duty of discharging its statutory responsibilities and of protecting the public. The reputation and public standing of this industry—and of your own institutions—depend in no small part on how well we can do that job.

Your stake in our success also has a concrete dollars-and-cents component. Under the provisions of law governing the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, your obligation to make payment and prepayment of insurance premiums continues unabated until the primary and secondary reserves of the Insurance Corporation reach the level of 2 percent of the savings accounts and creditor obligations of insured institutions. How long it takes us to reach that level depends in part upon how fast those reserves are depleted by losses which the Insurance Corporation must bear. At the present time, the industry is making payments and prepayments of insurance premiums to the Corporation at a rate of $250 million per year. Each loss that the Insurance Corporation must absorb, due to management either criminal or incompetent, prolongs your payment of insurance premiums by exactly the same amount.

On the basis of projections that the Insurance Corporation made in 1961, the cutoff level of 2 percent reserves was expected to be reached in 1970. Both how much you pay in the way of insurance premiums and how long you pay them, are directly and immediately affected by our capacity to deal with problems and problem institutions before they result in millions of dollars of losses to the Insurance Corporation.

The possibility also exists that you could be called upon to make good the losses of the Corporation through an additional assessment. And, as you know, you could be asked to supply deposits to the Corporation to protect its liquidity. We do not regard these as likely steps, but they should illustrate the importance of keeping this industry healthy and of providing a regulatory environment which restricts those who are careless or unwise. It is in this light, it seems to me, that you must assess your position on effective supervisory authority.

In making such an assessment, I hope there will be no misconceptions about the actual content of the Board's proposal. As I have participated in discussions of these issues from time to time, I must admit that I have encountered such misconceptions. Let me take a moment to deal with two that seems to crop up repeatedly.

I have heard some people express the view, or fear, that the Board's supervisory bill does not afford those affected by it adequate protection in terms of due process and judicial review. This indicates, it seems to me, either a total lack of familiarity with what the Board proposes or else an attitude that supervision ought not to exist or function.

Let me be specific. The bill provides for the issuance by the Board of two types of final orders—cease-and-desist or removal. No such final order could be issued by the Board except after opportunity for a full hearing on the record in which the institution or person affected could introduce evidence and cross-examine adverse witnesses under oath. Every such final order is subject to review by the courts.

The bill also provides, in situations where the violation or practice threatens substantial financial damage to the association, for the issuance by the Board of temporary orders of cessation or suspension. Such orders would be confined in duration to the pendency of the administrative hearing and proceeding; even so, such temporary orders could be limited or set aside upon application to the district courts.

As a final note on how completely the bill provides the safeguards of judicial review, the ex parte takeover of a Federal association by the Board, when that measure of last resort has to be used, is made subject to immediate review in the U.S. district court on an expedited basis. Under existing judicial decisions, the takeover of an association by Board appointment of a supervisory representative in charge is not an act itself subject to review by the courts.

In sum, judicial review of Board action is fully provided and more extensive than presently exists. One must indeed strain to find in this legislation some sort of threat of denial of due process or judicial review. The precise opposite is true. Court review is elevated by the bill to a far larger role in the supervisory process than it has ever had before.

At the same time, let me stress that in the public interest it is essential that supervision be free to act promptly when situations demand. Money is the stock in trade of a financial institution, and no business has a kind of merchandise more susceptible to rapid dissipation. The agency that examines and is familiar with this business must be able in the first instance to judge when action is necessary and what action is appropriate. This Board, I can assure you, would never willingly accept any measure that reduced supervision to the role of a plaintiff seeking redress before the courts in often protracted litigation. Both the public interest and your own require firmer protection than that.

A second misconception, perhaps not as fundamental as the first but one which nonetheless interferes with real understanding of the legislation, is the charge that it simply reflects the Board's desire for more power over the industry. I will concede that this interpretation of the bill is simple, but it is not very accurate. To begin with, it should be clear to all that the Board's existing powers are drastic—taking over an institution or terminating its insurance may for all practical purposes amount to its end as an independent enterprise. It should also be clear that the grounds for invoking these powers are broad—the statutory reference is to any violation of law or regulation, or unsafe or unsound practice or operation. In terms of the legal language, any infraction could mean the end of the institution.

Against that background, I would hope it would be evident that the issue is not one of the breadth of our powers but of their measured use. The Board is seeking not broader grounds for action but the possibility of acting in more limited ways—ways that may prevent deterioration of a precarious situation or forestall greater ultimate loss. Indeed, the proposed legislation actually narrows some of the grounds for takeover of a Federal association. Only if a violation of law or regulation portends substantial financial damage to the institution would it be a basis for the appointment of a conservator or a receiver.

This bill is easier to understand if you think in terms not of power but of remedies. The constant problem before supervision is to choose, and be able to take, action that is both appropriate and timely. Hence this bill provides remedies that are lesser than the present ones, in the hope that the present ones, which are so drastic, may become less needed and less used.

The implications of what we are discussing reach into the very basis upon which supervision of the savings and loan business is to be conducted. I noted at your Dallas convention the decided preference expressed by your outgoing president, John Stadtler, for greater reliance on supervision on an individual case basis and less prescription of detailed regulations applicable to the entire industry. I can understand his feeling and sympathize with it. The Board, too, is not greatly enamored of the constant promulgation of numerous regulations. One of the real problems we have with supervision by regulation is the volume of small changes constantly being suggested to make this or that minor improvement in the coverage or operation of some section.

As I noted earlier, however, preventive supervision is a vital aspect of our job and one we must seek to advance by one means or another. If the only enforcement remedies we have are terminal in nature, then we must rely on the issuance of regulations to try to halt at an early stage dangerous tendencies or developments. On the other hand, if a broader choice of remedies is available, the Board might well find that a particular problem could be handled with a limited number of cease-and-desist orders, thereby obviating the need for a whole area of regulation.

The misgiving that I have always heard some people voice is that supervision on a case basis may be arbitrary or unreasonable supervision if it is not tied to a set of detailed rules. If we again place greater stress on case supervision through reliance on a new cease-and-desist order remedy, the availability of judicial review whenever that remedy is invoked should surely temper such misgiving.

At the same time I realize the subject of officer or director removal is not one likely to arouse the enthusiasm of a management meeting. Limited and safeguarded as it is, I believe it also need not genuinely arouse your forebodings. For I concede that it would not often be appropriate or employed. A kind of removal remedy has been available to the Board since 1954 in the case of Federal associations through the emergency appointment of a supervisory representative in charge, and it has been utilized only four times. That figure ought to be some answer to those who would exaggerate your fears beyond any realistic dimensions. Nonetheless, some of our cases do lead us to feel that at times nothing short of removal could produce a change in policy and operations when the wrong element has obtained control.

When you weigh all the factors, therefore, I hope this measure will receive your considered support—in our mutual interest.

I have devoted most of my attention to the supervisory bill. It would not be appropriate, however, for me to pass over other bills without mention, for that might imply that they would not have the Board's strong and active support.

The holding company bill is one that we continue to feel is necessary for the security of this business. No doubt many of you have grown somewhat more accustomed to the situation, and perhaps it does not immediately concern you as much as before. But the public interest can only be protected in the long run by supervision of all of those who conduct the affairs of institutions entrusted with the people's money. The existence of another corporate layer cannot safely be made an insulation from the scrutiny of examiners or the policing of transactions. I trust this measure will continue to receive your meaningful support.

I should at least mention, even if I have no time remaining to discuss, the Federal savings bank bill and the Federal Deposit and Share Account Insurance Act bill. The savings bank charter bill continues, I believe, to afford a potential option of great significance and value to the savings and loan business, or at least to the mutual segment of it. And the Federal Deposit and Share Account Insurance Act contains safeguards whose enactment would strengthen the framework within which all our financial institutions operate. Both measures have the Board's unqualified support, and I hope both will receive favorable consideration by the Congress this year.

We also expect shortly to transmit, and I hope Congress will enact, a bill to make possible suitable buildings for not only the Board staff here in Washington but also our regional banks. With your assistance, I believe we can take another step toward better public recognition of the role the savings and loan sector of our economy and Government has come to play.

I could develop quite a few of these points further, but I believe we have reached the time for lunch. I wish you a profitable and productive meeting, and I appreciate your invitation to give you this expression of the views and position of the Board.

Thank you for your attention.

A Tribute to Will Clayton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on February 9, 1966, the world, no less than my home State of Texas, suffered a tremendous loss with the death of William Lockhart Clayton. Will Clayton combined all the attributes that a model man could have—he proved his success in business, in Government service, in diplomacy, and in statesmanship.

A man who was born of modest means and succeeded in building the world's largest cotton company, he furthered the progress of the world in commerce and trade relations between nations.

The free world is indebted to him for his leadership in the formation of the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He was a strong advocate of international cooperation. He shared his fortune no less than his time in contributing to causes for the betterment of the general welfare of this country and the entire free world.

His role was both advisory and official, but always he was far sighted and successful in his participation in many solutions to the world's problems.

As a tribute to William Lockhart Clayton, I ask unanimous consent that the front page article from the Houston Post of February 9, 1966, entitled "W. L. Clayton Dies Here After Heart Seizure," the article from the Houston Chronicle of February 9, entitled "William L. Clayton, Statesman, Dies," the editorial from the Houston Chronicle of Thursday, February 10, 1966, entitled "Will Clayton, Citizen of the World," the editorial from the Houston Post, dated February 10, 1966, entitled "William L. Clayton," and the editorial from the Washington Post dated Sunday, February 13, 1966, entitled "Will Clayton," be printed at this point in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 9, 1966]

W. L. CLAYTON DIES HERE AFTER HEART SEIZURE

William Lockhart Clayton, the man who helped found the world's largest cotton company and years later jotted down a memo that provided the concept of the Marshall plan, died in Houston at 4 p.m. Tuesday in Methodist Hospital.

Clayton, who was 86 Monday, died after a heart attack at his home at 5300 Caroline.

Funeral services will be at 10:30 a.m. Thursday at the First Methodist Church with burial at Glenwood Cemetery.

His son-in-law, S. Maurice McAshan, Jr., said the attack was sudden.

Clayton was talking to one of his daughters Monday in the early evening when he was seized by the attack.

He is survived by four daughters, several grand and great-grandchildren.

A former Under Secretary of State and a cofounder of Anderson, Clayton & Co. in 1904, Clayton has been recognized throughout the world as the idea man behind the Marshall plan—the plan by which wartorn Europe was able to make its miraculous recovery.

In Houston, he and his wife—Susan Vaughn Clayton, who died January 7, 1960—donated large tracts of land and great amounts of money to philanthropic enterprises.

He was honored by local, national, and international groups for his contributions to business and the general welfare.

An imposing man who stood 6 feet 3 inches, with gray hair and black brows, he was known for his nervy calm in explosive emergencies.

He had a record of Government service dating back to 1918, and almost until the instant of his death, was deeply involved with furthering the cause of democracies.

One of his favorite activities was within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and 2 years ago was the coauthor of the agenda of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization meeting.

Although retired from "administrative duties" of Anderson, Clayton & Co., in 1951 at 71, he served on the company's board of directors and maintained an office in Houston. He worked 6 days a week.

Politically, he once said: "I consider myself, by standards of today, a conservative-liberal. I'm not a liberal in the sense that I am a Socialist or a Communist. I am a Democrat."

Born on a farm near Tupelo, Miss., Clayton grew up in Jackson, Tenn. He left school at 13 and by studying shorthand at night, qualified as a court stenographer and did odd jobs on the side.

An early customer, however, wasn't completely satisfied with his work. William Jennings Bryan made him retype a speech he had copied because the margins were too narrow.

It was his proficiency at shorthand that led him to the field he subsequently dominated.

The firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co. started in 1904 by Clayton, a brother-in-law, Frank E. Anderson, and Frank's brother, Monroe Clayton, with an initial $3,000 investment, became a company with $475 million in assets by 1962.

The firm moved to Houston from Oklahoma City in 1916.

Always an advocate of expanded world trade, in opposition to high tariffs, Clayton's first Government post was with the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs for which he received no salary.

He served as Deputy Federal Loan Administrator, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and Surplus War Property Administrator before being appointed in 1944 as Assistant Secretary of State.

As Director of Economic Affairs for the State Department, Clayton's sphere of responsibility touched such fields as trade treaties, commercial policies, international aviation, and oil agreements.

The target of senatorial investigations several times, investigated by those who questioned his widespread market activities, Clayton emerged unscathed. He was calm and unfailingly courteous as a witness.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 9, 1966]

Will L. Clayton, Statesman, Dies—Marshall Plan Originator, Humanitarian, Financier Was 86

(By Olen Clements)

William Lockhart Clayton, statesman, humanitarian, financier, who quietly ranked among the 20th century's great Americans, is dead of a series of swift, severe coronary occlusions.

Death came at 4 p.m. Tuesday in Methodist Hospital of a painful heart disorder that beset him at the close of his 86th birthday celebration on Monday.

TALKING TO DAUGHTER

He was at home, 5300 Caroline, talking with one of his four surviving daughters when stricken.

Services will be at 10:30 a.m. Thursday in First Methodist Church.

The handsome, silver-haired Clayton spent the latter part of his life pumping new life into a world economy twice devastated by war.

He was the creator of the Marshall plan, which ranks as the greatest act of international generosity in history. He did it by jotting down a memorandum while flying back from Europe on May 27, 1947.

GENESIS OF POLICY

The memorandum was the genesis of the U.S. attitude toward European economic union and followed his almost singlehanded arrangement of a $3.74 billion loan to England in 1946.

The rugged-faced Clayton did not stop with the Marshall plan. He went on to plug for the European Common Market and a Western Hemisphere free trade area for Latin America.

He had great intellectual capacity and a natural ability for leadership. He headed Anderson Clayton & Co., the world's largest cotton factor, for most of his life. He was still a director at his death.

ALCHEMY OF SUCCESS

His visions of oil, cotton, sulfur and the great Houston Ship Channel provided much of the alchemy of the success of the city of Houston to which he devoted much of his life and money after moving here in 1917.

Clayton had the knack of bringing the poor and wealthy together. He concentrated heavily on whatever he did, but he did it in a quiet, soft manner.

He was an articulate man of innate gentleness, tact and consideration. He knew and associated with some of the great men of his time, William Jennings Bryan, Woodrow Wilson, Winston Churchill, Bernard Baruch, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jesse Jones. Yet he knew and practiced humility all of his life.

His philanthropies were manifold. One of his last was $350,000 to Johns Hopkins University's School for Advanced International Studies in Washington, D.C.

His gift in excess of $350,000 enabled Texas Southern University here to start construction of its first campus dormitories, in 1952. In 1959, he gave the university $30,000 to finish the Student Union Building. Clayton once served as TSU board chairman.

$150,000 DONATION

Only a few days ago, in association with his daughter and son-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. S. M. McAshan, Jr., he donated $150,000 to the Planned Parenthood Association for international expansion.

The Houston chapter of the association was one of his favorite projects. He had been trying to induce 20 other U.S. philanthropists to give $150,000 each to the association.

With all of his work in the humanities, he still found time to devote his energies and financial genius to improving the economy of the Western World. Last week he spent 4 days in New York and Washington where he attended meetings with the Atlantic Council and the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO.

Clayton first served his country in 1918 as an economic adviser in World War I. He returned to Government service in 1942 as Assistant Secretary of Commerce. He became the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in 1944, a job created especially for him by Congress.

In 1962 the Houston Rotary Club, second largest in the world, honored Clayton as a distinguished citizen. It was an honor of which he was proud.

President Kennedy wrote him on the eve of the occasion:

"Yours is a record of long and wise service to our Government. Your ideas and advice contributed richly to the development of new directions in international policy. Mobilization of our resources in two wars, planning on an international scale for emergency aid to the needy, and the marshaling of public support for the European recovery program owe much to your efforts.

"We are grateful for your leadership in economic policy matters while Under Secretary in the immediate postwar years. The recent report on foreign economic policy you and former Secretary (Christian) Herter prepared for the Joint Congressional Economic Committee has contributed greatly to public awareness of the problems which lie ahead.

"I congratulate you on your splendid record of service and dedication to your country."

Clayton, born in Tupelo, Miss., in 1880, founded Anderson, Clayton & Co. in 1904 with his brother-in-law, Frank E. Anderson, and Anderson's brother, Monroe D. Headquarters were in Oklahoma City. Monroe later created the multi-million-dollar M. D. Anderson Foundation.

The trio's $3,000 investment grew into a firm with $475 million in assets in 1962.

Clayton retired from administrative duties with the company in 1951 but remained a director.

He was married to the former Sue Vaughan of Clinton, Ky., in Jackson, Miss., on Aug. 14, 1902. Mrs. Clayton died on January 7, 1960.

Clayton went to work at the age of 13. But he continued his education, mastering shorthand and typing and becoming a deputy clerk in the chancery court of Jackson, Tenn., at the age of 15.

Working part time as a stenographer in a hotel, he met William Jeninngs Bryan and Jerome Hill, a St. Louis cotton merchant who was to play the leading role in shaping Clayton's career in the cotton business.

Hill gave Clayton a job as his secretary at $65 a month. Hill was general manager of the Cotton Ginners Compress Co., and taught Clayton the cotton business thoroughly.

Clayton was acclaimed "Cotton's Man of the Year" in 1948, after returning from Government service.

A nonsmoker, he did not touch alcohol until his 58th year when a doctor prescribed sweet sherry as medicine.

Dr. Charles L. Allen and the Reverend Frederick Marsh will conduct Clayton's rites. Burial will be in Glenwod Cemetery.

The family ask that contributions be sent to the Planned Parenthood Association, Houston chapter.

Survivors are four daughters, Mrs. Ellen Clayton Garwood, author of a biography of her father and wife of St. John Garwood, former justice of the Supreme Court of Texas and professor of law at the University of Texas; Mrs. Susan Clayton McAshan, Jr., wife of the president of Anderson, Clayton & Co.; Mrs. Burdine Clayton Johnson, wife of J. M. Johnson, vice president of the cotton company, and Mrs. Julia Clayton Baker, wife of Dr. Benjamin Baker, head of the heart research program at Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Md.; nine grandchildren, eight great-grandchildren; a sister, Mrs. Frank E. Anderson, and a brother, Benjamin Clayton, both of Houston.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 10, 1966]

Will Clayton, Citizen of the World

A problem for historians will be to record the many accomplishments of William Lockhart Clayton within the span of 86 years allotted to him. Even with his own example of how to be industrialist, philanthropist, humanitarian, and statesman, it will be no easy task.

At an age when most successful businessmen are planning only for retirement, Will Clayton began a second life. He was 60 when, after building the cotton firm he headed into the world's largest, embarked upon a career of national and international achievement matched by few others in a full lifetime. For a quarter of a century, in official and advisory roles, his genius was devoted to betterment of mankind through farsighted programs that changed the course of history.

In Houston, Will Clayton's name will live in the giant business organization he created, and in the housing for underprivileged made possible by his gracious wife. Afield, it will live in such memorable concepts as the Marshall plan that saved war-ravaged Europe from economic disaster, the NATO alliance that holds the line against military aggression, and the Common Market that speeds prosperity through united effort.

Will Clayton was a man of extraordinary vision, and of extraordinary force. He was a man devoted to the principle of brotherhood among men and nations. He was a man impossible to cast in such vague expressions as liberal or conservative. He was a man who towered above others in physical size and mental strength.

Will Clayton was one of Houston's greatest citizens, and Houston mourns his death. In a larger sense he was a citizen of the world, and the world has lost a great humanitarian.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 10, 1966]

WILLIAM L. CLAYTON

William Lockhart Clayton, who died Tuesday at the age of 86, was one of the truly great men of his time, and even though he scrupulously and consistently avoided the limelight to the extent that he could, he contributed notably to the shaping of the contemporary world and left behind him an imprint upon the affairs of men that never will be effaced.

He was one of a breed of men that is all too rare, in that he blended the hard realism that is essential to success in the world of business and commerce with an idealism, compassion for his fellow men and a high regard for human values that provided the foundation for a career of outstanding public service.

As a founder of the world's largest cotton company, an enterprise which contributed mightily to making Houston one of the major port cities of the world, he demonstrated his acumen and ability as a businessman. Through extensive philanthropies, he and Mrs. Clayton helped to enrich the lives of large numbers of their fellow citizens and the community as a whole.

In the area of public service, he will be remembered best as an originator of the Marshall plan which brought about the phenomenal postwar recovery of Western Europe. He believed passionately in the brotherhood of man. He was honored and respected in intellectual circles. He recognized and accepted the social responsibilities that go with wealth and business success.

If any one thing contributed most to the stature that he gained and deserved, it was perhaps the fact that he understood the realities of the world in which he lived. And in his thinking and conduct he proved that realism need not be incompatible with vision and the pursuit of goals that are part of mankind's deepest aspirations.

His counsel, as well as his services, were sought on frequent occasions by those in the highest echelons of Government. He responded without ostentation or fanfare. And, although he never sought elective office, he was an active participant in the political life of his Nation.

In the conflict between conservative and liberal political philosophies, which often seems to revolve around the question of value priorities, he once said that he considered himself a conservative liberal. In any case, he was a Democrat and remained stanchly loyal to that party throughout his life. Opposition partisans respected his views, as they respected him as a man.

Internationally, his special area of knowledge and expertise was that of trade and commercial relations between nations. This was based on personal experience with and understanding of the economic forces involved. But he recognized that economics, politics, and social considerations are inseparable, that they underlie and influence relations between countries as they do among individuals, and that they, therefore, are crucial in the continuing struggle for freedom and democracy.

By any measure, William Lockhart Clayton was a man of unusual talents and an outstanding citizen, not only of his community, State, and Nation, but the free world. Indeed, mankind as a whole is indebted to him. It is further along the road toward achievement of its goals as a result of his endeavors, only part of which were in Government. This and the welfare of his fellow men were the only rewards that he sought in a long and fruitful career of public service.

Members of his generation were fortunate to have had among them a man of his gifts, principles, and dedication, and the influence that he exerted will continue to be felt far into the future.

The Post joins with all his fellow citizens in saluting his memory and in extending condolences to members of his family. He was a good and valued friend.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 13, 1966]

WILL CLAYTON

"Economic nationalism," Will Clayton used to say, "just won't mix with political and military internationalism." In his quiet, courtly way, Clayton fought with a ruthless missionary determination for his creed, and it was Clayton as much as anyone who made economic internationalism come alive during the crucial transition period spanning the war and postwar years. He picked up where Cordell Hull left off in the newly created role of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Economic expertise found a place within Foreign Service sanctums for the first time in the heady early days of the Clayton regime at the State Department when the Marshall plan was born. Later, as an elder statesman peering down on Washington from retirement in Houston, he became one of the first to see the interrelationship between trade and aid in the Western approach to the developing countries.

The personal charm which gave Will Clayton his special finesse as a negotiator and bureaucrat was a blend of warmth and commanding dignity. His manner and style instantly conveyed the story of the self-made man who could go from a sharecropper's cabin in Mississippi to the cotton brokerage houses of Manhattan and then, at 63, to fulfillment in a new career as one of our exemplary public servants.

The Office of Emergency Planning Rendered Magnificent Service to Louisiana in Aiding and Assisting the State To Recover From the Effects of the Disastrous Hurricane Betsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Betsy was one of the most disastrous storms ever to hit this hemisphere in all history, and at the time that the Louisiana people so desperately needed help, and needed it quickly, the Office of Emergency Planning arrived—hardly before the wind stopped blowing. In fact, President Lyndon Johnson literally put them off the Presidential plane when it arrived in New Orleans with instructions to "get going and get the job done" and they did just that. They set up headquarters immediately and did an amazing job in the weeks that followed.

In view of this tremendous accomplishment, I have written the following letter of commendation to the Honorable Franklin B. Dryden, Acting Director of the Office of Emergency Planning:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

Hon. FRANKLIN B. DRYDEN,
Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DRYDEN: There is an old adage which goes "a friend in need, is a friend indeed," and I would like to take this opportunity to thank your agency for being such a magnificent friend to the people of Louisiana in their hours of deepest need following the devastating Hurricane Betsy.

The fine assistance of your agency in organizing, coordinating, and directing Federal emergency relief held the tragic effects of this storm to a minimum by helping to prevent further loss of life and human suffering, and by aiding and assisting our State in overcoming this tragedy.

Louisiana will be forever grateful to your agency, and to your capable, hardworking representatives, who went far beyond the call of duty to come to the aid of our striken State.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

Our Senator Becomes a Statesman—United States Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of the finest weekly newspapers in Indiana is the Bloomington Star-Courier. It is also one of the largest and oldest newspapers in my State.

This respected newspaper recently editorialized on my position concerning our Vietnam policy. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Bloomington, Ind. Star-Courier of February 3, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR SENIOR SENATOR BECOMES A STATESMAN

Ebullient, young man in a hurry, R. VANCE HARTKE is now at age 46, Indiana's senior U.S. Senator.

Resoundingly elected and then reelected as a Democrat from normally Republican Indiana, HARTKE spent his first 6-year term learning the ropes, doing his homework well, and following the politician's maxim, "The best way to get along is to go along."

Now, to the surprise of many who had become resigned to VANCE HARTKE's bustling earnestness and his somewhat countrified political outlook, Senator HARTKE is showing all the signs of becoming a statesman, in the real sense of the word.

Long happy to be tagged as one of Lyndon Johnson's most dependable yes-men, Senator HARTKE has in the past year repeatedly demonstrated the independence, courage, and intelligence which set him apart from other young men and which propelled him steadily upward in this world.

Item: A few months ago, HARTKE alone had the courage to inveigh against L.B.J.'s appointment of a retired Air Force general to head the supposedly civilian-dominated Federal Aviation Agency (FAA). HARTKE warned against the ever-growing trend toward military men and retired brass hats controlling our Government. (Too many people have paid too little attention to President Eisenhower's farewell message which warned against the danger of the growing military-industrial complex.)

Item: Following L.B.J.'s state of the Union message asking for higher taxes and reimposition of recently lowered excise taxes, HARTKE was among the few to doubt publicly whether the excise taxes should be reinstated.

Item: Vance Hartke led the 16 Democratic U.S. Senators who last week wrote President Johnson asking that he seriously consider not resuming the bombing of North Vietnam.

We're not sure whether we agree with all of Hartke's positions on these issues. However, his information is far superior to ours, and we must assume from past peformance that the Senator did not reach his dissenting opinions without patient study and deliberate judgment.

It is heartening to see a poor boy, who fought his way up from the little German village of Stendahl in rural Pike County, at last feel secure enough on the national political scene to reveal himself as a true Jacksonian Democrat who cares about the welfare of people.

So hats off to the emerging "New Vance Hartke," humanitarian and statesman.

Food and Grain Institute, a Center of Excellence, To Be Established at Kansas State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Kansas State University, of Manhattan, Kans., continues to set the pace in enlarging the world's knowledge in the areas of production and distribution of food through the establishment of the Food and Feed Grains Institute on that campus.

The scope and importance of this undertaking are outlined in a story in the February 8 issue of the Southwestern Miller. The editors of this fine publication also saw fit to editorialize on the center of excellence which this institute will become.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the news story and the editorial in the Appendix of the Record.

These items follow:

Establish Food and Feed Grains Institute

Manhattan, Kans., February 7.—Establishment of the Food and Feed Grains Institute at Kansas State University to include the present internationally noted department of flour and feed milling industries and to expand the services to the grain processing industries and American agriculture was announced last week by Dr. James A. McCain, president of the university. The institute will also involve the university more fully in growing international food programs, it was announced.

Dr. Glenn H. Beck, university vice president for agriculture, who joined in the announcement, said the Food and Feed Grains Institute will be a "center of excellence" in training personnel for service in the industries with which it is concerned, in conducting research, and in providing needed information. It will be supported by the resources of the entire university.

The new institute, recently approved by the Kansas State board of regents, will incorporate the flour, feed, and baking activities of the university and also draw on the school's resources in human and animal nutrition, marketing, and grain production. Each of the programs, including milling, feed, baking, and others will be under a chairman with an overall director.

DR. WILLIAM J. HOOVER, DIRECTOR

For director of the institute, Dr. William J. Hoover, now administrative vice president of Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., in Washington, D.C., has been chosen. He will assume his new duties April 1.

Dr. Hoover will be the director and will also take over as head of the activities of the Department of flour and feed milling industries which Dr. John A. Shellenberger has headed with great distinction for 21 years.

Dr. Hoover, now 37, received three degrees at the University of Illinois, where he specialized in food technology. He has been in industrial research nearly 15 years. He also has been active in several professional and honorary organizations, including the American Chemical Society and the American Association of Cereal Chemists. He is a former chairman of the Washington section of the Institute of Food Technologists, and was chairman of that organization's session on cereals, starches and confections at its 1965 meeting in Kansas City. He is scheduled to preside as chairman of a session on cereal grains, industrial uses at the 1966 annual meeting of the AACC in New York City in April. At last year's AACC meeting in Kansas City, he presented a paper on "Challenges to Increased Cereal Product Utilization."

He began his career as a food technologist with the Quartermaster Food & Container Institute in Chicago in 1951, and a year later became an instructor at the University of Illinois. A number of his papers have appeared in technical journals. He was born in Champaign, Ill., in 1928.

SHELLENBERGER IN A MAJOR ROLE

Dr. Shellenberger has reached the regents' mandatory retirement age for university administrators, but will continue on the staff in an important position. The leadership of Dr. Shellenberger brought international attention upon the services of Kansas State University to milling, baking, and feed manufacturing and paved the way for the Food & Feed Grains Institute.

OUTLINE OF MAJOR OBJECTIVES

The major objectives planned for the institute were thus listed by Dr. McCain and Dr. Beck:

Educate and train personnel for the grain and feed processing and marketing industries.

Develop methods of milling and processing grains as foods for humans and feeds for livestock.

Study nutritional properties of grain and grain products for humans and for livestock.

Investigate new food and industrial uses of grains with particular emphasis on wheat and sorghum.

Develop basic methods of evaluating quality in grains and grain products.

Study both economic and physical problems associated with handling, transporting, and storing grains and grain products.

Study domestic and international grain marketing structures.

Provide information to decisionmakers at State and National levels.

ALONE WITH UNIVERSITY DEGREES

The flour milling, feed milling, and baking courses of Kansas State University, now a part of the department of flour and feed milling industries, stand out in the world. It is the only school in the world granting a university degree in milling technology. It also offers the only 4-year baking program in the country which leads to a bachelor of science degree. The curriculum provides university training not only in milling and baking, but in engineering, the humanities, and in all the basic sciences. Students have enrolled in the department from all parts of the world.

The staff now includes specialists, milling engineers, biochemists, bacteriologists, microscopists, biologists, baking engineers, business administrators, and experienced educators.

The facilities include a pilot flour mill, a pilot feed mill, and a baking laboratory, all equipped with the most modern machinery and devices. The equipment consists largely of gifts from various interests that aggregate hundreds of thousands of dollars.

FIRST MILLING LESSONS IN 1909

Instruction in operative milling at Kansas State University was inaugurated in 1909. The first instruction was by Prof. L. A. Fitz. Milling and baking tests have been conducted at the university since 1905. The early investigators included Dr. C. O. Swanson, who headed the department from 1923 to 1939 and brought to it worldwide attention. The milling department was headed by Dr. E. G. Bayfield from 1939 to 1945, and Dr. Shellenberger has been its head since 1945.

COORDINATE WITH U.S. FACILITY

The new Institute will be closely coordinated with the U.S. Grain Marketing Research Center to be established on the campus of Kansas State University and also with grain industries throughout the Nation, Dr. McCain said.

A Center of Excellence

With an admirable record of invaluable contributions to the advancement of the grain growing and processing industries that has won it national and world acclaim, Kansas State University moved last week to add to its usefulness in this field. Dr. James A. McCain, president of the university, announced the establishment of a Food and Feed Grains Institute along lines that should cheer millers, bakers, feed manufacturers, and wheatgrowers in their quest for still greater achievements in production and distribution in their businesses. The institute, Dr. McCain disclosed, will aim not only to expand services to American agriculture and processing industries but, at the same time, involve the university more fully in the growing international food programs. It will weld together the present Department of Flour and Feed Milling Industries, including flour milling, baking and feed milling facilities, with the university's resources in human and animal nutrition, marketing and grain production. It will be closely coordinated with the $3,500,000 U.S. Grain Marketing Research Center being established on the university's campus. The aim is to make it a "center of excellence" in training personnel for industry and research and as a source of information, Dr. Glenn H. Beck, vice president of the university for agriculture, added in the announcement.

In the establishment of the institute, the highest level of the university, the work in milling, baking, feed milling, and other undertakings will acquire added prestige and importance within the organization. It will share in greater cooperation from all the other facilities of the university. To realize the ambitious objectives outlined for it, the institute will function through chairmen of its programs on flour milling, baking, and feed milling, and on other activities. The present Department of Flour and Feed Milling Industries will thus give way to the Food and Feed Grains Institute.

The objectives listed for the institute by Dr. McCain and Dr. Beck leave no doubt that it will be indeed busy and possess possibilities of inestimable results. Besides continuing in the training of personnel, for which the flour and feed milling and baking industries have already endowed the university with many thousands of dollars in money and equipment, the institute will study nutritional properties of grain and grain products for food and feeds, investigate new uses, seek to improve quality evaluation, and study economic and physical problems in handling and storage. It will also study domestic and international grain marketing structures and assemble information to decision makers at State and National levels.

To head the institute, Dr. William J. Hoover, a young man who is now administrative vice president of Corn Industries Foundation, Inc., in Washington, has been chosen as director. The university spent no little time in making the choice for this post. Dr. Hoover, a food technologist who has been administering the business of the Foundation and its applied research, discussed "Challenges to Increased Cereal Product Utilization" at the 1965 annual meeting of the American Association of Cereal Chemists.

Dr. John A. Shellenberger, now head of the Department of Flour and Feed Milling Industries, has reached the mandatory retirement age for university administrators, but will have an important assignment in the new institute. That the institute is being established and that the university is in a position to propose so many vital services for it in its special field is due in no small measure to the foundations laid by Dr. Shellenberger. His exceptional abilities brought worldwide recognition to the Department of Flour and Feed Milling Industries, inspired the industries it serves to subscribe large sums to supplement the public funds it derives as part of a State institution, and brought him many honors. He is scheduled to become president of the International Association of Ceral Chemists this year.

Kansas State University, which inaugurated instruction in grain processing back in 1909, merits support on its newly established Food and Feed Grains Institute and its ambitious plans.

The Federal School Program and the Operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a news report concerning a meeting of the Dover, N.H., School Board, contained in the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader, for Tuesday, February 15, and another news story concerning the resignation of a volunteer worker for the Office of Economic Opportunity in Swanzey, N.H., which appeared in the New Hampshire Sunday News, for February 13.

I insert these without comment. They are public statements bearing on the effectiveness and method of administration of two vital programs under the Great Society, and they certainly merit careful consideration and verification.

If any explanation or answer to the facts alleged are presented, either in the public press or by officials of the programs involved, I shall be glad to insert such responses when they are made.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Feb. 15, 1966]

Title I School Program Causes Dover Confusion

DOVER.—There was considerable confusion among school board members here last evening as to just how thoroughly they are involved in the Federal Government's title I program.

Miss Mildred Berwick, assistant superintendent of schools, triggered a discussion of the board's position on title I for "educationally deprived children" when she proposed the hiring of child development specialist, Peter R. Cegelka at a salary of $5,550 under the title I program.

BRYANT POSES QUESTION

Attorney Donald Bryant, vice chairman of the board, questioned whether the board had ever approved the local title I program under which Cegelka was supposed to be employed.

Miss Berwick replied that it had not, explaining that the State approved the local program only last week and last night was the first opportunity to bring it before the board.

School Committeeman William Isaacs suggested the board hire Cegelka, then approve the program.

Cegelka was hired, but Bryant said he was not of a mind to approve a program that he was seeing for the first time and had not had an opportunity to study.

Mrs. Helen Phipps, checking some minutes of a board meeting last December, first said the board had accepted the program, then altered her position and decided that the board voted at that time to accept $47,000 the Federal Government wanted to give Dover.

FEDERAL CONTROL ISSUE

Dr. Jesse Galt, pointing out that there has been considerable publicity given communities rejecting Federal funds under title I, asked Miss Berwick if it was not true that there was considerably less control involved in this program than in Headstart and others.

Mrs. Phipps questioned, "there isn't any (Federal) control, is there?"

Miss Berwick agreed with Dr. Galt there is less Federal control than in the case of Headstart. She said under title I she hasn't had to ask parents how much money they are making. She said she drew up the program and submitted it for approval.

After the meeting, Miss Berwick was asked about the 70-page booklet of Federal regulations she was carrying with her. She replied that the booklet provided guidelines by which she was to set up the program.

Asked if Cegelka would function the same as any guidance counselor employed on an elementary level by the Dover School Department, she indicated he would not because he will have to perform his duties in keeping with title I.

When the title I program money originally was appropriated, Supt. Frederick C. Walker said the $47,000 was based on 236 youngsters in Dover that a 1960 Federal census said came from homes in which the income was $2,000 or less annually. He said this program was aimed even lower than the $3,000 limit under Headstart. Walker went to the city welfare director and found only one family qualified.

Last night Miss Berwick indicated the picture has changed. She said it would be impossible to find the 236, some of whom might no longer be around, and the salary level is no longer the determining factor. If a child needs the program, he can be included.

She said the latest Federal regulation refers only to educationally deprived children" and this might apply to the student who misses school frequently, or who hasn't been attentive when he is there.

She said a committee representing public and parochial schools approved a program under title I in remedial reading, guidance and speech therapy.

The board approved Bryant's suggestion that approval of the program be delayed until the next meeting.

In other action, the board employed Mrs. Shirlie Abbott as a part-time school nurse at a salary of $2,725 and voted to buy three school buses for $17,255.60.

Bryant sought to hold up the hiring of Mrs. Abbott because he said he wanted to ask the superintendent some questions, but the board defeated his tabling motion that also had the support of Mrs. Phipps.

[From the New Hampshire Sunday News, Feb. 13, 1966]

Swanzey Woman Who Quit OEO Blasts Setup

(By Linnea Staples)

SWANZEY, February 12.—The antipoverty program has become "a paid political organizational vehicle for the Democratic Party," a Swanzey woman charged yesterday.

"This business of hiring a bunch of antipoverty amateurs and paying them whopping salaries to go out and do a job they know almost nothing about, just doesn't make sense," observed Mrs. Blanche MacFarlane, who revealed that her resignation earlier this winter as a volunteer worker for OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity) was prompted by her growing disenchantment with the program.

A number of factors contributed to her disillusionment, she stated, including:

"A State director who doesn't understand his own program; the choosing of a governing body without the prior knowledge or consent of many of those chosen; everything constantly at sixes and sevens"; and "too much confusion."

GOVERNING BODY

Mrs. MacFarlane charged that the program director for the combined Cheshire and Sullivan Counties office, Stuart Nims, was selected by a "screening committee," the membership of which included Keene Mayor and Governor's Councilor Robert Mallat, County Commissioner Gerard Russell, Mrs. Lorraine Page, of Keene, and Earl Borden, of Claremont, rather than by the governing body as a whole.

This governing body is supposed to be made up at least 33 percent of citizens with incomes under $3,000 a year and those affected by the program, and the remainder by representative citizens and persons working with the needy, she said, and is a sort of policymaking and advisory board.

Mrs. MacFarlane commented:

"If the Federal Government really wanted to accomplish something worthwhile with this program, why wasn't it set up to operate through experienced agencies already equipped to implement it?

"If they must use their own people, then why not make them qualify by means of civil service exams?"

A conspicuous lack of Republicans in highly paid antipoverty jobs, Mrs. MacFarlane declared, bears out her conviction that it is being used as a party vehicle.

She cited as a case in point that involving Robert Devold of Swanzey whom, she described as having "done a lot" for topflight Democrats.

"Now Bob Devold has been named OEO publicity man, and is traveling all over the State with a salary of some $12,000 a year plus, I believe, about another $3,000 in expense money," she said, asking:

"Can you think of a better Democratic organizational vehicle than that?"

Mrs. MacFarlane said that she, a Republican, became a volunteer worker for the Cheshire-Sullivan Counties antipoverty program last May, putting in 20 hours a week doing secretarial and clerical work at $1.25 an hour, and assisting in setting up the two-county office. She resigned in November but is still a member of the governing body.

"This war on poverty is a hopeful thing," she continued, "but it didn't take long for me to realize it wasn't going much of anywhere, or about to accomplish much of anything along the lines it is supposed to.

"The State director doesn't seem to understand his own program. For instance after he had been in office a year, he was speaking at a meeting of the League of Women Voters which I attended, and was asked about the makeup of the governing body. He couldn't tell us."

PROMISED "DEAL"

She then averred that one worker, known to her, was promised "juicy deal if she played her cards right."

The worker replied that she wasn't interested in "deals" but only in getting the program going, and was reminded, Mrs. MacFarlane stated, that this could be done also, but that "there are other things, too, you know."

Concerning appointments to the governing body, she declared:

"Almost everyone, so far as I've been able to learn, was put on the list without being asked if they wanted to be, so it isn't surprising that meetings are only sparsely attended and there isn't much interest."

Her own observations while working in the office, were that OEO affairs are "continually mixed up, always at sixes and sevens, and no one seems to know what is going on."

Great Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the money this Government will spend for education represents a "great U.S. investment," the Charleston Gazette believes.

It states:

The new Federal outlays for education of future citizens and leaders is the shiniest example of creative federalism.

And adds that—

Hopefully, this investment in enrichment of minds may some day exceed the Nation's spending for military purposes—or even abolish the need for it.

The article to which I have referred is most informative and because it has pertinent facts on a matter of general concern to us all I am offering it for the RECORD:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Feb. 7, 1966]

OUTLAY FOR EDUCATION GREAT U.S. INVESTMENT

Next fiscal year—for the first time in history—the Federal Government will spend more for education and welfare than for interest on the national debt.

Assuming that President Johnson gets what he asks for in the new budget, total expenditures for education and welfare will hit $8.4 billion in fiscal 1967.

This means 12 cents of every Federal revenue dollar will go for education, and welfare. Interest on the Federal debt—an item that now commands the second largest slice of the revenue pie—will get 11 cents of every tax dollar.

Put another way, it means that people who seek knowledge and subsistence will get a bigger share of the tax dollar than people who invest in U.S. Treasury bills and bonds the Government must issue to pay for its operation.

Perhaps there's no moral to be drawn here. The biggest budget item of all—defense—still claims more than half of the Federal tax dollar.

But it is significant that the Federal Government is steadily moving into a vacuum created by the inability of individual States to cope with the so-called "knowledge explosion." Climbing college enrollments and the full impact of the postwar baby boom have overwhelmed many State budgets—including West Virginia's. Despite increased State spending, educators contend funds are inadequate to meet the demand for more teachers and more facilities.

A breakdown of the proposed Federal spending next year is contained in the Commerce Clearing House's college and university reports, which carry the figures and federally supported programs.

The $8.4 billion total spending proposed for education and welfare represents a $1.3 billion increase over the present fiscal year. It is $3.2 billion more than was spent last fiscal year.

Almost half the money, $3.8 billion, will be spent by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—with the Office of Education spending 72 percent of this amount. And the Department of Defense will spend $2.1 billion on training other than such specialized military activities as recruit and pilot training. Other Federal agencies will split the remaining $2.5 billion.

The total Federal education tab has risen by more than 50 percent in the past 3 years, CCH reports. Expenditures for precollege level programs have risen from $793 million in 1965 to a projected $2.4 billion next year.

Critics of mushrooming Federal involvement in affairs held the primary concern and responsibility of States can find little solace in these figures. But those who decry the great human waste of human mindpower in an increasingly complex world where knowledge is at a premium may rejoice at this Federal invasion of State's rights. These, we believe, do not include the right of State governments to keep their people ignorant and ill fed.

The new Federal outlays for education of future citizens and leaders is the shiniest example of "creative federalism." Hopefully, this investment in enrichment of minds may someday exceed the Nation's spending for military purposes—or even abolish the need for it.

Operation Crossroads Africa, Inc., Receives Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently, the 1966 Institute of International Education-Reader's Digest Foundation Award for Distinguished Service in International Education has been presented to Operation Crossroads Africa, Inc., "for its vigorous and compelling contribution to the concept of partnership for mutual assistance understanding, and brotherhood between Americans and Africans." This award is made annually by IIE and the Reader's Digest Foundation for the purpose of encouraging and recognizing American citiizens from every segment of local and national life who are contributing to international understanding. The award was accepted by Rev. James H. Robinson, director of Operation Crossroads Africa.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the citation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION TO A PRIVATE ORGANIZATION FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

To Operation Crossroads Africa, Inc., a privately financed program dedicated to building bridges of friendship and understanding between America and Africa, the Institute of International Education and the Reader's Digest Foundation present their Award for Distinguished Service.

Founded in 1957 by Dr. James H. Robinson, Crossroads has been a pioneer in sending students, teachers, professors, and other specialists to countries in Africa for short-term summer programs. More than 1,800 Canadian and United States students have been involved in 119 building projects in 28 countries of East, West, North, and Central Africa. These include village schools, maternity clinics, community centers, playgrounds, wells, access roads, and market places. Living and working together with their African counterparts, translating idealism into practical action, and immersing themselves in the life of African communities, Crossroaders serve while they gain firsthand insight into the problems of emerging nations.

Crossroads is a living demonstration at the grassroots level that America cares. People of every religious and ethnic background have taken part in the program, and it is significant that the young Crossroader raises about one-third of the cost of his participation. Voluntary contributions from individuals, churches, service clubs, preparatory schools, student chest funds, and foundations provide the other two-thirds.

In addition to sending students to Africa, Crossroads innovations include special projects which furnish professional services to African communities. In 1961–63, with the cooperation of the National Education Association, short-term teacher training for African teachers was carried on by experienced American teachers in Liberia and Gabon. Volunteer American and Canadian physicians, nurses, and technicians have served with medical projects in African hospitals, clinics, and public health programs. Athletes and physical education directors have helped train athletes in Egypt, Somali, Guinea, and Mali for the Brazzaville games.

One hundred and eight U.S. colleges, universities, and preparatory schools cooperate with Crossroads in the initial screening of applicants from their institutions, and in helping to raise funds for those finally selected. Participants prepare by extensive briefing before their departure and return home to share their experience through talks to many groups and individuals. As ambassadors of their adopted countries, Crossroaders help to improve the image of Africa in America. They send books, school and medical supplies, funds for scholarships in Africa; provide hospitality to African students in this country, and keep alive a vital contact with African youth who will become Africa's future leaders.

The impact of the program continues long after participation ends. Nearly 25 percent of the former Crossroaders have returned to Africa to work with the Peace Corps, the United Nations, AID, in the east Africa teachers program, with religious groups, or to work directly with African governments in various capacities.

For its vigorous and compelling contribution to the concept of partnership for mutual assistance, understanding, and brotherhood between Americans and Africans, IIE and the Reader's Digest Foundation are proud to hail Operation Crossroads Africa as a unique example of the finest tradition of American volunteer agencies.

The award was accepted by Rev. James H. Robinson, director.

I Think I Never Knew Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the January 3 San Diego Union carried a very unusual article written by one of the country's most distinguished editorial writers and columnists, Floyd McCracken. For over 35 years Mr. McCracken has reduced the news of the day to clear and understandable language. His vast following attests to his remarkable and valuable talent. With your permission I insert his fine article entitled, "I Think I Never Knew Poverty," which I ask my colleagues to take a moment to read.

I Think I Never Knew Poverty

Recently I have come to believe that I personally never knew poverty. This surprises me a little because I have lived through hard times, business declines, recessions, and depressions. We knew them by different names, but they all had about the same effect upon human hopes and realizations.

But poverty—no. In my younger days the word seldom was used, and I think there was a good reason.

To have applied the word to conditions of our society would have been to admit defeat, and that we were not about to do.

There were other reasons, too. Men were willing and eager to work at any honorable task that would earn a little money. They had an abiding sense of responsibility for their families. I knew a man (my father) who worked in the woods, making fence rails and posts. He got a dollar for 100 rails and the same amout for 150 posts, but he had to take half of his pay in wheat. The grain was taken to a mill 3 miles away where it was ground into flour, the miller taking half of the wheat for his pay.

Today that man and his family doubtless would be classed as poverty stricken, but I am sure he would have rejected any such idea with scorn. Tomorrow would be better, he told himself. He would make it better.

It is true that some things were simpler in those days. The clothing we wore was truly functional. A couple of pairs of overalls (with the pockets riveted in), rough work shirts, laced boots, and a hat. These were standard for man and boy. Underwear was for winter.

Food, too, was simple. Plenty of bread, sometimes butter, occasionally beef or venison that was boiled or fried, stewed chicken, smoked ham and bacon from our own smokehouse, beans, cooked cereal for breakfast—such fare was filling if not fancy. Cakes and pies were for Sunday or holidays. There would be jams and jellies if the wild huckleberries had done well, or if currants and gooseberries had produced a good crop. We raised our own potatoes, carrots, and cabbage. These were stored in frost-resistant root houses for winter use.

I have a notion that such conditions today would cause a political storm. There would be an outcry that would reach across the land. Relief would be forthcoming, and I am not saying this would not be a good thing.

But I am saying that the life we lived inspired a code of self-reliance. Because there was no other way, we learned to meet adversity with a belief that we would conquer.

And another thing—we never were overwhelmed with a lack of mental stimulation. There was no poverty of the mind. The few books we had were read and reread.

The odd thing about all that is that we were struggling toward what we have today.

Address Delivered by Former Representative Brooks Hays at the National Interfraternity Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Brooks Hays, who for many years was one of the outstanding leaders in Congress, recently made a speech at the National Interfraternity Conference which I believe may be interesting to many of his former colleagues on the Hill.

Although a southerner, from Arkansas, former Congressman Hays was an early-day advocate of the rights of all men to human dignity and equal justice. He now is Arthur T. Vanderbilt Professor at Rutgers University and consultant to the President of the United States.

His experiences as a leader of his fraternity, as a professor, and as a Member of Congress have given him a rare understanding which makes important his comments on the three-way relationship existing between the national community, the academic community, and the Greek letter community.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech on the subject be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the speech were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts From Address of Brooks Hays, Arthur T. Vanderbilt Professor, Rutgers University and Consultant to the President of the United States, to the National Interfraternity Conference, Washington, D.C., December 3, 1965

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Greeks, we are entering the golden age of education. Popular education has, of course, been the basis of our hopes for popular government almost from the beginning; but, not until recently has the Federal Government launched a bold program for both elementary and higher education. The potentials are breathtaking, particularly in the light of a stepped-up private concern for this cause.

In signing one of the milestone bills, President Johnson said of education, "It conveys benefits beyond limit. It endows a person with the ability not only to make a living but with the precious capacity to live with purpose. It is the richest heritage one generation can bestow upon the next."

The projection of the substantial new Federal help should be welcome. But it requires a reexamination of the relations which the colleges and the fraternities bear to the Federal Government with its new benefactions. More on that point later.

I have few institutional interests. Among my chief loyalties are those having to do with my politics. I am a Democrat. My faith: I am a Baptist. And my academic ties: I am a Sigma Chi.

Al Smith also had a triple connection with a slight difference. He said, "I belong to the Catholic Church which cares for my soul; to the New York Athletic Club which cares for my body; and the Democratic Party which keeps body and soul together."

As a visiting professor at Rutgers University, I have picked up some of the academic jargon. I know, for example, that the president is to do the talking, the faculty is to do the thinking, and the dean is to keep the president from thinking and the faculty from talking.

At Rutgers, I have indulged some interests that a hectic political life denied me. I enjoy the company of young people. I am able to see the world through their eyes just a little better than when I joined them. I have more time for reflection and reading. Finally, I have leisure for recalling earlier experiences. My memories of my own college days bring delights.

I became a fraternity man just a half century ago and, while I have not worked at it as devotedly as many of you, I have preserved my ties to two chapters and to the national organization and have had gratifying rewards for the effort.

The three-way relationship existing between the national community, the academic community, and the Greek letter community is the focus of my comments tonight. This relationship has become one of intricate design and even tension as a result of the vastly significant changes in 20th century life. I can touch only fleetingly some of the implications.

At the outset, I offer a personal judgment on one topic of current interest—the moral fiber, or lack of it, of American youth, particularly on the campuses. To state it succinctly, I have every confidence in the moral solvency of student life today.

To be sure, some adverse forces have revealed points of strain, and some of the individual failures have had dramatic aspects, but underneath the irritations and excesses is a solid character that is a credit to our culture and ideals.

The fraternity is a creature of freedom. It was the product of a quieter century and was an agency of intellectual exertion fitting that simpler campus life. Some of its phases which still persist came out of a paucity of academic facilities. A vacuum had to be filled. Our fresh affluence has altered this but there are some new and unsettling forces that call for flexibility in policy and a continuing dialog between the colleges and the fraternities. When faith in student character is shaken, it is not surprising that the particular segment which is the concern of this conference should have its critics. Indeed, a wholesome self-criticism within the fraternity structure has been induced. You have not asked immunity from the alterations necessitated by the most sweeping changes in the history of higher education.

The word fraternity is not our monopoly. It has its counterparts in the Nation's political vocabulary: brotherhood, good will, cooperation. The concepts of nationhood would be impossible without this powerful ideal which in the larger community possesses an inspiring inclusiveness.

The local chapter provides the cell life of the fraternity system; and the chapter life provides one of the finest proving grounds for human relations on the American scene. In the intimate ties of friendship and mutual help is one practical application of the ideals of our Western culture. This culture, which is the soil for our growth, is not indigenous, though it bears a frontier flavor. Our 19th century forebears rejoiced to feature the Greek and Latin classics in special programs, a practice we moderns leave largely to the academic routine, but I assume that every ritual reflects the Greek emphasis upon brotherhood and learning. This emphasis has found favor in our Judeo-Christian counseling. It was echoed in St. Paul's cryptic accolade: "I am debtor to the Greek." It was eloquently phrased by Edmund Kern: "Greek culture broke out of its shell, became part of the currency of the Old World, softening with humanity the sternness of Rome and stiffening with reason the mystical fervor of Christianity."

In these times, with mammon proved a false god, and science, though a magnificent aid, found not to be the hoped-for angel to emancipate us from ignorance and provincialism, we must give life and meaning to the ideals from which our fraternity system flowered. We must confront the distraught bystanders, both friend and critic, with firm convictions. The Nation needs us in this role.

It was evident from the Senate debate on September 22 on the provisions of the educational bill regarding controls that might be imposed on fraternities that the Congress recognizes the limited character of the Federal Government's authority in this field. That authority is based upon the principle that the use of public funds carries the obligation to use them without discrimination. This principle Congress respects, hence their refusal to direct the Commissioner of Education not to inquire at all into the matter of fraternity policies. Still it was evident that Congress does not intend to replace fraternity and academic policy with arbitrary and sweeping judgments.

Further, there is the matter of the State governments' authority, and, in the case of church-related colleges, of ecclesiastical authority to be considered. Finally, the academic authorities have responsibilities growing out of our very existence of the campuses. In other words, we cannot claim immunity as churches may from any external scrutiny whatever.

At the same time, there is a great resource at hand—respect for the principles of free association and voluntary separatism, and these can be reconciled with the principle of nondiscrimination where good will and wisdom prevail. I trust that sufficient flexibility will be preserved to enable fraternity leadership to move toward the essential goals and that gains for the minority group will be largely voluntary. Contemplating this problem of conflicts of authority and policy in the governing of human society, James Madison said there must be "reciprocal forebearance."

In my own fraternity, which happily eliminated the Caucasian clause in 1963, my counsel will always be in the direction of creating conditions in which the Negro, the oriental, indeed, all others may aspire to full participation in fraternity life. For us to lag in moving toward this goal is to leave the undergraduate confused about the American dream of equality of opportunity. We do not want the Greek letter fraternity which is an integral part of the American educational system to fall behind. We do not want it to be said that we are less devoted to the ideal itself than those of the nonacademic world.

Obviously, whatever the Federal Commissioner of Education accomplishes in implementing title VI of the 1964 act as limited by the 1965 Educational Aid Act must be within the framework of American college life with the great diversities that go with it. Naturally, I would hope to see the fullest cooperation given the Commissioner and the college leadership by fraternity officials at the local and national levels. Surely it is apparent that the quiet but profound social revolution now taking place has penetrated college life. We cannot afford to close our eyes and ears to it.

In the interest of justice to all who have invested energy and means in their fraternities, let us make sure that the point of view of the alumni is considered.

A distinguished alumnus of my fraternity, Bolon Turner, is its present grand consul—the head of our national governing body. One day in 1919, I introduced him—a law school freshman—to the men of George Washington chapter and he became a Sigma Chi. Recently I read the correspondence between Judge Turner and some of the college presidents. With candor and convincing logic, he presented the fraternity point of view. He defended the national membership standards and pointed to the advantages to be derived from its retention. The faculty advisers should recognize not only the reasonableness of such standards but the desirability of having the parent organization as an adjunct of discipline and good scholarship. The corollary is that such national standards shall not be used to sustain outmoded practices related to racial minorities. It would be a grave mistake for the individual college authorities to rule that so-called local autonomy must prevail.

Basically the ideals of fraternities are the ideals of the college and the ideals of the Nation—and all are rooted in our Biblical faith. More than half of my undergraduate life was spent in a dormitory. I found in the loosely knit social life of our wing in the dormitory much the same kind of friendships and loyalties that endeared my fraternity to me. To be under fire from those who are honestly skeptical about the fraternity patterns should not divert fraternity men from their exertions nor make them apologetic, for we are defending established values. Fraternities are applying critical judgments themselves just as we expect the college and the Nation's Government to have a continuing scrutiny that makes for improvement. The Christian world, indeed the world of religion, has had exactly the same posture as reflected in G. K. Chesterton's familiar statement: "Christianity has not been tried and found wanting. It has been found difficult and not tried."

We have a twofold task in helping the fraternity man to enjoy the adjustments that spare him from what the psychologists are calling alienation. The first is individual. The final values of life are focused in the soul and the mind of the individual. He must not be alienated from himself. Secondly, he must find himself in society. In this process, he needs to comprehend the width and the depth of "fraternity." It is easier to understand it in terms of personal friendship in chapter life. The brothers are dear to him. It is not quite so easy to appreciate and maintain fraternal feelings toward other fraternity men, toward nonfraternity men, toward all other men.

It is generally easier to hold in affection those of one's own community and of one's own nation. The ideal of fraternity to be inclusive must have wide horizons. It encompasses the earth. The college man who must bear the burdens of leadership in a changing world must be compassionate and just and magnanimous—in short, he must be fraternal not alone to those in his circle, but to all who might be touched by him in the Nation's corporate life. This corporate expression is as vital as the individual expression.

The academic authorities may be restless because the new ideas having to do with extension of fraternal ties to eligible men of minority groups are not embraced in sudden edicts and actions. Patience at this point is a necessary virtue. The college has the power to apply rigid rules and invoke drastic penalties in some local situations. However, the net result of abrupt rulings might be to reduce the number of chapters in some of the older organizations. There are practical ways of achieving the essential goals of nondiscrimination without these dire results.

The ideals that underlie fraternity rituals are the abstractions of our religious faith. But without the abstractions we cannot come to grips with the frightening realities of the times.

Boiled down, what I am trying to say is that there is something more in the fraternality message than help for the individual fraternity man in becoming in "integer," and this is compatible with what I had to say about the final values being built into his heart and soul and mind.

We cannot afford, in other words, as academic men and fraternity men to be indifferent to the environmental influences. In meeting the larger requirements of citizenship, we are still concerning ourselves with the individual. We are seeking to condition the individual's environment so as to make likely favorable decisions in the soul struggles which every man experiences.

I would hope to give no encouragement in this comment to the fallacy that the student be less reflective and less devoted to the routine of study and the disciples of the classroom and undertake by some of the novel adventures of off-campus movements to enter into the decisionmaking. This belongs not to him but to his elders. I am merely reiterating that the college and the fraternity must work hard at the job of equipping the student to meet effectively the tough challenge of life when he emerges. And it is not too early to impart to him that the concept of fraternity can be enriched only as it assumes an inclusive character.

The People of Louisiana Are Grateful to the Corps of Engineers for Their Assistance Following Hurricane Betsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult for the average person to imagine the tremendous amount of devastation wrought by Hurricane Betsy when it hit Louisiana last fall—only if you had personally witnessed this tragedy would you comprehend the magnitude of the task undertaken by the Corps of Engineers to repair and rebuild facilities necessary to the health and safety of the people of Louisiana, and to assist them in debris clearance. The Corps of Engineers rose to the challenge and are accomplishing this herculean task in a remarkable manner.

To commend the Engineers for this magnificent job, I have written the following letters to the Chief of Engineers, Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, and the district engineer in Louisiana, Col. Thomas J. Bowen:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

Lt. Gen. WILLIAM F. CASSIDY,
Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL CASSIDY: Now that the shock of the disastrous Hurricane Betsy, which struck Louisiana with such fury last fall, has passed and reconstruction is underway, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Corps of Engineers for the magnificent role which they played in aiding and assisting our stricken State.

Without the capable help of the engineers, Louisiana could not have so rapidly made strides toward recovery from the devastating effects of this storm, perhaps the worst hurricane ever to hit our shores. Naturally, much remains to be done to obtain further protection from future storms of a similar nature, however progress is being made toward this goal, which is encouraging.

You can be assured that the people of Louisiana will long remember the helping hand of the Corps of Engineers which was extended at the time of their greatest need.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

Col. THOMAS J. BOWEN,
District Engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans, La.

DEAR COLONEL BOWEN: The people of Louisiana owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to you for the wonderful job that the Corps of Engineers did in aiding and assisting the State in recovering from the devastating effects of Hurricane Betsy.

Only those who personally witnessed the awesome damage will know to the fullest extent the magnificence of this accomplishment. The capable and willing help of the corps will always be remembered and appreciated by a grateful State.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

Jim Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance, Is an Outstanding Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most successful Government programs that the United States has ever undertaken is that of the partners of the alliance. This is a program that has a small annual budget, has attracted too little commendable attention, yet has suffered no adverse criticism.

One of the major reasons for the success of the partners of the alliance is the dynamic and responsible leadership of the Director, Jim Boren. Mr. Boren has been the Director of the program since it began in March 1964, and through his tireless efforts and diplomatic manner he has succeeded in creating 29 alliances between States of our Nation and countries and states of Latin America.

As a tribute to his leadership and the success of this commendable program I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Miami Herald of Sunday, February 6, 1966, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE "WEDS" AMERICANS TO LATIN DEVELOPMENT

(By Lee Winfrey)

WASHINGTON.—Jim Boren, who took his last vacation in 1958, sat up in a hospital bed and said, "I've got to get back to work next week."

Boren is a round-faced, 40-year-old Texan who looks a little like Comedian Jonathan Winters. Since 1964 he has traveled more than 150,000 miles—the equivalent of six times around the earth—as Director of Partners of the Alliance.

In his travels, which keep him on the road 3 days out of every 5, Boren has hooked up 29 States of the United States, with an equal number of countries and States in Latin America. Marks of his largely unpublicized work stretch from Mexico to Uruguay.

Partners of the Alliance consists of 11 people in an office of the Agency for International Development, the foreign aid arm of the U.S. Government, Boren doesn't give away money, however.

"I'm a catalyst," he says. "My job is to travel and get other people interested. This is not a giveaway program."

Specifically, the Partners, an arm of the Alliance for Progress, encourage and organize States and statewide groups to go into partnership with a country or State in Latin America.

Boren, for example, has arranged partnerships between Alabama and Guatemala, between Delaware and Panama, between Minnesota and Uruguay.

He has married Illinois to the Brazilian industrial state of Sao Paulo, Utah to the mining areas of the Bolivian mountains, California to four seacoast states in Mexico.

It is mostly an on-the-road job; 80 percent of the Partners' annual $200,000 budget goes for travel. Although the Partners will be 2 years old next month, there has been little time for stocktaking: only a kidney ailment last week forced Boren to stop long enough to add up what he and his staff have done.

Boren figures they have stirred up $3.5 million worth of projects for Latin America in the past 2 years. Partners projects have reached into all but 5 of the 19 principal republics in Latin America.

Only Argentina, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Paraguay have been untouched by the partners' program—and Boren hopes to get something rolling in the Dominican Republic and Paraguay this year.

Boren winces at any idea that this is an adoption program. "The term 'adoption' is patronizing" he says. "South America has plenty to offer in exchange. This isn't charity."

Thus the partners brought 12 educators from Costa Rica to Oregon to spend 3½ months improving the teaching of Spanish in 12 Oregon school districts. A $100,000 collection of Venezuelan art is in Tennessee on a 9-month tour of galleries in seven cities.

In exchange, 30 young Colombian women are studying for a semester at six Florida junior colleges, improving their secretarial skills and their English. Lights burn in 15 rural schools in Peru because of 15 electric generators sent from Texas.

Boren's job is to go out into the United States and help organize State partners committees. Sometimes a Congressman helps: Representative RICHARD FULTON, of Nashville, called the organizational meeting in Tennessee. Sometimes it is an organization, such as the Minnesota Jaycees who went into partnership with Uruguay.

Once a State committee is organized, Boren's office pays the expenses for them to go to the Latin American country or state and set up a list of projects.

"These aren't junkets," he says emphatically. "From Kentucky, we got the State Treasurer, the head of the Farm Bureau and the vice president of the State chamber of commerce. To get to their area in Ecuador, they traveled 180 miles by dugout canoe.

"They eat the dust and wade in the backwaters," says Boren, who is a great believer in the grassroots approach. "You don't learn about Peru by just visiting Lima and sitting in the hotel drinking whisky sours."

When the U.S. partners come home with their project list, Boren stays put in Washington and lets them carry the ball from there. No government aid money goes into paying for the projects the State committees decide to handle.

So far, the partners program has escaped serious criticism on Capitol Hill, where Congressmen often look askance at aid projects. Perhaps because he spent 4 years on the Hill as administrative assistant to Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas. Boren's congressional connections are good.

Boren got the idea for the partners while serving 2 years as deputy director of the U.S. foreign aid mission in Peru. He has been the director of the program since it began in March 1964.

He plans to slow down a little in 1966, though. This year he has promised his wife, is time for the vacation they haven't had for 8 years.

The Trial Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Herblock cartoon in yesterday's Washington Post portrays the ghost of Stalin in front of the Kremlin. On the Kremlin wall a sign announces that two liberal Soviet authors have been sentenced to prison terms for their writings. The cartoon's caption is "That's more like the good old days." This very well sums up world reaction to the 7- and 5-year prison terms given to Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel.

Over the years all of us have been heartened by the gradual withering away of the totalitarian state that had characterized Stalin's Russia. The cultural exchange program between the Soviet Union and the United States, the increase in American travelers to the Soviet Union, and the relaxation of restrictions on writers and artists all bode well for freedom of thought in the Soviet Union and the free exchange of ideas.

Recent developments, particularly the Newcomb Mott tragedy, appeared to foreshadow a movement toward closing a door that had been only partially opened. The door I am speaking of is the door to an open society and an open mind. The sentences of these two Soviet writers, who merely claimed the privilege of all writers and artists who have ever lived to bring the power of their pens to express their ideas, closes that door further. Ideas must be fought by more compelling ideas, not by the compulsion of prison.

As John Milton declared long ago in "Areopagitica":

> Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do ingloriously, by licensing and

prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple: whoever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial on this subject in today's Washington Post at this point in my remarks:

THE TRIAL ENDS

The opprobrium which has descended on the Soviet Government for its conviction on two writers is richly deserved. Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel were guilty of nothing more than presenting the artistic version of the truth as they saw it. This is the single essential function of art.

That the two men were convicted for writing as prophets rather than parrots is not vitiated by the fact that they got a semipublic trial and not a star chamber hearing or a bullet. They were punished for their views; that is the central point. How self-degrading that the Soviet public should now be summoned to blindly condemn the two men for views it has never been allowed to read.

The irony is that the Soviet Union, like the United States and Upper Volta and every other inhabited point on this earth, vitally needs the kind of independent critical analysis supplied by Sinyavsky and Daniel. In the short run, perhaps, probing honest criticism of any established order may be embarrassing but in the long run it is essential. This is particularly so for the Soviet Union, whose every major advance has been in response to conscientious criticism. At each stage, the critics have first been suppressed.

The Soviet Government has acted as though the Sinyavsky-Daniel brief would undermine it. This is ridiculous. The Soviet system has admitted much criticism since Stalin, all belated and all beneficial. The Government still stands and the people rarely riot in the streets. Soviet power is strong and one wonders why the Kremlin should show so much more doubt than its native critics.

The Communist Party has an interest in maintaining a theoretical monopoly on "truth." Hence its compulsion to squat atop independent-minded men. But the party is in trouble, probably permanent trouble. Stalin used the terror to enforce the party's will, but nothing less will do. If some men will court death in order to speak out, many more men will speak out if they need not court death. Unless the Kremlin is willing to kill its critics, it must learn to live with them. Far better that it should recognize how valuable critics are.

Fighting Alcoholism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Public Health Service has described alcoholism as among the worst of our public health menaces, ranking behind only heart disease, mental illness, and cancer. It has been estimated that the cost to business and industry from absenteeism, inefficiency, and accidents due to alcoholism runs to some $2 billion annually.

There are an estimated 5 to 6 million alcoholics in the Nation, 1 out of every 15 Americans who drink. Roughly 250,000 persons each year join the ranks of alcoholics. Some 15 percent of all new admissions to public non-Federal mental hospitals in 1960 were alcoholics.

Yet, despite the heavy incidence of alcoholism and its human and economic costs, the Federal establishment today has relatively few programs dealing with this problem. To remedy this situation, on January 26 for myself and Senators COOPER, FANNIN, MURPHY, PROUTY, and SCOTT, I introduced the Alcoholism Control Act of 1966—S. 2834. This measure establishes an Office of Alcoholism Control under the Surgeon General to administer a program of matching grants to the States for treatment, rehabilitation, education, prevention, and research in alcoholism; the Office would also administer a program of research, training, and demonstration projects and coordinate alcoholism programs conducted by different agencies.

The Washington Post, in a February 14 editorial, has indicated support of this proposal as an approach which would "insure a nationwide effort to control a disease which is responsible for a staggering amount of human anguish and crime as well as the destruction of the careers and lives of too many of this Nation's citizens."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO FIGHT ALCOHOLISM

In light of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals decision in the Driver case that chronic alcoholics cannot be prosecuted as criminals, a new emphasis must be placed on treating those afflicted with this most pernicious disease. If State and local courts come to accept the precedent of this decision, there will be heavy responsibility at the State and community level to provide adequate, well-run facilities for the treatment of alcoholism.

Fortunately JACOB JAVITTS and several other Republicans in the Senate have proposed a measure that would institute a Federal grant-in-aid program to fight alcoholism. Senator JAVITTS asks that an Office of Alcoholism be established under the Surgeon General "to administer a program of matching grants to the States for treatment, rehabilitation, education, prevention and research in alcoholism." The program would begin with $3 million in the next fiscal year and rise to an annual level of $9 million.

This approach would insure a nationwide effort to control a disease which is responsible for a staggering amount of human anguish and crime as well as the destruction of the careers and lives of too many of this Nation's citizens. With a push from the courts and the assistance of the Federal Government perhaps the battle against alcoholism can be pursued with more vigor.

Job Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, recently I received the following letter from a man who has been very vocal in the past about the waste in the Job Corps program. After making a visit to the Job Corps center in Omaha, Nebr., he had this to say:

Went for a tour of the Women's Job Corps the other day. Am convinced it is a good deal. These girls were well groomed, bright-eyed, and looked like a group right out of some college home economics department. It is smart business for the Government to take dead-enders, spend $3,000 to $6,000 on them and put them in the income tax paying category—which it appears is what this center is doing. Costs are what they are, due to the very low teacher-student ratio. It is about 1 for 10 plus counselors and advisers.

Well, it is apparently working. These girls are working hard and taking a real interest in themselves and other people too. They are being exposed to experiences and values which the average kid grows up with. It is people helping people—not using or abusing or ignoring—but helping.

Let's spend the money. It will change lives for the better. How can such a thing ever be valued in dollars?

It's Uncle Who Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Richard Starnes is a lucid columnist whose writings appear in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, and others. He is a keen observer of national affairs. One of his keen and lucid observations was published on Monday, February 14, in the Washington News. I ask unanimous consent that this column entitled, "It's Uncle Who Pays" be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S UNCLE WHO PAYS

(By Richard Starnes)

If the war in Vietnam follows the melancholy course of every other such mad enterprise, it will double in cost in 1967 (which would put the tab at $30 billion and change), and then will level off and only increase by about 10 percent every year thereafter until it ends.

The official rationale for the high price of wars, first developed to explain why the Battle of Hastings was so infernally expensive, is that the machinery for making war is always becoming more complicated and hence more costly. Broadswords cost more than pikes, for example, and matchlocks cost more than longbows.

But it seems to me that our own crop of war budget apologists are missing an excellent opportunity for advancing the art of explaining the high cost of war. The old system is still effective, to be sure, for it is a fact that an F–105 costs a lot more than a Spad. But where is the planning for 100 years, which is what the current generation of intellectual generals is supposed to be noted for? The sensible man can now foresee the day when we will be back to fighting with clubs and large boulders, and then where is the glib explanation to Congress on why that war will cost more than the previous one?

Instead of explaining away the cost with the old story of more sophisticated hardware, someone should here and now make the point that this is the only war in history financed almost entirely by one side.

Of course it is going to cost $15.8 billion to run the show in 1966, for the pity sakes. We're supplying our own chaps, which is only fair when you think about it, and we're supplying our South Vietnamese allies, which is probably unavoidable. But we are also still supplying a great deal of the hardware (a lovely word that no one but an ordained general can use convincingly) that the Vietcong is shooting back at us. They capture it, or otherwise acquire it, and it makes for quite an economical war for them, if not for us.

In addition to weapons, our side supplies the Vietcong with huge gobs of cash money. It isn't by choice, naturally, but it is happening. The thriving black market of Saigon is very likely a comfortable source of revenue for the Vietcong, and so undoubtedly are other earthier forms of corruption that flourish there. All roadborne commerce in Vietnam is subject to Vietcong tolls, including supplies that go to some American Special Forces camps. It's all American money, because the only money in the miserable little country is American.

There must be many students of budget hearings who pine, just as I pine for the day when some oily rascal explodes at his tormentor and says, "why, dagnab it, Senator, of course, it is an expensive war. We're paying for both ends of it aren't we? Its bound to be expensive. Just thank your lucky stars we don't have more allies in the thing with us. No country could afford it then.

Build Ramps for Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a column by Winsor French, of the Cleveland Press, which was inadvertently omitted on February 10:

BUILD RAMPS FOR HANDICAPPED

Well, here I go again on the subject of the handicapped, paraplegics, cardiacs, the people who must live in wheelchairs and who all find their lives are made unnecessarily more difficult simply because the architects who design so many of our important buildings never give a thought to ramps.

I recently had a letter from a Mrs. Thomas H. Mitchell concerning the problems her late husband had to face, having become a paraplegic following injuries sustained in World War I.

Not a man to be defeated easily, Mr. Mitchell never lived in the past, was always planning for the future and also thinking of the problems of other people in his condition. Engaged in the construction and engineering field, he had to travel all over the United States. This he and Mrs. Mitchell did together, either by air or in their own car.

The problems arose in various hotels where, as she writes, they had to be transported in ash lifts, garbage elevators and so on. They pretended to view these experiences as a lark, but they weren't, of course, and they were always trying to think of a way to solve the problem.

Finally they carried along with them especially made pieces of folding balsa wood that could be used as ramps if there were not too many steps.

It was a step forward, but they realized hardly an adequate solution. And they were still trying to solve it when a serious infection caused Mr. Mitchell's death in 1960. Still today Mrs. Mitchell gives it great thought, wonders why so many buildings have been constructed with nothing done to help the huge army of the handicapped.

I have had many an architect draw my attention to escalators, but these are not even a small step in the right direction. There are very few wheelchair-borne people who, unattended, can leave their chair, fold it, and then carrying it somehow manage to step onto a moving staircase.

The answer to the problem is crystal clear: Build ramps, and gently inclined ones, at that.

It is a far more serious problem than the average able-bodied man or woman might imagine. Forgetting the disappointment to people barred from theaters, galleries, and some instances even churches, it also affects youngsters struggling for a proper education, as I will try to point out at a later date.

L.B.J. and the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to insert in the Record two differing views of the President's ambitious "demonstration cities" program.

My first insertion is an editorial from the New York Daily News, of January 31, 1966. The Daily News feels as I do that the program is probably biting off more than it can chew, and that there is a very real menace in the proposed Federal "coordinators" or "commissars" as they are likely to be. The News editorial makes the point that the Federal Government may be getting a means of putting a stranglehold on city planning.

There is certainly no desire in this Nation for a Federal stranglehold on city planning. At the same time, there certainly is room for some creative federalism. Life magazine, in a February 11 editorial, says that the "demonstration cities" program is just the kind of creative federalism we need. I certainly agree that Federal funds are needed in our great megalopolitan areas—particularly in the great megalopolis stretching from Boston to Washington. I think Federal coordination is necessary to prevent overlap and offer informational guidance—especially as to program availability. In making these points, Life is certainly correct. What worries me is the point at which "creative federalism" ends and "encroaching centralism" begins.

Federal coordination and planning are theoretically good, but in practice, they will achieve something less than their abstract desirability. Federal planning will be the planning of backroomers who will put the financial and political weight of the Federal Government behind a veritable zoo of social schemes. The social "commissar" implementing this encroaching centralism may be the coordinator or he may be a Washington back-room planner. Whoever he is to be, he worries me.

My feeling with respect to the Demonstration Cities bill is that while it may be too wide eyed and optimistic, it is still an exciting jump into the middle of a tough problem except for the potential threat embodied in the so-called coordinator. This function properly is a basically informational one, and I propose to try to change the bill to achieve that result.

I will offer an amendment to substitute an information officer for the "commissar." To me, that is the change the bill needs. When I commented on the President's message, I said "the President's carrots come with Federal fishhooks." I want to see Congress cut out the fishhook. That is the way I resolve the conflict between the creative federalism and the encroaching centralism arguments summed up in the following Daily News and Life editorials:

[From the New York Daily News,
Jan. 31, 1966]

L.B.J. AND THE CITIES

Charging ahead in pursuit of his visions of the Great Society, President Lyndon B. Johnson last midweek unveiled a proposal for Federal aid in rebuilding selected U.S. cities on what he called an unprecedented scale.

The work would continue for 6 years, at an estimated total cost of $2.3 billion.

Cities with big slum areas would have those sore spots cured.

New towns would be built outside metropolitan areas, with the population explosion in mind.

"Effective social programs"—whatever that means—would be combined with physical revamping and reconstruction in cities. Big pilot projects would be numerous.

We should, said the President, "focus all the techniques and talent within our society on the crisis of the American city." As for the extent of this program:

There are few cities or towns in America which could not participate in the demonstration-cities program. We shall take special care to see that urban communities of all sizes are included * * * the impact of the program will be significant, involving as much as 15 to 20 percent of the existing substandard structures.

All this is ambitious, and we suppose it excites more than a few people. And far be it from us to deny that—

SERIOUS PROBLEMS

Serious problems bedevil many cities nowadays.

We are not aware, though, that any of our cities were built to their present size and impressiveness with massive direct help from the Federal Government.

Our belief has been that private citizens and privately owned corporations did the work, from the ground up, and that few apologies are owed to anybody for what was accomplished.

LET UNCLE SAM DO IT

Or is it possible that such things as the patch of midtown Manhattan pictured above are merely mirages which don't really exist, and will not come into being until L.B.J.'s Washington city wizards arrive and go to work?

Seriously, we're more worried than edified by the Johnson city renewal and improvement vision.

To us, it looks like (1) a means of giving the Federal Government a stranglehold on city planning and development, and conversely, (2) a standing excuse for city officials to pass the buck to Washington on local problems which those officials ought to solve.

We think Congress should hesitate long before adopting this plan or anything like it. If Congress eventually refuses to adopt it, we doubt that the Nation or the people will be seriously harmed. They may even benefit.

[From Life Magazine, Feb. 11, 1966]

A CHANCE FOR CREATIVE FEDERALISM

President Johnson wants to rebuild whole neighborhoods in a number of cities—perhaps as many as 70. And he would have Washington put up 90 percent of the money. The program would deal not only with housing but also the health, education, welfare, transportation, and recreation facilities of the affected area.

The usual complaints are heard from all sides—that the plan is another lavish New Deal handout or that it is just a skimpy rehash of existing programs. To New York GOP Congressman PAUL FINO it is a power grab: "No city that refuses to turn over its municipal affairs to a Federal commissar will get a nickel," he glooms.

The complainers miss the point—and may be missing an opportunity. The "demonstration cities program," as it has been tagged, is remarkable not for its size (a relatively modest $2.3 billion spread over 6 years) but for what it shows about the Johnsonian concept of "creative federalism."

This is more than a catch phrase. Writing in Fortune (January 1966), Max Ways makes the distinction clear. Ordinary federalism implies that the central government and State and local governments have a strictly limited amount of power to share. "Creative federalism" describes the situation now developing as technology and our society's natural vigor widen the range of available choices. "Total power—private and public, individual and organizational—is expanding very rapidly." Therefore, Ways says, "It is possible to think of vast increases in Federal Government power that do not encroach upon or diminish any other power."

Johnson's urban program is a concrete example of this concept. By letting local authorities actually spend Federal money (under the overall surveillance of a locally chosen supervisor who alines their efforts and serves as contact with Washington), those authorities are supposed to wax stronger and more effective. Federal funds will, however, not simply be "left on the stump" to be used, misused or stolen, as was the case in some earlier urban renewal operations. The Federal Government—by virtue of its capacity to see and act across the boundaries of local government—will coordinate, prevent overlap and offer guidance of many kinds.

If the program works the result is clearly more "power" for everybody to share. Washington is in a position to jar cities into trying new approaches—"we intend," says the President, "to help only those cities who help themselves"—because one of the main theses of "creative federalism" is that the money will go where it will do the most good, not necessarily where it is most lacking. Of course, some flexibility and ingenuity will be needed in Washington, too. The new Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which will oversee the program, is mostly an amalgam of agencies with a reputation for stodginess.

The United States already has had enough experience with urban recovery projects, good and bad, to know that local initiative and competence are indispensable. The President's plan must be judged by how well it stimulates the cities themselves to use their imagination. On paper, it appears well calculated to do just that.

The Role of Industry in Today's Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1966, William J. Erwin, chairman of the board, Dan River Mills, Inc., and first vice president, American Textile Manufacturers Institute, made a very excellent address at an industry appreciation dinner sponsored by the Shelby, N.C., Lions Club.

Mr. Erwin discussed in a very splendid manner his subject, "The Role of Industry in Today's Society."

Since Mr. Erwin's remarks were so impressive I felt that our colleagues would be interested in having the benefit of them. I, therefore, request unanimous consent that they be made a part of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE ROLE OF INDUSTRY IN TODAY'S SOCIETY

(By William J. Erwin, chairman of the board, Dan River Mills, Inc.; first vice president, American Textile Manufacturers' Institute)

You are very kind to invite me to speak to you tonight. To me, this is like a homecoming, for I was born in Pineville, N.C., not far from here, and lived in Shelby in the late twenties as manager-superintendent of the Ella Mills.

The company that I serve has made many acquisitions in the past 10 years and I have been involved in them, but this was not my first experience in the acquisition business. The first acquisition I made was in Shelby, when I persuaded Elizabeth Suttle, a Shelby girl, to marry me. Perhaps I should call it a merger. It has paid good dividends through the years, and one stock dividend.

Elizabeth is not only my closest tie in every facet of my life; she is also my closest tie to Shelby, but not, as I have indicated, the single tie. After all, I labored in your vineyard for several years and had the privilege of knowing and being tutored by several textile executives who left an indelible mark on the cultural and industrial life of Cleveland County. I should like to mention two of them: J. R. Dover and R. T. LeGrand. I am so pleased that the sons and grandsons of these patriarchs are following in their footsteps.

Virginia is my adopted State and North Carolina my native State. I have deep admiration for and revel in the accomplishments of both—which makes me think of the occasion when a prominent North Carolinian was telling a prominent Virginian about the virtues of industrial development of the Tarheel State and the Virginian became a little annoyed. "You know, Virginia is the cradle of the Republic and the mother of Presidents," said the Virginian. The North Carolinian retorted, "Yes, but Virginia hasn't been pregnant for many, many years."

The presence of your distinguished Governor and your distinguished senior Senator, your Congressman, and many State officials, tempts me to mention that Dan River has a substantial interest in North Carolina. Four of our directors are from your State, and more than 1,100 North Carolinians own some three quarters of a million shares of Dan River Mills' stock. Recently, we acquired a company in Burlington, now our only manufacturing operation in North Carolina. Additionally, we are substantial users of the fibers you produce in Cleveland County, and expect to become even larger users.

I must assume by the nature of things that I am the spokesman for the large number of industry people here this evening, and in that context, I must commend the Lions Club (I am not so much of a Rotarian that I can't see some good even in a Lion) for sponsoring and organizing this gathering on behalf of all the citizens of Shelby and Cleveland County.

So far as I know, this is a very rare event. There are all kinds of dinners to appreciate this person or in testimony to another, but appreciation to industry—that is a seldom thing. Like all things rare—a helping hand, an unexpected courtesy, a gracious compliment when least anticipated—it has a special quality which surprises and touches the recipient.

Industry evokes an image of plants, machinery and equipment, production lines, high finance, and board rooms. But when you strip it down to what really counts, industry is people. The people of industry in Shelby and Cleveland County are moved by your appreciation.

Yes, your expression here tonight is a high moment in the lives of those of us who must be concerned, as the popular comment goes, with meeting a payroll.

The concern goes much deeper than that, of course, and I thought that perhaps the most constructive contribution I could make would be to reflect in these next few minutes an industrialist's view of industry—its role and its responsibilities.

Basically, the responsibilities of industry fall into three broad, very general categories: to make a profit, to provide jobs, and to take part in community life.

But, as I said, the concern goes much deeper than these broad categories, moving into a myriad of more definitive byways of the mainstream.

In the first place, in our pursuit of profit, we have a responsibility to produce high quality goods, to innovate in terms of both product and production to the end that prices and production costs alike are realistic and honest. And we have a responsibility to sell those goods vigorously in every available market.

In the second place, in providing jobs, it is not enough merely to provide a man who wants to work with a place to do that work. Our responsibility is so broad as to insist that we offer incentive as well as security, to provide the means by which employees might refine their basic needs in a constant uplifting of both living standards and personal ambitions.

Third, in taking part in community life, our basic responsibility includes a deep-seated obligation to invest in growth—growth for the company, its product line, its people and its environment, and not necessarily in that order. Our responsibility includes imparting a sense of order to that growth, planning it as carefully as possible under the circumstances which shape our judgment, establishing it soundly, and transacting it smoothly.

The young king of Egypt in the third century B.C., complained to his teacher, the great Euclid, that he had to apply himself in order to learn geometry and was favored with the classic response, "There is no royal road to geometry." There is no royal road to success. Our social responsibilities have never been greater.

Just to remind you of the influence of industry in community growth, let me cite these figures. If they are wrong, blame the Shelby Chamber of Commerce; they furnished them. In the short 6-year period from 1958 to 1964, the Cleveland County taxable property valuation almost doubled, from $88 to $175 million; insured wages increased 100 percent, from $33 to $66 million; average insured employment jumped from 12,000 to more than 17,000. These are outstanding gains; they do you credit. Obviously, not all these gains occurred within industry, but I do no disservice to any other segment of your economy when I assert that industry is the engine which powered this remarkable economic growth.

Industry does not perform its role in a vacuum. Rather, it is performed in a pressure vessel which sometimes simmers and more often bubbles as heat is applied from all sides. For example, we are obligated to recognize that we are no longer part of a world that is limited by geographical conditions or by the distance you can travel in a day's time. There is no insularity from the world around us, certainly not in the textile industry.

Actually, I believe the daily encounters with a shrinking world are but reminders of something we began to realize 30 years ago. The realities were forced into the background by World War II, the unnatural economic conditions following the war, and then the Korean conflict—but they were shoved violently at us about 10 years ago.

We realized that there was, indeed, a rebuilt textile industry in Japan. That Hong Kong could be a great deal more than a free port with a chronic water shortage.

We realized that trade agreements negotiated with one nation could be quickly appropriated by others under our most-favored-nation concept, and that legislative proposals to sell American cotton abroad on a cutrate basis could have that cotton turn around and sent back to us in shirts and slacks faster than we could bat an eye. We realized that we could lose domestic markets to goods from places we never heard of, and that we couldn't sell goods in those never-heard-of places if we wanted to. In short, we woke up to the fact that we could be dead as the world's great textile Nation, and in a hurry.

This explains our great concern for the proper administration of the unique long-term international cotton textile trade arrangement, which regulates the movement of cotton textiles between exporting and importing nations. It explains our great hope that the concept of this arrangement might be extended to all textile products regardless of fiber content. As I have said so often, this is a multifiber industry and our foreign trade program must take this fact into account.

There was a time when we, like other American industry, believed the solution to our problems lay in a tariff wall that was penetrated only at great cost. Now, there is hardly an industry in this country which will deny the importance of international trade. There simply must be foreign access to our domestic markets, and access to foreign markets for us. On the other hand, we cannot make the United States carry the full burden of trade with developing and expanding industrial nations. The answer, of course, is in a foreign trade policy somewhere between these extremes, a concept which takes into realistic account the various capabilities of trading nations. It is a concept which demands a view longer than the moment, a vision with reality and proveable fact.

Another example: As you well know, decisions made in Washington by the administration or by the Congress, have a widening influence on the conditions under which industry operates. And the influence is not all bad.

Recent administrations have recognized that the textile industry is basic to the Nation's economic health, that there are millions of Americans who earn their living from textiles by growing or making the raw materials, by producing the yarns and fabrics, and by transforming them into apparel, household furnishings, and industrial products.

There are other millions in the military service who need the fabrics this industry produces. As the struggle in Vietnam escalates, and the requirements of the military grow, these needs will be met. On this, the industry is of one mind.

The people of Cleveland County do not need to be sold on the importance of the textile industry, but Washington did. The leaders and staff of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, your representatives in Congress, the represenatives of other great textile-products States, your governors and other governors, all joined together to do the job. These administrations—Kennedy's and Johnson's—were convinced that there were problems which bore heavily on the industry which only they could correct. They advocated and took action to alleviate them. First, they liberalized depreciation allowances for the textile industry. Second, they worked out the long-term cotton textile arrangement I mentioned earlier to bring some reasonable control of cotton textile imports from low-wage foreign nations. Third, they urged Congress to legislate one-price cotton and the Congress responded.

The results are history. In 1965, textile production was at a record high. Fiber consumption hit a new peak. Cotton consumption increased. Textile sales volume was at the highest level in history. Profits were up substantially. Capital investment by the textile industry reached a record. As recently as 1958, capital investment by textile companies amounted to about $300 million. In 1966, by conservative estimates, capital investment will exceed $1 billion, more than a threefold increase.

Employees shared in the industry's new prosperity. In recent years, wage increase has followed wage increase, and other benefits have been improved. And there are more employees working in the industry to participate in these improvements.

The consumer has gained, too. The American consumer can buy from a hitherto unmatched array of textile products—unmatched in terms of variety of style, of color, of fiber content, of quality, and of price. In no other product, can he—or more often she—obtain so much value for the money spent.

Everybody knows that the cost of living has risen. Higher standards of what is appropriate and fitting in a prosperous economy contribute to this; so too has the gradual inflation we have experienced for a number of years. This has affected textile prices. They have increased, but less than those for other products. If you will analyze the consumers' price index, the accepted measure of changes in the cost of living, and break it down into its component items, you will be impressed by the fact that apparel prices have increased the least—and textiles are the raw materials for apparel. Go a step further. Analyze the changes in the wholesale price index which reflects directly the course of textile prices. Again you will be impressed by the fact that textile prices have advanced less than the prices on other commodities.

The conclusion is inescapable—farmers, employees, stockholders, the government, everybody—has benefited from the upsurge in textiles. Another conclusion is clear—unshackled, freed of unwise Government-imposed restrictions, industry can best perform its classic role in investment and expansion.

Let's look at another side of industry's role. It seems to me there has been a quite special affinity between the textile industry and the communities in which our plants are located. It traces back to the way our industry was founded. The beginnings were small. More often than not, a textile mill was started by local capital, usually in a small town, sometimes not in a town at all, but on a river site, with the town growing up around it. In any event, it was a local, community enterprise. The fortunes of the town and the mill were closely intertwined.

Much of that has changed. The industry has multiplied in size; ownership has broadened; acquisitions and mergers have created big, diversified, integrated organizations. Local capital is important, but Wall Street is, also.

Happily, not all has changed. The affinity remains. Textile companies continue to be concerned about the well-being of the communities in which they operate. They support better schools, support civic improvements, support the institutions and agencies which make the community what it is. Financially, of course, but it is not simply a matter of taxes and contributions. Look among your leaders, here or elsewhere in the South—in civic clubs, on governing bodies, on school boards, on commissions, in fund campaigns, you find textile people. They are there by choice, yes; but with the encouragement and backing of their companies.

You can call this self-serving, but if you do, you miss the point. The textile industry abides by the gospel that its responsibility does not end with the running of a successful operation and the making of a profit. It is, like everyone else, a citizen of the community, and expects to act accordingly—and responsibly.

There is one other area I want to mention in which the textile industry has accepted its role with enthusiasm. I speak of education, and more specifically, higher education. The quest for education is a dominant feature of our society, and we are happy to see it. Selfishly, we cry of our need for bright, highly educated personnel who can master a new technology and adapt to the challenge of a complex and rapidly changing industry. On larger grounds, we see the educated man and woman as the best answer to the quest for sanity and peace in a world bewildered by the science of the space age, yet torn by the kinds of fears, jealousies, and hates which had their birth in the jungle.

In a recent survey, it was discovered that the textile industry ranked second to printing and publishing in the percentage of net earnings donated to support higher education. The largest company in our industry has contributed about $5 million in the past decade to aid institutions of higher learning. Many other companies designate colleges and universities as the principal recipients of their corporate giving. Dozens of textile companies provide scholarships or loans, or both, to assist needy young people in their pursuit of college and graduate degrees. Textile executives and managers—they must count in the hundreds—serve as trustees on the boards of colleges and universities, and give of their time and counsel to guide these institutions as they improve and expand their programs and facilities. You can sense I am proud of the manner in which the textile industry has seized hold of its role in education.

You surely have heard of the mountain man in North Carolina who was interviewed by a newspaper reporter on his 100th birthday. When the reporter asked him, "You've seen a lot of changes in your day, haven't you?" the old fellow replied, "Yes, and I've been agin every single one of them."

Whether we are against it or not, we must acknowledge that history is a never-ending process of adjustment, of change, of transition—and this is particularly true of our economic apparatus. You cannot stop change any more than King Canute could turn back the waves. Arnold Toynbee calls it a permanent industrial revolution. Each succeeding generation must face up to peril and promise unlike any before it. And each generation has a choice of sleeping through it, like Rip Van Winkle, or working to influence the direction the change takes.

The greatest fault of Rip Van Winkle was not that he beat his wife—that's only a simple misdemeanor—nor that he neglected and abused his children, nor even that he got drunk. Old Rip's real tragedy was that he slept through a revolution with a loaded rifle at his side. In every phase of our national existence—economic, political, social, cultural—strong forces are at work. We must not sleep like old Rip; we must fight to preserve the private enterprise system which has enabled industry to meet its responsibility in undergirding today's society.

Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is both right and necessary that we devote a few minutes today, the 16th of February, to pay homage and tribute to a nation whose people deserve the highest accolades it is possible to give. The nation of which I speak is, of course, Lithuania, which today celebrates the 48th anniversary of its declaration of independence on this date in 1918.

Despite the fact that it has been nearly one-half century since the Lithuanian people were able to throw off the yoke of their oppressors, the idea and goal of an independent state wherein they could enjoy the fruits of peace, freedom, and prosperity has not for a moment been abandoned. Indeed, the devotion and ardor with which the Lithuanians for many centuries sought to rid themselves of the tyrannical rule imposed upon them by a series of conquerors, invaders and occupiers is a magnificent and moving tale.

Against the most incredible odds, the Lithuanian people maintained their national identity, their language, their religion, and their culture. Despite the attempts of the Russian czars, the Polish Army, and German occupiers of all political hues to root out this brave people, the Lithuanian national consciousness continued to flourish. In the few years of liberty which Lithuania enjoyed enjoyed between the two world wars, a great flowering of the arts took place. Musicians, actors, athletes, writers, poets, and artists made their homeland famous all over the United States and Europe. There are few, if any, musicians among us who have not heard of Mikas Petrauskas and Anna Kaska; those interested in the theater know Ivan Lebedeff and Shirley White; followers of sport know Jack Sharkey and Billie Burke, while names such as V. D. Brenner, Louis Rosenthal, Basanavičius, and J. Maciulius-Maironis have also made their names bywords in their own field of artistic endeavor.

This is, I think, the highest tribute of all: the efforts and achievements of a people despite all the adversities which a cruel fate has heaped upon them. When the Lithuanians are once again permitted to live in peace, and follow their own pursuits, we may look forward to a new renaissance from this embattled people.

Mr. Speaker, I await that day with pleasure, and wish the Lithuanians nothing but the best until that glorious day arrives.

Poverty War Workers Join Antirodent Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary aims of the Johnson administration's war on poverty is to get people to work. To get them off the local welfare rolls and help them become self-sufficient citizens learning trades and paying their fair share of the taxload.

There appeared an article in the February 8 edition of the Chicago Sun-Times dealing with a rather unusual application of poverty war workers hired under a grant as community aids to the Chicago rodent and pest control program. I understand that this approach will greatly aid in the fight against rodents and pests in the poorer sections of the city. It will be the first time that inspection aids will be women and it will be another first for the war on poverty.

I commend the article from the Sun-Times to my colleagues:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Feb. 8, 1966]

POVERTY WAR WORKERS JOIN ANTIRODENT PROJECT

(By Basil Talbott)

Chicago's rodent and pest control program entered a new phase Monday with the reassignment of 22 poverty war workers to the Chicago Department of Buildings.

The workers were lent by the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity and are being trained to make modified building inspections in the city's stepped-up war on slums.

They were transferred to the building department from CCUO's urban progress centers where they had been employed as community and program representatives.

Abel D. Swirsky, deputy commissioner of the building department, said Commissioner Sidney D. Smith plans to deputize the new personnel as inspector aids under supervision of professional city inspectors.

Three of the new aids had been community representatives working in neighborhoods "familarizing persons with all antipoverty programs and meeting with community organizations," said a CCUO spokesman.

The other were program representatives "assigned to urban progress centers since the cold season," the spokesman said. "Most of the programs they were working on depended on the availability of youths outdoors."

The aids attended their first class Friday at the building department and began working in the field Monday, Swirsky said. Working with the aids are 10 laborers and street foremen on loan from the department of streets and sanitation.

The sanitation department personnel, who had been working on another phase of the rat control program, received their training Thursday.

"The aids will visit buildings and flats and ascertain whether rodent and pest situations exist there," Swirsky said. Under supervision of a special team of 18 department inspectors working out of the urban progress centers, the aids will prepare notices of violations to the property owners, he said.

Copies of the notices will be sent to the Chicago Board of Health which has been supervising a rat-extermination program funded partially by the war on poverty.

Carlos Stepto, assistant chief of inspection for the building department and head of the new program, said the aids will act as advance men for the health department teams, who have been doing the actual extermination.

"They will make a cursory examination of buildings solely for rats, roaches and rubbish conditions for the purpose of getting the rat control crews in," Stepto said. Professional department inspectors will make complete inspections at a later time.

Some 50 of the 100 persons who have been working on the actual extermination were hired under a war on poverty grant as community aids. "The 50 are unemployed or underemployed neighborhood residents who were referred to the health department by the CCUO," according to Health Commissioner Samuel L. Andelman.

Sixteen of the new building inspection aids are women. "As far as I know this is the first time women have worked as building inspectors," Swirsky said.

"It's not a dainty assignment," he said, "but women have a deep and natural interest in these matters. Women can locate housekeeping violations just as well as men can."

Stepto said that the women "seemed enthusiastic during the training sessions" and that he was confident they would work out well.

Before the teams of inspector aids were established, city inspectors were acting as the advance men for the rodent control teams, Swirsky said.

"With the addition of aids we will double or triple the building surveys we have been doing and step up the involvement of the poor in the program," he said.

The 56th Anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, this month the Boy Scouts of America are celebrating their 56th anniversary.

The history of this outstanding organization is one of which all Boy Scouts—past and present—can be tremendously proud. The Boy Scouts were chartered by Congress in 1916. In the past 56 years, more than 37 million Americans have been members of the Boy Scouts; the Scouts have more than 5½ million members today. Many of our Nation's leaders were Boy Scouts in their youth.

The Boy Scouts work to develop honorable young men of initiative and good character. Good citizenship and good sense is stressed.

I join with millions of other Americans in saluting the Boy Scouts of America and in wishing them continued success.

His Work on Civil Rights Will Be a Memorial to Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, Battle Creek lost a devoted public servant and the Fort Custer Job Corps Center lost a good right arm. Herman McGee, who was among the strongest and most dedicated persons I have known, and who won many battles which would have been avoided by ordinary men, will continue to be an inspiration to those of us who have been left behind him.

Mr. McGee had dedicated himself to the belief that all men are created equal, that might need not make right, and that love and respect for one's fellows must pervade the individual lives of each of us. He lived his beliefs, and the illness which took him was aggravated by his concerns that he must always do more to reduce the frictions arising in his community.

In a very real sense, Mr. McGee gave his life to the Fort Custer Job Corps Center. He spent his evenings allaying the misunderstandings which developed between the boys from the center and those from the town. He was at street corners and in soda fountains when needed. He took the boys into his own home. He was determined that the boys from the center would gain fully from the opportunity which it offered them. His passing leaves a gap which will remain open.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished newspaper serving the community, the Battle Creek Enquirer & News, expressed in its editorial page last Sunday a fitting tribute to this great citizen, and I insert it following my remarks in the RECORD.

HIS WORK ON CIVIL RIGHTS WILL BE A MEMORIAL TO HIM

Back in 1961, a Houston, Tex., industrialist offered any Communist or Socialist one-way passage "to the country of his choice, provided he gives up his citizenship and never returns."

Declaring he was neither a Communist nor a Socialist, a Battle Creek man wrote the Texan.

"I accept your offer for my family and myself," he said. "My reasons are numerous, but it should be explanation enough to you to say that I am a Negro.

"Since I haven't enjoyed many of the privileges and rights of a U.S. citizen that are guaranteed by the U.S. Government, which they cannot enforce, I do not feel that renouncing this second-class citizenship will be any great loss.

"I am not bitter, but I do feel that this is a hopeless situation for which the U.S. Government is partly to blame."

The writer of that letter, Herman McGee, died Friday. His death, at the age of 40, was untimely, but he had lived long enough to witness some change in the conditions he protested.

After writing the letter quoted above, Mr. McGee said privately that rather than running away from the problem, he had decided to stay here and do something about it. He put his decision into action by helping to found the Battle Creek chapter of the Congress on Racial Equality and serving as its chairman, and by serving as vice president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He served, also, with distinction, as vice chairman of the community action division of the Calhoun County Community Council.

Always firm in the cause of civil rights, he was also willing to listen and to learn. Thereby he did a great deal to improve relations between Negro and the white communities in this city.

Mr. McGee would not say that his task was completed. It is far from done. But it can be said of him that he contributed more than most, Negro or white, for a cause in which he believed. His work will be a memorial to him.

Eli Lilly and Ayrshire Given Honors by Wabash Valley Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have become educated to the fact that the water supply which we take for granted in many areas is in real jeopardy because of pollution.

Partly the problems of water pollution stem from our rapidly growing population and its demands for water. Another major problem results from industrial wastes which are dumped into our streams untreated or inadequately treated.

Consequently the far-sighted and responsible action of the Eli Lilly Co. in constructing an excellent treatment facility for their Tippecanoe Laboratories in Lafayette, Ind., is very welcome news. This company again demonstrates the kind of community interest and concern for the general welfare which have made it an outstanding company.

It is also gratifying to note that this very responsible action by the company was recognized by the Wabash Valley Association and honored for its "outstanding efforts in handling waste materials." The story is well told in the following story from the February 6, 1966, issue of the Terre Haute Tribune-Star:

WABASH VALLEY NEWS: ELI LILLY AND AYRSHIRE GIVEN HONORS BY WABASH VALLEY ASSOCIATION

OLNEY, ILL.—Eli Lilly & Co. was honored here Friday for its outstanding efforts in handling waste materials at its Tippecanoe Laboratories in Lafayette, Ind., and its continuing efforts to keep the Wabash River clean.

The Lilly Co. is the first Indiana industrial concern to be cited for its water conservation efforts by the 9-year-old Wabash Valley Association. Four other companies with plants in Indiana and Illinois also received commendations.

The awards were made at the annual meeting of the association at Olney. More than 1,000 association officers and members attended the awards program.

The Wabash Valley Association has headquarters in Mount Carmel, Ill. It was organized in 1957 in an effort to educate citizens in proper water management and soil conservation. There are 58 association chapters in the 80 counties wholly within the Wabash Valley watershed.

Many of Indiana and Illinois' U.S. Senators and Representatives are charter members of the group. Its president is Robert Gramelspacher, Jasper, Ind., businessman and a former member of the Indiana House of Representatives.

Association awards were presented by Henry J. Wallace, first vice president.

In accepting the award for the Lilly Co., Jerome J. Stefaniak, Ph. D., director of the Tippecanoe Laboratories, expressed his appreciation for the recognition. He pointed out that the achievements were made possible by the efforts of the engineering and technical staff, headed by Robert H. L. Howe, Ph. D., and the full cooperation of the group assigned to waste disposal.

The Wabash Valley Association's citation states:

"Eli Lilly & Co. has performed a meritorious service in its effort to prevent stream pollution to the best of its considerable ability. The design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the Tippecanoe Laboratories in Lafayette, which are engaged in the production of phrmaceuticals and agricultural chemicals, are an outstanding example of a modern corporation's efforts to live in harmony with its environment.

"As the laboratories were originally designated, adequate waste treatment facilities were included as part of the building program. As the operations have been expanded, so have the waste treatment facilities."

The waste disposal system installed by Eli Lilly & Co. at the Tippecanoe facility cost nearly $2 million, and operational costs total more than $200,000 annually. The company has an active waste monitoring program, both above and downstream from the plant, and monthly results are submitted to the Indiana Water Pollution Control Board.

The Tippecanoe Laboratories were established in 1954 with 35 employees. Employment today is more than 300. Seven employees operate the disposal system on a 24-hour, 7-day-a-week basis. The system is large enough to handle the disposal needs of a city with 60,000 to 70,000 population. This population is roughly that of the cities of Lafayette and West Lafayette combined.

A second Indiana company to be commended by the Wabash Valley Association is Ayrshire Collieries Corp. of Indianapolis. It was recognized for its strip mine reclamation work in Clay County.

Illinois concerns honored for water pollution abatement are Marathon Oil Co.'s refinery at Robinson, Texaco's refinery at Lawrenceville, and American Machine & Foundry's wheel division at Olney.

Little's Research Report Backs Army's Civilian Gun Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and the American people have been bombarded with a constant flow of antifirearms propaganda, and I take the floor today in another attempt to set the record straight.

My colleagues have heard alarming accusations of the loose operation of the Army's civilian marksmanship program—of how guns and ammunition furnished by the Defense Department are going to arm fanatics, and that the program is worthless and a waste of money. The Army itself ordered a study into the entire program of the Office of Civilian Marksmanship following the assassination of President John K. Kennedy, and reports that told of fanatical groups hoarding arsenals to fight off Communist invasion of our country.

The study was made by the Arthur D. Little Co., a private and respected research firm, and it will be made available within a few days. Already garbled and twisted versions of the report are appearing in the Nation's press. I wish to call to the attention of my colleague's an article about the report that appeared in the New York Times of February 13, 1966.

My colleagues might note that the headline belies the content of the story, but the casual reader would not get past the implication carried in the headline "New Curbs Urged on Rifle Program." In view of the harsh accusations against this program, the National Rifle Association which is associated with it, and decent law-abiding people who oppose unnecessary restrictions on peaceful use of firearms, the impact is obvious. Well, let us look at exactly what the story says:

> However, the study, which was carried out by a private research concern, endorsed the basic program and advocated a more effective public relations effort to win "social acceptance." It also endorsed the close liaison between the Army and the National Rifle Association.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, under this Army program, limited quantities of military arms are loaned, and amunition furnished free, to be used in target practice by organized shooting clubs. It is under the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice headed by an Assistant Secretary of Army, and works colsely with NRA. The executive office is headed by Col M. R. Preble, who has the title of Director of Civilian Marksmanship.

Permit me to continue with the story:

> The study group recommended that the staff of the director be broadened to include representatives throughout the country. It also recommended that the Army official assume direct responsibility for checking individual participants in the national program.

The Arthur D. Little investigators reported that although improvements in control would be desirable, they had been unable to uncover a single incident where a club affiliated with the Director of Civilian Marksmanship or its members have been convicted of using firearms, ammunition and/or Government property improperly, or where Director of Civilian Marksmanship arms have been used in crimes of violence.

The investigators endorsed the program on the same ground on which it was initiated 50 years ago, as a means of contributing to national defense by training young men in the use of arms. The Army's training program, it observed, still leaves something to be desired.

> Studies indicated that the men who had previous rifle training were not only more proficient than other recruits "but more apt to enlist" and "more apt to prefer a combat outfit."

Sure, the report recommended tightening controls of certain aspects of the program, but the twisted headline in this news story in my judgment is incredible. The full story, in my judgment, gave a clean bill of health to this program in a study of more than 100 clubs "in areas where problems of control were apt to be most critical." The areas selected by the research group according to the story itself were "known to have problems with racial tensions and violence, extremists and subversive groups, and high crime rates." The report said it found "no instances" of direct orientation toward any political programs or extremist activities, and, in almost all instances, club officers stressed that it was club policy to reject applicants known to have extremist views.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have sat idly by in the past and seen valuable and vital Government programs harshly and unduly criticized, without raising the voice of commonsense.

This, in my judgment, is a good program. The statements made concerning its operation have been unjustified. In this day, and in this age, when young men are forced to carry arms for the defense of the free world—every minute of training in the use and care of firearms is important to them and to us.

I want to bring to my colleagues attention a few brief paragraphs of a letter I received from a close friend and constituent, who knows from his own war experience the value of such training. These comments are from Mr. Billy E. Lee, an attorney at law in Houston, and I think they have a direct bearing on this matter:

> "In 1942 I went into the Marine Corps with no weapons training except what I had picked up as a kid hunting and practicing on targets with a .22 and a .410 single-shotgun. In 1943, I requested and was fortunate enough to be assigned to the scout and sniper school of the 4th Marine Division, training at Camp Pendleton, Calif. There I was issued a superb 1903A4 Springfield with a star gaged bore and mounting an 8X Unertl scope. All marines with whom I ever came in contact had been instilled with a deserved confidence both in themselves and their rifle, and all marines, cooks, clerks, and assault troops alike, were riflemen, and proud of it. In the scout and sniper school this was even more pronounced. Each of us was specially chosen, specially trained, and supplied with a special rifle. To us, our individual rifle was not only a weapon of defense, it was the means of saving the lives of many of our brothers in arms. We were totally misnamed, as we were neither scouts nor snipers. We were actually antisnipers. Whenever isolated enemy sniper action held up an advance, one of us would be sent into the area to locate and remove the enemy. In seeking out an entrenched enemy you can readily see that we were expendable. However, our superior marksmanship as individuals enabled us to save many lives that would have been lost by a frontal attack by a squad or platoon of marines.
>
> After the war, a rifle ceased to be my chief means of survival. I returned to the civilian life I had known, with no necessity to depend upon a weapon and my marksmanship training to hang on to my own life and to protect my friends. The training I had received was not mustered out of existence at the same time I was mustered out of service, however. Instead, it has continued and has improved considerably since my termination of Marine Corps service. I am a member of Bayou Rifles, Inc., of Houston, and of San Antonio Big Bore Rifle Club, and of the Texas State Rifle Association, and am a life member of the National Rifle Association. During the course of a year I shoot in at least 15 tournaments. I have my own reloading press and dies and load my own ammunition. Each year for the past 6 years I have gone to Colorado for the big game season in October, and next year plan on going to Idaho for a pack trip into this Nation's big wilderness area in the Idaho primitive area. I am not an officer in any of the organizations mentioned, just a gun-toting, run-of-the-mill shooter. By constant practice and continued training I am now a much better scout and sniper than I was in the days that I was being paid by the Government to act as such. My natural equipment, such as youthful eyes and strong body, are depreciated by the years, but the education I have received by practice and study have more than made up for the quality of this one individual shooter, if Uncle Sam should have further need of me, either as a frontline fighting man, or as a rifle coach in training other young men to go into combat, or as a last ditch guerrilla fighting off an enemy who invaded us deeply and who was a challenge to our very existence as a democracy.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the type of man I want to see this program keep trained to benefit our country. And I, for one, thank God our Army had the foresight 50 years ago to initiate this program, and I shall do all in my power to see that it is continued.

The story from the New York Times to which I referred follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1966]

NEW CURBS URGED ON RIFLE PROGRAM

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Tighter measures of control have been recommended in a special study of the Government's program for promoting rifle practice with loaned arms and free ammunition.

Among the recommendations was one that would strengthen the Army's direct responsibility in the program, in which the civilian-run National Rifle Association now has a dominant role.

However, the study, which was carried out by a private research concern, endorsed the basic program and advocated a more effective public relations effort to win social acceptance. It also endorsed the close liaison between the Army and the National Rifle Association.

The study was ordered by the Army after the assassination of President Kennedy and stories about the arsenals that had been collected by the Minutemen, a group preparing to fight as guerrillas in the event of a Communist takeover of this country.

Arthur D. Little, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass., an industrial group headed by Maj. Gen.

James M. Gavin, retired, conducted the study.

Under the existing Federal program, the Army distributes limited quantities of military arms, on loan, and free ammunition to be used in target practice to organized shooting clubs.

BACKED BY FEDERAL FUNDS

The clubs are supported by the federally financed National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, headed by an Assistant Secretary of the Army, in close coordination with the privately managed National Rifle Association, which has more than 600,000 members.

These include youth groups, hunters for sport and competitors in target shooting. The study recommended that club officers be fingerprinted and the prints be submitted for checking with police authorities.

The executive officer of the board is an Army colonel who also has the title of Director of Civilian Marksmanship. The present director, Col. Merele R. Preble, has a civilian deputy and a staff of 22 persons to keep records.

The study group recommended that the staff of the director be broadened to include representatives throughout the country. It also recommended that the Army official assume direct responsibility for checking individual participants in the national program.

Most of this is now done by the National Rifle Association, although the national board is technically responsible for lending arms and distributing ammunition to qualified clubs. The board thus supports about half of the association's 12,000 member clubs.

NO ABUSES UNCOVERED

The Kennedy assassination and the stories about the Minutemen, especially one about the discovery of a huge Minuteman arsenal in Clinton, Ill., in May 1964, focused attention on the precautions taken to assure that only authorized and responsible persons were getting arms and ammunition under the Federal program.

The Arthur D. Little investigators reported that although improvements in control would be desirable, they had been unable to uncover a single incident where a club affiliated with the Director of Civilian Marksmanship, "or its members have been convicted of using firearms, ammunition, and/or Government property improperly or where the Director of Civilian Marksmanship arms have been used in crimes of violence."

The investigators endorsed the program on the same ground on which it was initiated 50 years ago, as a means of contributing to national defense by training young men in the use of arms. The Army's training program, it observed, "still leaves something to be desired."

Studies indicated that the men who had had previous rifle training were not only more proficient than other recruits, but more apt to enlist and more apt to prefer a combat outfit.

The study group also emphasized the benefits of the program in developing teams to represent the United States in international marksmanship competition, including the Olympics.

The report included recommendations for improved budget practices, so that while savings could be achieved in certain areas the net effect would be to underscore the value of the entire program for relatively modest outlays.

The report said that 100 clubs "in areas where problems of control were apt to be most critical" were selected for the study. These were areas, it was said, "known to have problems with racial tensions and violence, extremists and subversive groups, and high crime rates."

The group said that it found no instances of direct orientation toward any political programs or extremist activities and, in almost all instances, club officers stressed that it was club policy to reject applicants known to have extremist views.

Job Corpsmen Visit Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, one of the goals of the war on poverty is to help our less fortunate Americans equip themselves for a full, active and productive life.

The Washington Sunday Star of February 13 contained an article about 38 Job Corpsmen from the Camp Kilmer, N.J., Job Corps camp visiting the Nation's Capital and spending the weekend with families in the greater Washington metropolitan area. Through such weekend "happy family hospitality sessions," the rather limited world of these young people can be immeasurably broadened and brightened. I hope the Members of this body will read this article:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 13, 1966]

FAMILY WEEKEND: 38 JOB CORPSMEN VISIT HERE

(By Larry A. Still)

Thirty-eight members of the Job Corps from Camp Kilmer, N.J., today are ending a "happy family weekend" with complete strangers in Washington.

The 38 corpsmen were selected from 1,500 trainees at Kilmer to participate in the second "hospitality weekend" with families in the greater metropolitan Washington area.

Some 22 families volunteered to pick up the youths, ranging from 16 to 21 years of age, to give them an opportunity to share in the normal life of an average family for a weekend, said Mr. and Mrs. Roy Larini, who accompanied the group as chaperones.

The families met their corpsmen at the Foundry Methodist Church, 16th and O Streets NW. They immediately began a round of activities that included a visit to the Lincoln Memorial, tours of the Capitol and Arlington Cemetery, supper at the Washington Hebrew Congregation, and an evening of social relaxation with "their family and friends."

The volunteers included residents of Alexandria and Arlington, Va., Silver Spring and Rockville, Md., and the District who participated through the National Council of Churches and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Two youths from each of the 19 dormitories at Camp Kilmer were picked for the trip on the basis of class merit, attendance, and conduct, Mrs. Larini said.

Larini is an instructor in the building trades at the camp and his wife, Ruth, is a social activities specialist. James Shickora, a recent graduate of American University, also accompanied the youths as a dormitory group leader.

"They all line up for these trips. They would rather come to Washington than go to New York on weekends," Mrs. Larini said.

The hospitality weekends began last November with the first trip to Washington. Since then, Kilmer corpsmen have visited families in Princeton, N.J., Brooklyn, N.Y., and Oyster Bay, Long Island.

"We try to involve our young people with the young people of the neighboring area so it will increase the bond of understanding between them," the chaperone explained.

Most of the youths admitted they preferred Washington to other cities. "My mother told me if I ever get a chance to get here, to take it," said Matthew Struckhoff, 21, of Augusta, Mo.

Matthew has been in the Corps 2 months. He is studying auto mechanics in order to operate heavy equipment machinery in highway construction. "I have always liked tractors," he explained. "I am just a farm boy."

Struckhoff's companion, Robert White, also 21, of Houston, was making his second family visit after touring Hyde Park, N.Y., "where President Roosevelt lived."

Struckhoff and White were taken home by Bert H. Cooper of 1313 Porter Street NW., who participated in the first hospitality weekend last fall.

Ethics in the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, since I came to the U.S. Congress in January of 1965, I have been concerned about the need for legislation relating to ethics in the legislative branch. After reviewing the many bills and resolutions introduced in both Houses of Congress during the past 10 years, I felt that proposed legislation did not go far enough in providing the basis for continuing guidelines in this field.

On February 4, 1966, I had the opportunity and privilege to address the New York University Alumni of the New York State Bar Association in New York City. I include my remarks on that occasion in the RECORD at this point:

ETHICS IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

When I was elected to the 89th Congress in November 1964, one of my first tasks was to review my personal—my business and real estate investments, and my legal and professional affiliations as senior partner of a New York law firm, to determine possible areas of conflict of interest.

Since this was my first experience in holding public office—I had not been in politics before—I sought the advice of three of the leading Members of the House whom I had known for periods up to 30 years.

While I knew there was no official set of standards to which I could refer, I was amazed to learn that there was no set of unofficial guidelines for House Members to follow.

In my campaign for this high office, I had expressed my interest in legislation, both at the State and Federal level, which would require persons who hold public office to make such disclosures as would protect the best interests of the people who elected them. I favored then and still favor, a full disclosure of financial interests, investments in stocks, bonds, and securities, as well as real estate holdings—and a disclosure of such interests when voting on legislation affecting them.

When I went to Washington in January, I researched legislation previously offered in this area. I found that the main thrust of the pending legislation was to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics to define the conduct expected of Members of the legislative branch. Such a proposal is contained in bills introduced by a number of Members of the House and Senate on both sides of the aisle.

All the proposed legislation seeks to establish a committee to draw up a report and propose a code of ethics. Then the committee is discharged.

Many bills provide for a public disclosure of financial interests, using a dollar figure, most favoring the figure of $10,000. Thus only financial interests over and above that amount would be required to be reported.

Only few of the bills include a means of enforcement, or the consequences of violation of the code of ethics.

When a new Member of the House approaches his colleagues for advice and guidance in matters involving a possible conflict of interest the responses are vague, indefinite, conflicting, and confusing.

Let me cite some of the problems which I was faced with when I was elected. Other House Members are likewise faced with complex problems, varying only in matters of degree.

I was and still am senior member of a law firm which, at that time had 6 partners and 12 associates. A quick survey showed that we had very little to do with Federal agencies insofar as our real estate activities were concerned, and no clients who sold products directly to the Federal Government, but in our activities on behalf of corporations, we did considerable work with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Also in our corporate work we had dealings with the Food and Drug Administration and the usual contact with the Internal Revenue Service.

I could get no definitive opinion as to whether the filing of a registration statement on behalf of a client with the Securities and Exchange Commission, or even the filing of a routine periodic report form would represent a "conflict of interest."

It was recommended by House Members that a new law firm be established in which I would not be a partner and not participate in fees—which would engage in handling all matters in which the Federal Government was involved—a procedure approved by the bar association. This does not seem to me to be the best solution of the problem since there need not necessarily be a conflict of interest involving the routine dealings by a law firm with an agency of the Federal Government.

I carefully studied all of the pending legislation and I have thus far refrained from expressing myself in favor of or in support of any of the bills and have refrained from introducing a bill of my own, up to the present time. I have not found the answer to provide the elements missing from the pending legislation.

I have been privileged to serve as a member of the board of directors of the New York County Lawyers Association during the past 7 years. I have also served as chairman of a special committee to examine into problems dealing with professional ethics—professional economics—and unlawful practice of the law. One of the specific problems dealt with by my special committee was that (provision of penal law section 276) dealing with division of fees with attorneys and the problem of so-called forwarding fees. The State of New York considers an attorney in any one of the other 49 States, not admitted to practice in the State of New York, as a layman and prohibits the sharing of fees with him.

I have been impressed throughout the years with the effectiveness of the self-policing procedures relating to professional ethics and conduct by bar associations. The investigations of alleged misconduct on the part of an attorney is conducted under rules of maximum security to protect the number of the bar who is involved. I know of no violations of the confidential nature of these investigations.

That is why I am now considering and am engaged in drafting legislation, the main purpose of which will be to establish a joint Senate-House Committee of Congressional ethics, or two separate committees, one dealing with the problems of House Members and the other dealing with problems of Members of the Senate. Such committee will not be confined only to lawyers but should be available to assist all Members with possible conflict-of-interest problems.

As I conceive it, the committee should be available for advisory opinions and thus set up guidelines and standards which could be used by all Members. The committee would also hear complaints against Members insofar as it relates to problems of ethics and conflict of interest and enforce the code of ethics which Congress itself adopts.

I invite the cooperation—the advice of the American Bar Association, the New York County Lawyers Association, the Nassau County Bar Association, and other Bar Associations in helping to formulate this legislation.

In bringing it to you today I have done so to stimulate your interest in the problem of ethics and conflict of interest and welcome your recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, after I receive replies to the inquiries which I have sent to some of our distinguished members of the bar, I plan to introduce legislation along the lines outlined above. I urge my colleagues to consider these suggestions so that we may eliminate those situations which create even the appearance of conflict of interest or improper conduct for members of the legislative branch.

Backs Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the Houston Post sees that "social, economic, and political reforms are, in a very real sense, weapons for achieving the desired victory" in Vietnam.

It said on February 11 that "without the support of the Vietnamese people in the villages and rice paddies, however it is obtained, the Vietcong would soon wither away."

As the Post clearly puts it, "rehabilitation and conquest must go on simultaneously."

In reading this editorial on "Security and Reform Linked," I felt it would add some light to a subject which vitally concerns the entire world, and with this in mind I make the editorial available for the RECORD:

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 11, 1966]

SECURITY AND REFORM LINKED

Some observers of the Honolulu conference professed to see evidence of conflict, despite the public declaration of agreement, in the fact that the South Vietnam officials, in their public statements, emphasized the military aspects of the war in their country while the Americans stressed the dual nature of the struggle, the importance of a simultaneous effort to improve conditions of life for the people of South Vietnam.

It would be remarkable if there were not some differences of viewpoint or opinion between the governments in Saigon and Washington. Communist propaganda to the contrary, the leaders of South Vietnam are not puppets. Their people have been experiencing war for a decade, and they can hardly be blamed for wanting to achieve a military victory as quickly as possible.

The fact is that security and the need for social and economic reforms that would benefit the South Vietnamese people, particularly those in the countryside, are inseparable. Obviously, very little can de done for them except on a very temporary basis until the government in Saigon is able to give them physical protection from Communist terror and tyranny.

However, the launching of these nonmilitary efforts is not something that can wait until the entire country, or even most of it, has been cleared of enemy elements. Social, economic, and political reforms are, in a very real sense, weapons for achieving the desired victory.

The military effort required would be much less if the people would refuse to submit passively any longer to Communist control in areas that the Communists hold. But they must be given both an incentive to resist, and an alternative to submission.

At the very least, reforms can be initiated in those areas that are held firmly by the Saigon government and its allies, and extended as the other areas are brought under control.

Without the support of the Vietnamese people in the villages and rice paddies, however, it is obtained, the Vietcong would soon wither away. And without their support for the Saigon government, the struggle could go on interminably.

The dual nature of the war that is being fought confuses a great many people. It is different from the wars of the past to which they are accustomed. In these conventional wars, all energies and resources could be concentrated on winning a military victory in a relatively short time, with little regard for social, economic and political reforms in the areas being fought over. The messy and costly job of cleaning up and rehabilitating conquered areas could come later.

In the type of guerrilla war to which the Communists are resorting in South Vietnam, the two operations cannot be wrapped into neat, separate packages. Rehabilitation and conquest must go on simultaneously.

If in any given situation it comes to a choice of which should have priority, the military or the nonmilitary effort, then, of course, the military one must take precedence because the work of rehabilitation cannot be carried out, on any basis of permanency, until firm physical control has been established and there is physical security for the people in the area. There are many areas in South Vietnam where this choice does not have to be made.

Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, although February 16 marked the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, Lithuania has not been truly independent since 1940 when that gallant nation was again taken over by Russian force of arms. Her actual independence lasted only a little over 20 years, but her spirit of independence is as high and brave as ever. Her people, both home and abroad, continue to resist the tyranny and oppression of Communist domination. I salute the courageous people of Lithuania, and look forward to the day when they will all be able to celebrate in truth her independence.

Embargo Problems in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged to note in the Washington Evening Star, February 16, 1966 the comments of the syndicated columnist, Richard Wilson, on the subject of the rising concern over the continuation of free-world trade with North Vietnam. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make this article available to the wider audience it deserves.

EMBARGO PROBLEMS IN VIETNAM

(By Richard Wilson)

A contradiction in the Vietnam war that excites many people is the continuous supply of the Vietcong by U.S. allies, particularly the British. This is one of those problems that gets through to main street.

County newspapers are publishing letters from irritated readers who can't understand why our closest allies should engage in a profitable trade in war materials with our adversaries. Even Secretary of State Dean Rusk shows a little irritation when he notes that the British ask us to embargo Rhodesia but won't themselves embargo Hanoi.

Some high U.S. Navy officials are bothered by the contradiction, also. Adm. Roy L. Johnson, U.S. Pacific Fleet commander, says the 7th Fleet in the western Pacific "has the capability" to blockade or quarantine the North Vietnam ports, but he stops short of advocating it as do some Navy officials farther down the line at the Pentagon.

All through 1965 free-world ships plied in and out of North Vietnam harbors with vital supplies. About 150 vessels were at one time engaged in this trade under the flags of Britain, Norway, Greece, The Netherlands, Lebanon and even West Germany—all good allies.

Britain supplied the most shipping, probably about half of it. In 1965 a combination of pressure and high insurance rates began to cut into a trade that helped to supply the Vietcong.

At one time more than a dozen ships carried cargoes into Communist North Vietnam and then came into American ports to pick up or deliver shipments in the United States. These were mainly Greek ships. Such ships are now being blacklisted by U.S. maritime authorities from hauling Government-financed grain and other goods.

Now there is an interesting shift in cargoes for North Vietnam. Allied trade to help supply the Vietcong has fallen off and the Red flag now flies above more ships going into the Vietnam harbors. Polish and Russian ships are the main suppliers. An airlift carries goods from the Soviet Union across Communist China into North Vietnam. Russian rail shipments are transshipped twice to cross China for unloading in North Vietnam.

But goods are still reaching the Vietcong by sea, and it is suspected that free-world ships may be unloading at Hong Kong for reshipment to continue the flow of supplies through North Vietnam. According to one estimate, allied ship trade with the Vietcong has accounted for approximately 17 percent of all nonstrategic goods going into North Vietnam.

What stands out in all this is that the continuous sea supply for North Vietnam and the Vietcong, whether allied or Communist, could be stopped if we had the will to do it, and without bombing Hanoi or the harbor at Haiphong.

The Kennedy precedent in the Cuban missile crisis is invoked to show what a determined government can do in using its superior sea power. When the Kennedy quarantine was imposed, the Russian ships turned back. Republican policymakers have called for the imposition of a Kennedy quarantine on Hanoi.

There are, however, some very sharp differences between the Cuban quarantine and the Vietnam shipping problem. The Cuban quarantine was confined to offensive weapons. It did not cover the range of supplies that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong need to maintain their economy and carry on guerrilla warfare.

Heavy military equipment is believed to be going into the Vietnam ports in Russian and Polish ships. A recent Polish broadcast spoke of the 50th shipment from the port of Gydnia to Hanoi as shipments from the free world have dropped off.

The new condition, therefore, is that a quarantine would not stop at sea and turn back the ships of our allies so much as it would ships flying the Red flag. This would amount to a serious confrontation on the sea between the United States and the Soviet Government, and not merely an exchange of frigid notes with the Wilson government in Britain.

Sentiment in Congress against this shipping, originally aroused by Representative PAUL ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, appears to be rising as more protests are heard from main street, but there is yet no sign that the Johnson administration is moving toward either a blockade or a quarantine.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, again we pause to join with Lithuanian people everywhere in commemorating the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day, February 16. Today, while we do not recognize the incorporation of this valiant country into the Soviet Union, the brave people of this nation are enslaved by their Commmuist oppressors. Lithuanian Americans deserve much credit for the vigorous work they have done and are continuing to do in behalf of freedom for their native country. We must stand firm in our support for the rise of this nation to be free and independent again. I join my colleagues in rededication to the fight for self-determination for Lithuania and all forcibly enslaved nations.

Vast Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Tennessean declares that President Johnson's food-for-freedom plan "could well be one of the most significant steps the United States has taken in its relations with the rest of the world."

The paper thinks that "the key to the program, insofar as other countries are concerned, is self-help. The President correctly pointed out that it would be self-defeating for this country to increase food aid without regard to incentives in recipient lands."

This program is being hailed in all sectors of the country by informed observers and because the editorial to which I have referred is so typical of many I have read I ask that it be reprinted in the RECORD, where it may be read in its entirety.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Feb. 12, 1966]

FOOD-FOR-FREEDOM PLAN CAN BE VAST OPPORTUNITY

Hunger represents the oldest, most persistent and most explosive political issue in the world. The cry for bread has helped spark two of history's most profound revolutions in France and Russia. It is a vast and growing problem today.

It has been estimated by a United Nations agency that up to one-half the world's population suffers from chronic hunger or malnutrition. At least a billion people are undernourished as a result of poor diet. And, with the world population burgeoning, hunger could prompt a savage struggle for survival among millions in many lands.

Within this framework of reference, President Johnson's new food-for-freedom program is an encouraging step in the right direction. As outlined to the Congress, the expanded program would not only extend food subsistence to hungry nations, but will seek to supply American know-how and materials to enable farmers in less-developed countries to increase their own production.

The key to the program, insofar as other countries are concerned, is self-help. The President correctly pointed out that it would be self-defeating for this country to increase food aid without regard to incentives in recipient lands. "Local agriculture would decline as dependence upon U.S. food increased. Such a course would lead to disaster."

Too, there is a problem at home. This Nation's own food stockpiles are shrinking, and obviously there must be adequate food reserves for the future. The switch in long-range domestic emphasis from curbing surpluses to assuring adequate commodity reserves probably won't mean any immediate changes in acreage or marketing controls for crops other than wheat, rice, and soybeans.

But in the future great increases in planting, involving relaxation in crop controls, might well come—as determined by domestic needs, commercial export market demands, and requirements of the food-for-freedom problem.

Congress should look closely at the legislative mechanisms for implementing this program, with an eye on future potentials of change and the effect on the farmer. But as to the overall program, it could well be one of the most significant steps the United States has taken in its relations with the rest of the world.

Humanity and prudence call equally for a major effort on the part of this Nation to help others help themselves to stave off mankind's oldest enemy—hunger.

The Surge for Clean Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation will be forever indebted to the man who has made the need for clean water a topic of conversation on every one's lips. I refer to our distinguished colleague, the dean of the Minnesota delegation, Mr. JOHN BLATNIK.

It would be an endless task to list the accolades that have poured in across the country in honor of the chief sponsor of such laws as the Water Quality Act of 1965. In appreciation of his great contribution to his Nation, our colleague has well earned the name, "Mr. Water Pollution Control."

Today JOHN BLATNIK is delivering an important talk before the Midwest Governors' Conference in Lexington, Ky., as part of his relentless campaign to clean up our rivers and streams.

I urge every Member of this House to read and digest this talk:

THE SURGE FOR CLEAN WATER

(Remarks of the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK at Midwest Governors' Conference, Lexington, Ky., February 17, 1966)

I am privileged and certainly honored to be invited to address this distinguished group of Midwest Governors. I convey the best wishes of your respective congressional delegations for a successful conference. It is indeed an inspiration to see successful leaders like yourselves turn so much attention to the enormous task of cleaning up our water. This is the kind of team effort we have fought for since the first water pollution control bill back in 1956. If we are to overturn pollution as the boss of our waterways, our joint effort must be a total all-out commitment.

During the decade since 1956 the Federal Government has spent approximately $200 million for treatment plant construction right here in the Midwestern States that are represented here today. This is not even a down payment on what should be done. This kind of pace in 1966 is like using the same tools today to cross the ocean that Columbus used. As you know, it took him 70 days to cross the Atlantic. Lindbergh crossed it in 33 hours. A B–58 can do it in a little over 3 hours, and 2 months ago our Gemini spacecraft covered that distance in just about 10 minutes.

Why is it then, with this fantistic advance of science, that we are still in the era of Columbus when it comes to rolling back the tide of pollution? This, gentlemen, is the immediate and enormous task that we must set about. We need your leadership, your help. There is a big gap between 70 days and 10 minutes. But we are going to close it.

The surge for clean water soared to an all-time high in the 89th Congress. To help make up for lost time Congress directed five separate cabinet level agencies to zero in on what has been called the No. 1 domestic problem—that of cleaning up our waters. These bold, realistic steps are more in keeping with 20th century living. This all-out legislative effort will push us forward at least to the Lindbergh era. But the fact still remains that we have allowed pollution's poisoning power to become the absolute master of our waterways before we launched this fivefold 89th congressional attack for clean water.

Let's look briefly at the highlights of these major efforts:

Water Quality Act of 1965: This powerful instrument is the result of just plain hard work. We met with conservationists, with industrialists, with State and Federal officials, civic groups and many others to come up with a cross section representation of the needs of this vast program. I must admit some of these meetings were not too pleasant, but we called a spade a spade and so did our opposition. Finally, after 5 months in conference and about eight drafts of statutory language, we emerged with a strong workable bill that was a major, significant surge forward in our pollution abatement program.

Frankly, the States' role in the stepped-up program for clean water put us to the wall. Many said the States "have obviously failed—we cannot depend on them." But fortunately the majority of the conferees agreed—and I led that point of view—that the States should be given a chance to establish their own water quality criteria. If they comply, then this can be the basis for Federal standards. This is consistent with the team effort of having governments at every level work hand in hand to accomplish this task.

In addition to upgrading the whole program, this act also doubles the amount of the grants available for single and joint projects. It also makes $20 million a year available the next 4 years for waste-water research and development. I have summarized the contents of the act in the handout that you should have at your tables. Now let's move on briefly to other 89th Congress legislation that fortifies our all-out effort for clean water.

HHFA (Public Law 89–117): Now under new Cabinet head, Robert C. Weaver. This act includes authorization for 50 percent of project cost to local governing bodies to build public water and sewer facilities. The purpose of this act is to promote orderly urban development, especially in needed community facilities for low income families. As of this date $100 million was appropriated under this act for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

Farmers Home Administration Amendments of 1965: Administered by the Department of Agriculture, grants for the construction of rural water and waste disposal systems will be available on a 50-percent matching grant basis. The grants are authorized to total $50 million annually for water and sewer facilities. It is expected that over 30,000 rural communities (less than 5,500 population) will qualify for this 50-percent matching grants. These grants are designed to serve a rural area and as such take up where other programs leave off, so as not to leave a gap between urban and rural programs. No grant will be made unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies that the waste water carried by the proposed facility meets the appropriate water quality standards.

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965: I was privileged to manage this act on the House side, and I am proud to say that we got the Federal share up to 80 percent in the neediest areas for water and sewer facilities. Basic criteria for eligibility for substantial unemployment and/or low family income. As you know, this program combines the best features of accelerated public works and ARA and authorizes $500 million annually for 4 years for public works and development facility grants.

Water Resources Planning Act: This act establishes a water resources council made up of the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Agriculture, Army, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The purpose of it is for maximum development of water resources by the coordinated planning of water supply needs by region. The act authorizes $5 million per year for 10 years to States for water resource planning, with emphasis on comprehensive development.

Encouraging as this legislation seems, it is but an idle paper entry unless we are able to harness the State leaders right here in this room in an all-out unprecedented "pull together" effort to meet the challenge at hand. One only need glance at the overpowering reality of the 20th century to appreciate the urgency of maintaining clean water. Look at the population explosion alone.

Keep in mind that our supply of water is more or less constant, but think that at the beginning of the Christian era—at the time of the first Christmas—there were only about 250 million people in the whole world.

In another 10 years there'll be that many might here in the United States. And we live on only 7 percent of the earth's surface. So it's time we take bold action commensurate with the era in which we live.

We have no choice but to manage and conserve this precious item called water. The same amount of water must be made to serve more and more people. This mandate is made clear by the fact that it took the human race over 2,000 years to develop a population of 3 billion people, and we are going to double that figure in less than 30 years. Right here in America we are growing so rapidly that we have almost the numerical equivalent of a new State of Kentucky every year. This is just people increase, not to mention the vast new technological, chemical, and scientific changes that correspond to such a growth.

Imagine the impact these changes have on our supply of water. One of the best yardsticks to demonstrate this impact of our changing times is the fact that our old processes are becoming obsolete so fast today that the average American industrial worker changes jobs 15 times and has to be retrained 3 times in the course of his career. So just as our highly retrained industrial worker gives his product the 1966 treatment, let's do the same for our Nation's water. Let us stop pretending that the ancient aqueducts that carry our combined sewer and storm runoff are sufficient. Like the up-to-date industrial worker, let's attack the backlog of unbuilt treatment plants. Let us prod our State pollution officers into firm action. Some of our States have been real laggards in this effort. Once we get a full, all-out commitment, then you prod us into increasing the Federal share of the cost of this national problem. The success of this joint effort stems largely from your initiative. Your cooperation made the highway program work. It will also make this program work.

A good example of strong, bold, realistic State action is the billion-dollar bond issue passed by New York State. The worst drought in two centuries has forced public action in that State. It's not hard to talk about clean usable water to New Yorkers. The lack of usable water has made it the number one topic of conversation. Restaurants were forbidden to serve water unless the customer specifically asked for it. This is a real paradox when the Hudson flows right by their doorstep, but severe pollution has put the Hudson water off limits. Even if it took the drought to bring the message home to New York, they responded, and in 6 years they hope to again have clean usable water. I salute New York's commitment and I hope other States will follow suit.

As we enter our 60th month of continuous economic expansion—the longest period of unbroken economic growth in the history of our Nation—I hope all of us here make a firm commitment to provide enough clean useable water to allow this economic trend to continue. Water is the lifeblood of our economy, yet through misuse and mismanagement we enter 1966 with torrents of pollution and a trickle of clean water. With your forceful help in the months ahead, we will reverse this.

We can count on help from others too. The Presidential Science Advisory Committee has just released its pollution panel report with over 100 recommendations ranging from assessing taxes on those who pollute to suggested enforcing procedures. This is not the only panel of experts channeling their efforts to restore clean water. With the fivefold increase of water in the United States, just in the last 50 years industry too is tooling up to meet this challenge—the industrially supported National Council for Stream Improvement has established five regional research centers, the soap and detergent industry spent over a million dollars last year to minimize the role of detergents as pollutants. We can also count on technical and scientific data to start flowing from the two national water quality labs that are staffing up now to join the surge for clean water. So you can see, many hands are at work in our common effort to unseat pollution as the king of our waterways.

The most helpful of these cooperative hands has been in the form of Federal incentive grants. From 1956 through 1965 the 13 midwestern States represented here today have received over $200 million in grants under the Federal Water Pollution Control and Accelerated Public Works Acts. This construction assistance for these 2,325 projects represents a total cost of $835.5 million. Your larger cities alone need a staggering $660 million worth of construction at present. By 1972 they must provide an additional $747 million worth of facilities.

Now I do not want to sound too critical, but the one area where we have failed the greatest and received the least amount of support is at the State level. Though the States have the primary responsibility for water pollution control, the 13 States represented here today have not put up $1 toward the over $835 million construction cost of these waste treatment plants just mentioned. The communities or municipalities have had to come up with over $635 million and the Federal Government came up with over $200 million in grants. So I urge you to go to your legislatures and bring the States into this program. Surely if the local communities can raise over $600 million and the Federal Government can put in over $200 million, then the State can come up with some financial grants. If one city like St. Louis can commit itself to a $95 million program, the State should be able to come up with as much, and more. One of the States here provides loans for treatment construction plants, but I was horrified to learn that none of our 13 States provide construction grants. I hope you will join the all-out effort and urge your legislatures to correct this. The alternative, and you would not wish to countenance it, is having your cities bypass the State entirely and deal directly with the Federal Government in Washington.

If these States would authorize construction grants like some of their sister States do, we on a Federal level would have a much easier job. As you know, the Federal construction grants program expires June 30, 1967. How do you expect us to renew this program if we have to report that blocks of States like this group meeting here today do not put one 1 cent for construction grants. This is the same kind of inactivity that forced the Federal Government to go in and set standards. The States failed to act and the Federal Government was forced to step in.

Stepped-up State activity in all aspects of water pollution prevention, control, and abatement is now urgently necessary. Your universities are training and turning out scientific minds eager for the challenge. Put them to work for you in developing effective solutions to your complex problems. In your efforts to further your State's economic growth and progress, keep the long-range interest in view. Insist that the new industries attracted to your States abide by your conditions for waste disposal. They would be the first to leave if their supply of acceptable water should run out. Enforce these conditions, as well on all water users in your State. A modern treatment plant is a considerable investment. It would be better protected if the State provided for certification of those entrusted with its operation and maintenance. These are only some of the measures to be taken. Most important, of course, is the effective administration and implementation of the laws you already have for controlling water pollution.

I hope we can have more meetings like this one in order to better understand our mutual problem of cleaning up our water.

In closing then I just want to remind you of President Johnson's closing remarks at the signing of this Water Quality Act of 1956: "The ultimate victory of cleaning up our waters really rests in the hands of all the people of America, not just the Government in Washington. Much of the money, imagination, and effort must be generated at the local level."

Thanks again for your indulgence, and I firmly believe with your help and cooperation water pollution can be conquered in this century.

America and Her Agriculture in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, in an address at the annual meeting of the National Limestone Institute, January 17, at the Statler Hilton Hotel, Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, raised several pertinent questions regarding the role of America in world food production.

Mr. Newsom's knowledge and understanding are such that his views are worthy of note, particularly the questions he posed regarding the solutions to the problem of population versus adequate food production.

The text of Mr. Newsom's address follows:

AMERICA AND HER AGRICULTURE IN A CHANGING WORLD

America and her agriculture have undergone drastic changes in the past 50 years. There are few, if any, major segments of any economy anywhere in the world that have changed more as a result of the terrific increase in general knowledge and technology, which characterizes the world in which we now live. Sometimes I feel that not all of us who are making decisions of our own or trying to influence the pattern in which we live, are thoroughly aware of the terrific change in the rate of growth of knowledge.

We need to remind our contemporaries and coworkers that whereas it took 1,750 years from the time of Christ to double the world's knowledge, the second doubling was achieved by 1915—or in only 165 years. The third doubling came in 1950, but the fourth doubling of knowledge came in 1960. There are, indeed, those among us who suspect that the fifth doubling of knowledge has even now been achieved—or will be very early in 1966.

But this is not all. This change in agriculture (and, indeed, in our America) has not been at a steady or uniform rate. America and her agriculture have had their economic, technical and scientific—and, indeed, their whole social structure changed drastically—even uprooted—as a result of wars and their cessation, and the consequent dislocation of anything remotely resembling a normal production pattern and its evolution.

Having responded to the demand to feed as well as arm our allies, as well as ourselves, to make the world safe for democracy, American agriculture found itself making an adjustment that extracted $34 billion from its capital structure in the infamous decade of the 1920's, under the compulsion of reversing the adjustment that was required in the second half of the decade of the teens.

In fact, that downward adjustment, which, of necessity, extended into the decade of the 1930's, not only destroyed agricultural purchasing power in the United States, but brought the whole rural economy to the brink of ruin, and although there are differences of opinion as to the contribution that certain other factors made to the great depression, there are few people who fail to recognize that no national economy can afford to put any substantial segment of itself through the sort of disastrous adjustment that befell American agriculture in the 1920's and early 1930's.

Many of you here today remember the campaign slogan "Food will win the war and write the peace" in the late 1930's. Some of you know also of the downward adjustment (and the pain therein) in the middle and latter 1940's. All of us, I believe, can remember the unsuccessful attempt of a great and benevolent Federal Government to alleviate the disastrous impact on American agriculture at the close of the Korean war. Many of us appreciate the efforts of Government, though obviously they were not as intelligently designed and directed as they might have been; else we would not have followed a policy that taxed the total storage capacity of the Nation itself and, indeed, put Government itself in possession of well over 100 million tons of grain, along with a comparable quantity of other products, in attempting to fix a price level below which no portion of the total production in this country could move into any market, other than that provided by Government itself.

Facing, as we do, therefore, a changed world in our second half of the decade of the 1960's, the importance of our having at long last achieved the first substantial modification in policy with reference to the basic question of how Government should attempt to balance the effects of those economic institutions and practices—both within our own economy and international in character—is hard to overestimate. We have all too long tended to insulate America's agriculture from the rest of the economy; even at the very time that we were increasingly becoming more and more interdependent upon all other sectors of our own economy. It should be clear that we have also become less able to insulate ourselves from the rest of the world.

There may be reason to support the contention of some of the leaders in agriculture of the rest of the world—both in developed and developing countries—that our prolonged practice of trying to use the power of Government to peg prices in our own country above the world prices and then use the economic power of American taxpayers (through export subsidy) to maintain a presumably reasonable or just share, or in some cases to recapture that share of the world's market for our natural export products constituted an act of economic aggression on the rights of producers in the rest of the world.

They do not accept the infallibility of the U.S. Government to make determination as to a fair or reasonable share of the world market for American farmers. Some even believe that this very action itself has, in some cases, contributed to the declining production of food and agricultural products, in relation to the population of those very countries themselves.

I therefore have no hesitancy in saying that the very substantial change in our U.S. farm policy, which came in the wheat-cotton legislation of 1963 and which was brought substantially further into focus by the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1965, and out of which very wonderful results have already been achieved, place us in excellent position for the future.

The achievement of the highest average income per farm in the history of the United States stands as a testimonial to this fact.

The substantial reduction in Government-held surpluses in the same period of time, along with the reasonable and sound increase in agricultural exports (up $1.8 billion since 1960) with the prospect of equitably achieving another billion dollars increase within the next 2 or 3 years—coupled, of course, with the expansion of the quantity of food available to needy, both at home and abroad, and the continuing reduction in the cost of food in relation to consumer income—all these stand as noteworthy achievements of the past few years.

Let us then recognize that we have an excellent framework for preserving our individual enterprise system in agriculture—both in agricultural production and in the processing as well as domestic and export trade in the products of agriculture—in competition with anything that the collective or Communist pattern of a substantial portion of the world may even dare to dream of.

Dr. Earl L. Butz, dean of the College of Agriculture, Purdue University, clearly sets forth the problem facing the world in the following statement:

"The world is on a collision course. When the massive forces of an exploding world population meet the much more stable trend of world food production, something must give. Unless we give increased attention now to the softening of the impending collision, many parts of the world within a decade will be skirting a disaster of such proportions as to threaten the peace and stability of the Western World."

The growing awareness on the part of the American public and its agricultural and political leaders of this impending crisis in world food production and the nutrition requirements have led to a flurry of statements and proposals that range from responsible to the irresponsible. Simple answers and political cliches are not adequate to meet the highly complicated and interrelated economic, political, social, and moral problems confronting the concerned people of the world as they try to devise programs to alleviate the prospect of abject hunger in major portions of the world. Let me propose to you some of the quandries, the very sharp and uncomfortable horns of not one but several dilemmas that face us as we seek solutions.

1. How can the limited productive capacity of North America, Western Europe, and Australia-New Zealand, the only surplus food-producing areas in the world, comprising less than one-fourth of the world's population, expect to meet the food deficit of an exploding population in three-fourths of the world?

Even if we took all of the 50 million acres out of the present U.S. land reserve, we would produce an additional 40 million tons of grain. This would allow us to triple our shipments overseas, but would still leave a food deficit in the early 1980's of an additional 50 to 60 millions tons.

2. Obviously, if there is to be any solution to the problem of population versus production, much of the solution rests with the developing countries. Several of these countries do not have any physical frontiers available to expand the acreage available for production. Therefore, how can we stimulate a takeoff in production per acre in the developing countries in the face of limits on available land and capital, and in the face of an unbelievable illiteracy as well as institutional inertias such as religious taboos, social customs, etc.?

Not only is this a question of methods, but time is the important element. Therefore, the question is: How quickly can the less-developed countries make the transition from area-expanding methods of increasing food output, to the yield-raising methods which will obviously be necessary?

More baffling quandaries yet remain. Among them are these questions:

1. How can we continually increase our production for nonmarket demands without destroying the integrity of the capital invested in the productive capacities of Western Europe, North America, Australia, and New Zealand, in view of the fact that the existence of a surplus which is not marketable in its regular sense tends to destroy or depress the existing cash markets?

2. The second dilemma is related to the first. How do we prevent reduction in market prices as a result of technological improvements in food production in the developing countries to the point that the foodstuffs will be available for the needy peoples of the world, without destroying the capacities of these same countries to increase their own food production?

Most of the developing countries depend on their agricultural exports for the capital necessary for the development of their economies. It is axiomatic that a takeoff in agricultural production must precede capital and industrial development. History has clearly demonstrated this fact. If the developing countries are not to become increasingly vulnerable to the blandishments of communism, then this development must be relatively rapid.

Suggestions that the United States can become unilaterally responsible for the increasing food needs of the world is, therefore, economically irresponsible and politically hazardous. We must try to bring evolution to a velocity, however, which will prevent revolution. Observation of what is happening in this world food and population situation clearly confirms the development of crisis during the next two decades. It promises to require much of the productive capacity of the United States, properly directed to the commercial markets of the world, and wisely directed at the food needs which are not met by the commercial markets. But it is also going to take the continued development of the agriculture of the food deficit areas, and highly stimulated increase in the per-acre yields.

This will require a maximum effort to improve the technology of food production in the food-deficit areas. This must include general education programs, designed to improve the literacy level of the peasants who produce the food. It will require substantial outlay of capital by the developing countries. There must be substantial exportation of technological know-how by the developed countries. And, of interest to a group such as this gathered here today, it must include both the exportation of the facilities for the production of soil-building chemicals and soilbuilders themselves from the developed countries, and a proper incentive to the producers themselves to induce the necessary human effort, to apply all these and the growing and developing ingenuity and will to work—which has characterized our own individual enterprise agricultural system.

What I am trying to say is that we do not have time to build the hydroelectric plants that would be necessary for the development of a fertilizer capacity which is going to be required by the food-deficit nations.

In any projection into the future, government must play a substantial role in this evolution. We can, however, and must develop individual incentive and opportunity or the program will fail.

At the present time the U.S. is exporting three-fifths of all our wheat being used each year. Approximately 50 percent of this goes out under government programs. If we were to triple our exports, which would be the result of maximum usage of our productive land, then it is reasonable to presume that we would quadruple the amount that we are shipping under Government programs. This means that twice as much would be going out under Government programs as would be consumed for domestic use and exported for cash.

Such a possibility even though it may be temporarily required cannot be accepted as a permanent pattern. We note with interest that the American Bankers Association has chosen as the subject of its annual symposium next month, "Government-Business Relationships." Even though our Government may be required to engage in a massive program to alleviate hunger in the world, and to improve economic development in the free world, we must not carelessly lead or permit those who have yet to determine the course of their governments and economies to conclude that farmers anywhere in the world are not entitled to and need not have a fair and reasonable income in relation to their fellow countrymen.

A strong and viable agricultural program, in which the Government plays a partnership role, is clearly indicated for the future. Pricing policies such as those which were developed and made a part of the Agricultural Act of 1965, in which the domestic share of our agricultural production is insured at a price that will bring farm income into proper relationship with the income levels of the rest of our American economy are both just and sound.

We are now able to offer to the markets of the world a substantial amount of agricultural production which can be priced competitively with the agricultural exports of other food-exporting countries. We must, however, look forward to commodity arrangements or agreements permitting the farmers of agricultural exporting countries to maintain reasonable access to markets, as well as levels of income and the opportunity to increase their productive capacity in terms of efficiency.

Although the "market" as we have known it must perform certain functions in this situation; clearly this is not a problem that can be answered by a "return to a free market economy." We cannot lump all this production into one pile and destroy at one time the economic integrity of the invested capital of farmers around the world; and with this destruction also destroy any possibility of meeting the projected food needs of the world within our democratic-capitalistic, economic, and political structures.

The individual freedom and the economic organization of agriculture within the United States clearly, therefore, dictate that we should talk and think of meeting the world food crisis within this present legislative framework, and at the same time giving the greatest possible assurance of the expansion of individual freedom and of the wise and constructive economic organization of agriculture in the rest of the world by an intelligent example or demonstration on the part of the United States.

Clearly, American agriculture has a productive potential that staggers the imagination. All talk, therefore, of eliminating reasonable market regulations and effective price and income influences on production patterns seems as certain to invite disaster as did the old philosophy of a one-price straitjacket with such control of production as became necessary, invite economic stagnation.

If we are to enhance, rather than diminish, the prospect of peace in the world, as an objective of organized society, then we must be reasonably certain that such action as we take in attempting to change or reverse the direction of agriculture, must be taken or evolved cautiously and with the establishment of both domestic and international machinery that will insure that the burden of meeting the food and nutritional requirements of the world in this changing, or adjustment, period—the burden in terms of money and the benefits in terms of markets and outlets, will be shared logically and equitably according to efficiency (rather than according to any one government's edict or decision) among all the producing as well as contributing nations of the world.

Let us not forget the lessons of the past 50 years as we plan to meet the challenge of the next 20 or 30 years.

The Ombudsman: Tribune of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, since early in 1963, I have been working for the adoption of an Americanized version of the ombudsman, a remarkable Swedish bred institution.

During the first session of this Congress, my bill to establish an Administrative Counsel of the Congress as an American ombudsman was accorded a hearing in the Committee on House Administration. In addition, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress has the proposal under consideration.

In the last several months, interest in the ombudsman has increased sharply, spurred in part by the announcement of the British Government last October that it would ask the current session of Parliament to create a Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration or British ombudsman. The British White Paper outlined an institution which would be similar in many ways to the proposed American ombudsman. A bill to establish a British ombudsman was introduced in the House of Commons on Monday.

Last month, Senator Edward Long, chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure in the other body, announced his intention to hold hearings on the ombudsman.

In view of this interest, I should like to call Members attention to the current issue of the annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. It contains an article by Prof. Stanley Anderson and me which describes the American ombudsman proposal in the context of problems which are common to modern governments throughout the world.

Professor Anderson is a lawyer and an assistant professor of political science at the University of California at Santa Barbara. He is an honorary fellow of the American-Scandinavian Foundation and an expert on the ombudsman. During 1964, he was associated with me as an American Political Science Association fellow.

I include the article from the Annals:

THE OMBUDSMAN: TRIBUNE OF THE PEOPLE

(By Henry S. Reuss and Stanley V. Anderson)

Abstract: The ombudsman is an agent of Parliament who receives and may investigate citizens' grievances against bureaucracy. His powers are to recommend, to publicize, and to report to Parliament. The institution began in Sweden and has been adopted or considered by many other countries. There is widespread interest in the ombudsman because the institution meets a general need in modern, industrialized nations for a means of resolving citizens' unique, individual problems with a depersonalized administration. The courts, which are slow and costly, do not provide adequate means of redressing citizens' personal grievances. In the United States, Congressmen have an ombudsmanlike role in investigating and trying to solve constituents' problems. But this job—called "casework" on Capitol Hill—is so burdensome that it interferes with Congressmen's more important legislative and policymaking functions. Congressman Reuss has proposed establishing an administrative counsel, inspired by the ombudsman, to take over a part of the "casework," thereby lightening the burden on Congressmen and aiding citizens more effectively. The chairman of the administrative conference may also function as a kind of ombudsman. California and other States and cities are considering establishment of ombudsmen.

We promised another freedom to our people at election time, that we would set up a citizens' appeal authority, an ombudsman, to which any aggrieved citizen——

Honorable Members: "Ha-ha." [1]

Such was the response which Prime Minister Keith Holyoake received from the New Zealand House of Representatives in June 1961, when he referred to the ombudsman plank contained in the National Party's platform for the 1960 general elections.

The members' outburst was directed at the name "ombudsman," rather than at the concept. But when the debate was completed and the measure finally adopted in September 1962, the members agreed that "there shall be appointed, as an officer of Parliament, a commissioner of investigations, to be called the ombudsman." And the man chosen by Parliament to fill the office, Sir Guy Powles, a distinguished jurist, diplomat, and administrator, styles himself ombudsman rather than commissioner. New Zealand's adoption not only of the institution but of its outlandish title was symbolic of the great prestige the ombudsman has won as a defender of individual rights.

ORIGIN IN SWEDEN

The institution originated in Sweden 155 years ago. In Swedish, "ombudsman" means "agent" or "representative." Similar offices were set up in Finland (1919), Denmark (1955), and Norway (1963).[2] Separate ombudsmen for military affairs were created in Sweden (1915), Norway (1952), and West Germany (1956). (In 1965, the Swedish military ombudsman was merged again with the office of civil ombudsman.) Related institutions exist in India, Japan, Nepal, and the Philippines.

Ombudsman proposals are currently under consideration in Australia, Canada, Great Britain, Ireland, Holland, and the United States. In 1965, ombudsman bills were introduced in the legislatures of California, Connecticut, Illinois, New York, and Utah, as well as in the New York City Council, and companion bills were dropped into the hoppers of the U.S. Congress by Congressman Henry S. Reuss (H.R. 4273) and Senator Claiborne Pell (S. 984), proposing the establishment of an administrative counsel of Congress, modeled after the ombudsman.

The literature on the ombudsman is extensive. A bibliography of English-language materials alone fills seven typewritten pages.[3] Articles have appeared in such widely read publications as the New York Times magazine,[4] the New Yorker,[5] and the Reader's Digest.[6]

What is this ombudsman?

Drawing a composite picture, the ombudsman is appointed by the legislature for the term of office of that body. He is eligible for reappointment, and may be discharged by Parliament, though Parliament may not interfere in his handling of individual cases. The ombudsman has great discretion in deciding what matters to investigate. He receives citizens' complaints and makes announced and unannounced inspection tours. He may take matters up of his own volition. Finally, the ombudsman may compel testimony and the production of evidence.

THE OMBUDSMAN'S POWER

While the ombudsman has no power to alter the results of an administrative decision, changes are sometimes made when he commences an investigation or upon his final recommendation. The only sanction which the ombudsman can impose is censure. The ombudsman must extend an opportunity to be heard to anyone whom he intends to reprimand. The ombudsman may suggest that disciplinary action be taken by an agency, following established procedures of notice and hearing, or he may recommend that the regular prosecuting authorities institute criminal charges.

The ombudsman is free to suggest changes in rules and regulations to the administrative agencies, and may also propose remedial legislation to the Parliament, usually in his annual report. He makes available to the press the results of his investigations when he deems its advisable.

The office of ombudsman is quite small, composed of half a dozen attorneys and a corresponding number of secretaries. It would not do to create a parabureaucracy; this would merely superimpose a new layer of officials on top of those we already have. The ombudsman is alerted by squeaking wheels—citizens' grievances and newspaper reports—and must rely in the first instance on the agencies under investigation to supply the facts he needs to judge the merits of the complaints he receives. The New Zealand ombudsman has stated that he could not function without the cooperation of the bureaucracy.

Fortunately, this cooperation is almost invariably forthcoming civil servants welcome the opportunity to have unfounded complaints identified as such. The majority of the complaints which the ombudsman receives are without merit. Often, the complainant is laboring under a mistake of fact or law, which the ombudsman's reply can clarify for him. Furthermore, government employees are among those who may complain to the ombudsman when they have grievances about working conditions. At

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

the top, supervisory officials welcome the information which the ombudsman may supply on the operation of the lower echelons.

THE NEED FOR THE OMBUDSMAN

Why all this interest in the ombudsman?

The organization of the modern, positive state requires depersonalized administration. Government can be accomplished only through directives laid down by rulemakers who are several layers removed from the people ruled.

The citizen is faced with a vast, and often bewildering, panoply of statutes, regulations, and ordinances applied by an overlapping array of judges and bureaucrats.

All the industrialized nations are confronted with the conflict between the demands of society and the desires of individuals, between the need for general rules and practices of administration and the peculiarities of particular cases.

Totalitarian government resolves the problem by endeavoring to crush individuals who stand in the way of the state and the arbitrary application of its ukases. Indifference to the individual is justified by reference to a millennial future, in which "each will receive according to his needs."

In democratic societies, there must be unceasing adjustment of the relation between individuals and society.

Through representative government, the society's highest legislative and administrative authorities are responsible to the people. The President of the United States, Governors, Congressmen, State legislators, county supervisors, city councilmen, district attorneys—these are all elected officials. Individuals have their vote to make their interests and desires felt in legislation and administration.

Powerful nongovernmental organizations have arisen which represent individuals by classes—as industrial workers, as bankers, as gun-club members, or whatever. Trade unions, large corporations, interest-group associations—these are the bodies who have the weight to influence the policies of government.

DEALING WITH INDIVIDUAL PROBLEMS

But neither the ultimate control of public officials through the electoral process nor widespread participation by citizens in influential nongovernmental organizations meets fully the need of individuals with unique, personal problems with the government.

When the great nongovernmental organizations deal with the government, it is usually over general problems and broad questions of public policy. But what of the man in the street? "When two elephants fight, it is the grass that suffers." [7]

Moveover, the officials with whom the public most frequently comes into contact are not elected. They are administrators who have the tenure in office which is needed to operate a merit civil service and to provide the expertise required to run a modern government.

The citizen with an individual problem has recourse to the courts. The courts are the final guardians of the Bill of Rights, protecting the individual's freedom of speech, privacy, movement, and assembly. Judges can pass also on the legality of administrative action. But judicial remedies are slow and costly. They can be applied to the multifarious activities of the positive state only at the cost of swamping the courts and paralyzing the bureaucracy.

COUNTERWEIGHTS TO BUREAUCRATIC POWER

Bureaucratic ills may be susceptible to bureaucratic solutions—a bit of the hair of the dog that bites. Attempts to provide such solutions are many. In 1964, for example, liaison officers for consumer affairs were set up in a number of Federal departments and agencies.[8] California has a consumer counsel, to represent "the public interest at legislative, regulatory, and administrative proceedings to balance against the highly paid spokesmen of industry." [9]

Civilian police review boards have been established in Rochester, N.Y., and Philadelphia, Pa. Last March, an alleged official misconduct section [10] was set up in the Los Angeles district attorney's office.

Examples could be multiplied: legal-aid societies, public defender systems, Better Business Bureaus—all of these are governmental or quasi-governmental operations, designed to equalize the weight of the individual against the organized forces of society.

Because the individual carries little weight against the vast power of the bureaucracy, the Government must lend its weight to him, using the force of Government to restrain and humanize government.

Clearly, what is needed is an institution responsive to citizens' problems which can control bureaucracy without stifling bureaucracy, allow necessary discretion without permitting capriciousness, reward promptness, courtesy, and efficiency by singling out delay, rudeness and bumbling, and insure fairness by uncovering bias and error.

THE SUCCESS OF THE OMBUDSMAN

Judging by the experience of the Scandinavian states and New Zealand, the ombudsman is extraordinarily well suited to foster these ends.

Primary responsibility for good government must rest with honest and intelligent officials. But even the very best of bureaucracies administering the best laws will suffer the flaws which arise from sheer size and human foible. A successful ombudsman will reduce malfunction by his very presence and through the reforms which he inspires. But he will not put himself out of business until administrators become philosopher kings.

Under the American system of separation of powers, State and Federal legislatures make laws, or delegate the power to do so, and executive officers carry them out. To complete the circle, the legislators are supposed to check on the executive in order to insure that the laws are enforced properly. The vastness and variety of modern bureaucracies make this an extremely demanding task.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CASE WORK

Individual legislators are striving to fulfill this role, not least in the U.S. Congress. On the basis of extensive interviews and round-table discussions with nearly a score of Representatives from each political party, the author of a Brookings Institution study notes:

"Probably the most important mail (received by a Congressman) is the 'case' mail. * * * Denied a favorable ruling by the bureaucracy on a matter of direct concern to him, puzzled or irked by delays in obtaining a decision, confused by the administrative maze through which he is directed to proceed, or ignorant of whom to write, a constituent may turn to his Congressman for help. * * * A person who has a reasonable complaint or query is regarded as providing an opportunity rather than as adding an extra burden to an already busy office. The party affiliation of the individual even when known to be different from that of the Congressman does not normally act as a deterrent to action." [11]

No systematic study has been made of the number and kind of constituent complaints. During the first 9 months of 1961, Senator VANCE HARTKE reports that he "had 300 inquiries from people from Indiana who work for the Federal Government and wanted assistance with something pertaining to their jobs * * * handled 709 (service and veteran) problems * * * assisted 261 Hoosiers with social security problems, 27 with draft board problems, 18 with railroad retirements, and * * * 61 immigration cases who could be helped within the framework of the present law." [12]

"HUMANIZING THE BUREAUCRACY"

To handle this casework, as it is called on Capitol Hill, and to do the other work of a congressional office, House Members have approximately 10 staff members and Senators have 30 or more. Lawmakers throughout the world undoubtedly perform a similar function—in Great Britain it is referred to as "constituency surgery"—but probably nowhere is the volume as great as in Washington, D.C. "Write your Congressman," is a byword of the American political vocabulary.

As one of the authors has pointed out elsewhere:

"Thousands of citizens' complaints and problems flow into congressional offices every year. * * * Legislators and their staffs spend a large part of their time investigating such problems, urging correction of apparent injustices and errors and explaining to the citizens a bureaucracy that is often too wrapped up in jargon to explain itself. * * * This congressional role has been important in humanizing the bureaucracy and in making it responsible. * * * It helps to have [the actions of civil servants] watched by a Member of Congress who has to answer to the people every 2 or 6 years; he is sure to prod them toward the best possible administration of the laws. * * * So the United States in a sense, already has not only one but 535 ombudsmen in its 100 Senators and 435 Representatives.[13]

CONGRESSMEN'S TIME

This would all be well and good if it were not for one major drawback: casework distracts the Congressman and his staff from their primary legislative function. While still a Member of the House of Representatives, the late Senator Estes Kefauver described a sample workday of 15 hours, in which actual sessions of the House and his two committees lasted about 7 hours. After taking care of constituent visits and requests, time for studying pending legislation had to be squeezed in between 7 and 8:45 a.m., during lunchtime, and after midnight.[14]

Recognition of these conflicting demands on the legislators' time underlies the previously cited Reuss-Pell bill which is now before the Congress. It reads, in part, as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the increasing complexity of the Federal Government has created difficulties on the part of private citizens in dealing with the Government, that there is a clear need for the Congress to be informed of the nature of such difficulties, particularly those of a recurrent nature, in order that remedial legislative action may be taken, and that, under existing procedures, such information is only sporadically available and frequently is inadequately developed or fails entirely to reach the appropriate legislative committees. The Congress further finds that the necessary and proper efforts of its individual Members to deal with these problems have increasingly become so burdensome as to constitute a serious impediment to the discharge of their other legislative duties."

THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSEL

Consequently, the bill provides for the establishment of an Administrative Counsel of the Congress, to be apponted for the 2-year term of a given Congress by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. Under the Reuss bill, the Counsel is to receive the same pay as a Congressman, and is given the investigatory powers of a congressional committee, excluding the right to issue subpenas.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The duties to be assumed by this new office are specified in section 4 of the bill:

"Upon the request of any Member of either House of Congress, the Administrative Counsel shall review the case of any person who alleges that he believes that he has been subjected to any improper penalty, or that he has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States, or that the determination or award of any such right or benefit has been, is being, or will be unreasonably delayed, as a result of any action or failure to act on the part of any officer or employee of the United States other than [the President, Congressman, judicial officers, and officials of the District of Columbia]. * * * Upon the completion of his review, he shall report his conclusions and recommendations, if any, to the Member or committee by whom the claim was referred."

Finally, the Counsel is authorized in section 7 to make interim reports to Congress "on any occasion when he deems such action appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act," and is directed to submit an annual report to Congress:

"Such report shall summarize his activities, shall include reviews of those individual cases which, in his judgment, should be brought to the attention of the Congress, and shall set forth such recommendations for legislation or further investigation as he may deem appropriate."

ADVANTAGES AND ORIGINS

The Counsel would have other advantages besides that of allowing Members of Congress to devote more time to legislative and policy matters.

With a small staff of experts, the Counsel could do a better job than Members of Congress in protecting citizens' rights. As it is now, Members of Congress and the men-of-all-work on their staffs must be generalists who find themselves at a distinct disadvantage in dealing with the administration's experts. Centralizing congressional "casework" in the Counsel would be far more efficient and less costly than indefinite expansion of the 535 individual congressional office staffs.

While the ombudsman idea inspired the proposal for an Administrative Counsel, the Counsel also parallels existing American institutions. In the Offices of the Legislative Counsel and in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, Congress has given itself the advantages of expert, centralized assistance in legislative drafting and research, respectively. During 1964, for example, the Legislative Reference Service's 150 experts responded to 105,000 congressional inquiries.

Congressional oversight does not, of course, relieve the executive branch of the responsibility to keep its own house clean. A new broom was created on the executive side in 1964, through the establishment by Congress of an Administrative Conference of the United States, composed of the head or deputy of each executive department and independent regulatory board or commission, as well as of lawyers and scholars appointed by the President or the Chairman of the Conference.

The Chairman of the Administrative Conference might function as a kind of ombudsman himself. He is empowered "to make inquiries into matters he deems important for conference consideration, including matters proposed by persons inside or outside the Federal Government." The grievances of private citizens would fall under this blanket, as would the information and recommendations supplied as public documents by an Administrative Counsel of the Congress.

STATE PROPOSALS

Meanwhile, at the State level, the more manageable size of populations would seem to permit a more direct implementation of the ombudsman concept. Three of the largest States and two of the smallest are working in that direction.[15] In the 1965 session of the California Legislature, for example, Speaker Jesse M. Unruh introduced assembly bill No. 2956, providing for the establishment of an office of ombudsman. Speaker Unruh has also called for the creation of a nine-man Citizens' Advisory Committee "to investigate the feasibility of incorporating into the structure of the State government an official similar to the ombudsman."

All of these proposals—State and Federal—are signs of widespread concern with individuals' rights and individual justice in administration. This concern is a wholesome sign. It should not exhaust itself, however, in righteous indignation or hopeless resignation. Rather, concern should lead to continuing appraisal of the adequacy of our political institutions to the needs of man in an increasingly depersonalized society. Appraisal, in turn, should lead to carefully tailored proposals for specific reform.

Article I of the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution directs:

"Congress shall make no law * * * abridging * * * the right of the people * * * to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

If this guarantee is to be meaningful, we must insure that the channels of communication are kept open and effective. The voice of the ordinary citizen must be selectively amplified in the Halls of Congress and the State legislatures. Adaptations of the ombudsman give promise of high fidelity.[16]

---

[1] "Parliamentary Debates," N.Z. (1961), p. 96.

[2] See Stanley V. Anderson, "The Scandinavian Ombudsman," 12 The American-Scandinavian Review, No. 4 (December 1964), pp. 403–409. Upon request, the author will supply reprints of this survey article.

[3] "The Ombudsman: A Bibliography," published by the Northern California Friends Committee on Legislation, San Francisco, February 1965.

[4] HENRY S. REUSS, "An 'Ombudsman' for America." The New York Times magazine, Sept. 13, 1964, pp. 30, 134–135, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 23, 1964, pp. 21839–40, and in Joseph S. Clark (ed.), "Congressional Reform: Problems and Prospects" (New York: Crowell, 1965), pp. 292–297.

[5] John Bainbridge, "A Civilized Thing," the New Yorker, Feb. 13, 1965, pp. 136–151.

[6] George Kent, "Where You Can Fight 'City Hall,'" 103 the Rotarian (July 1963), pp. 38–40, condensed as "Watchdog for the Common Man," Reader's Digest (August 1963), pp. 82–85.

[7] An African proverb, taken from Cecil V. Crabb, Jr., "The Elephants and the Grass: A Study of Nonalinement" (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965).

[8] "Government Aids to Consumers," Consumer Reports (December 1964), pp. 259–265.

[9] Ibid., p. 264.

[10] A name which surely would warrant another "ha-ha" if it had been presented to the New Zealand Parliament.

[11] Charles L. Clapp, "The Congressman: His Work as He Sees It" (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964), p. 84. The title of this excellent work calls to mind the jibe of Adlai Stevenson at a reunion with a prominent classmate: "Well," he said, "we have both gone out to do the Lord's work, you in your way, and I in His."

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 16, 1961, pp. A8204–A8205, excerpted in Norman C. Thomas and Karl A. Lamb, "Congress: Politics and Practice" (New York: Random House, 1964), pp. 42–43.

[13] Henry S. Reuss, "We Need an American Ombudsman," Christian Century, Mar. 3, 1965, pp. 269–271, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 15, 1965, pp. A1165–A1166.

[14] Estes Kefauver and Jack Levin, "A Twentieth-Century Congress" (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1947), p. 194, excerpted in John P. Roche and Leonard W. Levy (eds.), The Congress: Documents in American Government (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964), pp. 204–206.

[15] See Stanley V. Anderson "The Ombudsman: Public Defender Against Maladministration," 6 Public Affairs Report, No. 2 (April 1965). This is the bulletin of the Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley. The institute is carrying out a study of the suitability of ombudsman institution for adaptation in California.

[16] A lengthy symposium on the ombudsman appeared in Canada after this article was written. It is Donald C. Rowat (ed.), "The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender" (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965).

Unemployment Insurance for Hospital Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, unemployment insurance should no longer be considered a privilege. It is a right. No category of workers should be excluded from its benefits. So it is shocking that people who work in voluntary hospitals are not awarded unemployment insurance.

In an editorial last Saturday, February 12, the New York Amsterdam News eloquently criticized this inequity in the present law. It pointed out that 1,500 Negro and Puerto Rican workers have been laid off in the last 2 years; they received no insurance. It urged the Congress to support H.R. 8282, the bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS].

The editorial follows:

CORRECTIVE MEASURE

During the recent transit strike considerable publicity was given to the fact that workers who couldn't get to work should apply for immediate unemployment insurance benefits to tide them over that rugged period.

This applied to all workers except those employed in voluntary hospitals.

Does that make sense? Is it fair?

We say it doesn't make sense and it certainly isn't fair.

There should be no glaring exceptions such as these in the attitude of our local, State, and Federal Government between any group of workers.

But these exceptions do exist and some of the ill informed, when told that this group of hospital workers were not covered by unemployment insurance, quickly asked why hospital workers need unemployment insurance. After all, they said, "they don't have any layoffs."

This is simply not true.

Last year Mount Morris Park Hospital closed its doors. What happened to the workers who couldn't get jobs right away? They were left to beg or go on relief.

Reliable reports state that some 1,500 Negro and Puerto Rican hospital workers have been laid off in the last 2 years because the hospitals they worked in closed their doors, or food and laundry departments were leased to commercial firms, or they were knocked out of their jobs because of the introduction into the hospital of more scientific equipment.

These glaring injustices can be corrected by the enactment by the Congress of an administration bill which would extend unemployment insurance benefits to this group of workers. The bill, known as the McCarthy-Mills bill, is listed as S. 1991 in the Senate and H.R. 8282 in the House of Representatives.

If enacted, the bill would extend unemployment insurance benefits to the 1 million workers employed in nonprofit hospitals as well as to all nonprofit institution employees.

The American Hospital Association, which employs these workers, is unfortunately opposed to the bill.

But the fact that the American Hospital Association is forever looking backward today when the look is strictly forward should make no difference.

The bill should be passed and passed immediately.

Second Front in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, it is important for all Americans to keep in mind that our commitment in South Vietnam and our chances for victory in southeast Asia do not depend on military achievement alone. The struggle to obtain for the people of South Vietnam the right of self-determination and freedom is a many faceted struggle having military, social, human and political aspects.

The following editorial from the February 9, 1966, edition of Newsday discusses the second front agreed to by President Johnson and South Vietnam Premier Nguyen Cao Ky. I believe my colleagues in the House of Representatives will find the editorial interesting and a penetrating analysis of the depth of our commitment to freedom.

SECOND FRONT IN VIETNAM

President Johnson and South Vietnam Premier Nguyen Cao Ky have agreed to open a second front—a peaceable front. While pressing forward with the war, a program of social and political reform will be undertaken by the United States and South Vietnam in an effort to bring a better life to the people after they have been made secure from the Vietcong.

This is a vital part of our struggle for freedom in South Vietnam. While there is strong anti-Communist feeling among many South Vietnamese, large numbers of villagers have either been "reeducated" or terrorized into cooperating with the Vietcong. Unless the Ky government, with American aid, can undercut the Reds' hold on these people, the stability of South Vietnam will remain in jeopardy even if our side is victorious in battle with the Communist forces.

About 25 percent ofthe country is so firmly in control of the Vietcong that no program of pacification and rural improvement can be carried out. Another 20 percent is being fought over, and a substantial amount of the remaining territory is in delicate equilibrium. Thus the second front program is to be concentrated in one-third or fewer of the rural villages and hamlets the South Vietnam Government claims to control. That is a fairly small beginning, but it is the philosophy behind it that counts.

President Johnson, with his dramatic meeting in Honolulu, has chosen a new approach to the Vietnam problem that is bound to win public support in this country and, hopefully, will achieve concrete results in South Vietnam. American troops have saved South Vietnam from a Communist takeover. But as our forces continue to fight for military victory, there must be an equally aggressive fight to win the minds and hearts of all the people. The Johnson-Ky "second front" is an imaginative idea, and one that deserves endorsement.

Mr. Speaker, while our President, our Vice President, our Ambassador to the United Nations and our ambassadors around the world continue to search for the road to the conference table and ultimate peace which appears to be so elusive, the opening of a second front as outlined in the Newsday editorial will bring comfort to the Vietnamese who have suffered so much for so long a time.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Growth of Chowan College, Murfreesboro, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1966

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the people of North Carolina are very proud of their educational institutions and of the progress that has been made in education in our State over the years.

An outstanding example of how education is growing in North Carolina is the case of Chowan College.

It has not been many years since Chowan College was a small institution that almost became a casualty of World War II. Today Chowan College is the second largest private junior college in North Carolina, and it is widely recognized as one of the fastest growing and most progressive junior colleges in our Nation.

It has been my pleasure to be intimately acquainted with the work this college is doing and with its president, my good friend, Dr. Bruce Whitaker, who serves with a distinguished board of trustees and faculty.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial concerning Chowan College which was published in the January 5, 1966, issue of the News-Herald of Murfreesboro, N.C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHOWAN NO. 1 AT HOME

It was already known hereabouts that Chowan College is just not what it used to be any more. Nonetheless there are many who were probably surprised to learn through a recent news story that Chowan is now the second largest private junior college in the State.

"And the least among you shall be first," is almost a reality at Chowan. It was always a nice school as the saying goes. But it really used to be sort of seedy. In those days it inspired more sympathy than anything else from those who wanted to see it progress. Now that sympathy has turned to pride.

The news release said Chowan's current enrollment is 1,179, second only to Wingate's 1,486. All we can say is "Wingate better look out." It better if the recent past is any kind of an indication of what the near future will be. From only a few hundred students just a decade ago, Chowan is now well over the thousand student mark. This is a growth record of which any institution—educational, business, or other—could be proud.

But of even more importance in the job of providing a sound Christian education are two other factors, one of which is easy to see at Chowan. The other is also present but not as easily noted and often forgotten. The growth in the physical plant on the Murfreesboro campus is obvious to even casual visitors who remember what it used to be like. Not to be noticed by merely looking at the school is that the instructional staff and facilities available have been constantly upgraded all during the period of student body growth. The real test of a school and the education it provides is the quality of the teachers and the things they have available to teach with. In these areas Chowan continues to improve.

There are many factors and many people responsible for the growth and improvement of the Roanoke-Chowan's own home grown community college. Certainly among the chief of these is the type of leadership Chowan has had in two consecutive administrations. The late Dr. F. O. Mixon guided Chowan on the start of its upward climb. His work has been continued and new approaches begun by today's dynamic president, Dr. Bruce Whitaker. Institutions many times the size of Chowan would deem themselves fortunate to have even one president the caliber of these two Christian educators. For Chowan to have had two in a row is singularly fortunate.

It is easy to take hometown things for granted and even to depreciate their value. In Chowan's case those of us in its home region ought not to let this happen to us. The Roanoke-Chowan is an immensely better place to live because it has Chowan in its midst. Not only can our children attend, so can we ourselves in various adult education programs. The books of its library are available to all. Its athletic events and cultural programs are brighteners to life in this area. Its faculty members and students who hail from other places are good leavens for our often too ingrown ways.

Note should be taken of Chowan's position now as second largest private junior college in the State. But more importantly for those of us close to it, appreciation should be had for what it has, is and can mean to the greater Roanoke-Chowan area in which it is located.

Alsop Article Spotlights Nuclear War Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in an article in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post the distinguished columnist and commentator, Mr. Stewart Alsop, brought forcefully to our minds the overriding danger of our time—nuclear warfare. We have lived so long with this potential threat we often fail to realize its magnitude. I am grateful to Mr. Alsop for his timeless and timely reminder. I call the attention of the House to his words:

AFFAIRS OF STATE: "WE COULD STOCKPILE BIRDS"

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Well, just for example, we could stockpile birds. It wouldn't be impossible, you know—biologists know how to trap birds by the thousands. There's always some way to deal with these problems.

This odd comment, made by a high Defense Department official, rather vividly suggests the surrealistic complexities surrounding an immensely grave decision which the President and the Congress are sooner or later going to have to face up to. The decision is this—whether to make a really serious effort to assure the survival of a big proportion, at least, of the people of the United States in case of nuclear war. The decision involves a great many billions of dollars. It could also involve a great many millions of American lives—71 million American lives according to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's estimate.

Last year, in testimony on Capitol Hill, Secretary McNamara, with his passion for "quantification," reduced the problem to a sort of money-lives equation. He produced a little chart which assumed a massive nuclear attack on our biggest cities as follows:

Spending:	*Fatalities*
0	149, 000, 000
$5,000,000,000	120, 000, 000
$15,000,000,000	96, 000, 000
$25,000,000,000	78, 000, 000

In other words, if nothing is done, and if McNamara's quantification is correct, about three out of four Americans would die in a major nuclear war. But given a fully mature A–ICBM, or antimissile system, only (an odd word to use in this context) a bit more than a third of the citizenry would be killed. That is quite a difference.

To make the difference, the first requirement is a system which will really shoot down incoming missiles. This is quite a trick—it is a bit like hitting one bullet with another bullet. But there is no longer any doubt that the trick can be done.

The Army and the Air Force have been playing games with each other in the Kwajalein Island area, and these games have proved beyond question that an antimissile missile really can shoot down an incoming intercontinental missile. They have proved that a mature missile defense, with all its fantastic complex of computers, radar, and missiles, could indeed destroy a very high proportion of incoming missiles before they reached their target—if the radar could first sort out the real missiles from the fake missiles.

"Interception isn't the problem any more," says one expert. "The problem is discrimination." There are all sorts of tricks for fooling the radar-computer system of the defense, from dropping "chaff," or metal strips, to create confusing blips on the radar screen, to attaching "dinosaur wings" to the missile to make its trajectory unpredictable. But even the problem of discrimination can be solved, the experts believe, if enough money is spent.

But is it worth spending billions of dollars to solve the problem? The more you examine that question, the more eerily unanswerable it seems. In the first place, as McNamara has pointed out, an antimissile missile system is not worth having unless it is married to an adequate shelter program. There are two reasons why this is so.

First, an A-ICBM like Nike X has a nuclear warhead. The warhead is designed to explode in the atmosphere, which creates radioactive fallout. It would not be very useful to fire hundreds or even thousands of such missiles, knocking out a high proportion of enemy missiles, if it meant killing by radiation millions of your own people.

Second, the enemy, instead of aiming at the defended cities, might aim at the undefended open spaces. To kill the people of Chicago, it is not necessary to hit the city—a big thermonuclear weapon exploded several hundred miles upwind of Chicago could kill every Chicagoan not protected from radiation. So a lot of the $25 billion in the biggest McNamara estimate would go for radiation shelters.

But, some scientists ask, what good is it to protect people in shelters if they are going to die anyway when they emerge from the shelters? Here we come to those stockpiled birds. Secretary McNamara's precise figures were produced by feeding certain "quantifiable" assumptions—weight of attack, concentration of population, defensive kill rate, degree of sheltering—into a computer, and then reading off the answers. But the scientists point out that there are some factors in this terrible equation which are simply not quantifiable.

Take those birds. Dr. Barry Commoner of Washington University points out that birds are about 10 times as sensitive to radiation as most insects (of course, the creeping, undercover insects, like cockroaches, would also have shelter). The humans might be in their shelters during a nuclear exchange, but the birds wouldn't be. The birds would die, the insects would survive, and the "ecological balance," or chain of life, would be upset. With no birds to control them, the insects would multiply at a cancerous rate, and the humans would emerge from their shelters to find their crops and food supplies consumed. Having escaped a new-fashioned death by radiation, they would die an old-fashioned death by starvation.

Of course, the birds serve only to illustrate the problem. The heart of the problem is this: Some animals and plants are a lot more vulnerable to radiation than others. (Pine trees, for example, are much more vulnerable than deciduous trees.) Thus a major nuclear attack, quite apart from blast and fire damage, might render a whole continent, even a whole world, uninhabitable, simply by upsetting the ecological balance.

There are other problems which are not quantifiable, like the danger of floods resulting from the destruction of ground cover, the danger of strontium 90 and other death-dealing radiation in foodstuffs, the danger of epidemics resulting from the breakdown of medical services. There is even, according to a Hudson Institute study, some danger of another ice age resulting from a very big nuclear exchange. A catastrophic climactic change could result from the global dust cloud, obscuring the sun, thrown up by the explosion of thousands of bombs.

All this sounds macabre to the point of lunacy. But these are serious matters, which serious men must seriously debate behind the closed doors where the vital decisions are made. As all this suggests, some scientists contend passionately that even Secretary McNamara's blood-chilling quantification of the fatalities resulting from a major nuclear exchange is very low. In any case, McNamara has surely been eternally right in rejecting the idiot theory of the "bigger bang for a buck"—the notion that the nuclear weapon is a nice, cheap substitute for all other forms of defense.

The plain fact is that resort to nuclear war is in itself an act of total despair and utter irrationality—and yet we must somehow convince our adversaries, and our allies too, that we will commit this act of madness if we are left no choice. Meanwhile, there may be some consolation in Winston Churchill's remark, at the beginning of the atomic age: "I sometimes have the awed thought that when everyone can kill everyone else, no one will want to kill anyone at all."

The Payments Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the Washington Post this morning, there appeared a very able editorial on our balance-of-payments situation.

The principal point of the editorial is that there is a great likelihood that our balance-of-payments position in the current year will very likely deteriorate, partly because of the growing expenses of the Vietnamese war, and partly because of our declining trade surplus.

To an important degree, however, the unfavorable outlook of our balance of payments, the Washington Post editorial points out, is due to unwise Government policies, principally the interest equalization tax and the "voluntary controls" on direct investment and bank loans to foreign borrowers. I agree with the vital point of the editorial:

> Those programs are conducted on the assumption that it is somehow possible to isolate the trade account from the capital account in the balance of payments. But the facts suggest that there are close links between exports of dollars, and exports of goods and services. Those links, as well as the Vietnamese war, may block "the march toward equilibrium in 1966."

In my statements on this issue over the years, I have tried to make these very same points. We ignore this rather elementary principle only at our gravest peril.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 18, 1966]

THE PAYMENTS OUTLOOK

Although the improvement in the U.S. balance-of-payments position was greater in 1965 than in any year since 1957, Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler has wisely refrained from raising expectations of comparable progress in 1966. This intensification of the Vietnamese war is the most obvious cause for an increased dollar outflow. But unfavorable economic factors, notably a faster rate of growth in this country than elsewhere in the industrialized world, and unwise Government policies, should not be ignored.

According to Secretary Fowler's estimates, the Vietnamese war added $250 million to the dollar outflow in 1965 and is likely to add $700 million in 1966. Because of well-established business links, a substantial portion of that dollar outflow may find its way into the coffers of the Bank of France, where it can be used to make further purchases of gold from the U.S. Treasury.

Yet it is the trade balance rather than Government spending abroad that may cause the greatest trouble in 1966. Between 1964 and 1965 the trade surplus—merchandise exports less merchandise imports—dropped from $6.7 to $4.8 billion principally because imports grew faster than exports. In 1966, it is hoped that the trade surplus will rise to $6 billion. But there are forces at work which render it unlikely that that expectation will be realized.

So long as the U.S. economy grows faster than those of other advanced countries, its trade position is likely to deteriorate. The rapid rate of income growth in this country will increase the demand for imports, and with booming domestic markets and tightness on the supply side the incentive to export will diminish. Slower income growth in other countries will dampen the demand for imports from the United States while excess capacity, slackness on the supply side, should make it possible for them to expand exports.

Although the charge will be denied, these unfavorable trends are being reinforced, not mitigated by the interest equalization tax and the "voluntary" controls on direct investment and bank loans to foreign borrowers. Those programs are conducted on the assumption that it is somehow possible to isolate the trade account from the capital account in the balance of payments. But the fact suggest that there are close links between exports of dollars and exports of goods and services. Those links, as well as the Vietnamese war, may block "the march toward equilibrium in 1966."

Fiscal Planning for an Urban Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that our large urban communities in the United States must give more attention to the problems of fiscal planning. Schools, hospitals, private agencies, and local governmental units must find new ways of meeting the costs of serving the public.

With the assistance of a demonstration grant from the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, and matching funds provided by the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust, a 3-year study has been carried out in the Pittsburgh area. I think other Members of the Congress, as I have, may find the report on this study highly instructive. It gives me particular pleasure to note that the very able new Under Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Dr. Robert C. Wood, was a special consultant to the agencies which carried out this study.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an explanation of the report at this point in the RECORD:

Further action toward development of a countywide system of fiscal planning practices has been urged by the redevelopment agencies of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.

Robert B. Pease, executive director of the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh, and Sherwood Pine, executive director of the Redevelopment Authority of Allegheny County, said in a joint statement:

"It is quite clear that schools, hospitals, private agencies and local governmental units throughout Allegheny County must take decisive steps soon to meet the mounting costs of serving the public.

"But they need to act cooperatively and in relation to each other if they are to keep abreast of the expanding demands for more and better community services. Together, they must find a way of coordinating and budgeting of funds for community improvement and services."

The statement was issued in connection with their announcement that a 100-page report on public finance in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County has been published in full and is available for general distribution.

The report, titled "Fiscal Planning for an Urban Community," was based on a 3-year study made by the Economy League staff under sponsorship of the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh, and the Redevelopment Authority of Allegheny County.

Dr. Robert C. Wood, recently appointed Under Secretary of the new U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, served as special consultant to the two redevelopment authorities in developing the study.

The research study and publication of the book presenting its findings were financed through a demonstration grant from the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, with one-third local matching funds provided by the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust.

Mr. Pease pointed out that:

1. The Fiscal Study, covering the 1957–61 period, predicted an overall community service deficit of nearly $150 million by 1967.

2. Budgetary trends of the past 4 years in both private and governmental fields of community service show a continuation of 1957–61 trends and sustain the study's deficit projection.

The following financing developments of recent years were cited as major examples:

Average tuition rates of five Pittsburgh universities and colleges have increased by 48 percent in 4 years.

While hospital costs generally have increased at a somewhat lower rate than in the 1957–61 period, the Blue Cross hospitalization benefit program has required two rate increases in 4 years, the second of which becomes effective next month.

Since 1961, 92 communities in Allegheny County have found it necessary to increase real estate millage for school purposes, even though State appropriations to school districts have been substantially expanded.

The city of Pittsburgh School District has received an additional allocation of State funds which, when fully effective, will be equal to more than 7 mills on city real estate, thus forestalling a tax rate boost.

The city of Pittsburgh municipal government, for the current year, has raised real estate taxes 1 mill and water rates 20 percent to obtain $5 million in essential revenues. Since 1961, the city has also increased revenue by adding parking and occupation taxes, though eliminating the wholesale tax.

Of the 128 suburban municipalities of Allegheny County, 14 have raised real estate levies since 1961. Many others were able to hold the line on real estate taxes only because they continue to realize an increasing return from earned income (wage) taxes.

In addition, Federal and State grants to local operating budgets (excluding highway funds and programs not financed by current budgets, such as urban renewal) increased from $370,000 in 1961 to $2,597,000 by 1964, as reported by the Department of Internal Affairs.

The most critical budget problems, according to Mr. Pease and Mr. Pine, continue to be those affecting universities and colleges, which the fiscal study analyzed as the fastest growing field of community service in terms of financial requirements.

The severity of these problems, they added, has been vividly brought home by the University of Pittsburgh's $19 million deficit, which led to an emergency State appropriation and in recent weeks a move toward State-related status for continuing appropriations.

While the plight of other local institutions of higher education is not as critical, they have been forced to raise tuition fees in order to operate within their financial limitations.

"All Pittsburgh colleges and universities are under the same kind of economic pressures, which in the future will expand, not abate," the statement said.

"All Pittsburgh schools of higher learning must be given priority consideration in any overall fiscal planning."

Mr. Pease said two major steps have been taken to implement some of the chief recommendations of the fiscal study, as presented in preliminary form at a 3-day conference of the Allegheny seminar early last fall.

In the first action, the Allegheny seminar agreed to expand its participating membership to include private community service agencies together with representatives of the educational field, both public and private.

As a result, the Health and Welfare Association, Hospital Planning Association, Catholic Diocesan School Board, Pittsburgh colleges and universities, and local foundations have accepted the seminar's invitation to become participating members.

Secondly, at the request of the Allegheny seminary, the Pennsylvania Economy League will continue to collect data and make financial projections for the seminar.

Within the near future, the league staff will begin research activities to bring the published fiscal planning report up to date, according to Howard B. Stewart, director of the Economy League's western division.

Tougher Diplomacy Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1966

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Alice Widener, the highly skilled writer and political analyst, has written a thought-provoking article on some of the weaknesses in our foreign policy. This column, entitled "Needed by United States—Tougher Diplomacy," was published in the Shreveport Journal, a Shreveport-Bossier City, La., newspaper, as well as a number of other newspapers throughout the country, on February 7. Since it so fully describes discrepancies in our dealings with allies who ought to be giving us their full support at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED BY UNITED STATES—TOUGHER DIPLOMACY

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—In a recent television debate on our Vietnam policy, Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, called for a tougher approach to our overall diplomacy, an approach that would result in some more equitable arrangements.

For much too long, indeed since 1945, the United States has been the main giver in international affairs. Scores of other nations, including our principal allies, have been the takers. While expecting us to be generous, idealistic and self-sacrificing, they feel entirely free to be selfish, realistic and demanding. Their attitude is not based on the concept that Americans are morally better than other people; mainly, it is based on the concept that since we are richest and strongest we should be the targets of soak-the-rich strategy and tactics.

In 1945, our main allies were victorious but economically almost prostrate. In contrast to other victorious nations in other wars, they could not enrich themselves through seizure of booty because the vanquished nations were devastated and bankrupt.

At the end of World War II, in contrast with the end of World War I, there was no talk of long-term reparations. In Germany, the Russians seized all the factories, machinery and movable assets possible. But the British, French and Americans did not loot the German territory. Nor did the United States loot Japan.

From 1945 until the Marshall plan was ended, we Americans gave billions upon billions of dollars to the nations of West Europe and to Great Britain. Long after their prosperity was restored, we continued to look on them as near-destitute welfare clients.

In 1958, during a trip through West Europe, I reported it was "rich, prosperous, and fully recovered from the war." In their dealings with us, however, most West Europeans and the British continued to talk "poor mouth." Also, they were not above blackmailing us with threats of making deals with and concessions to their common enemy, the Russian Communist regime.

In deference to our West European allies and to Britain, and also to minority pressures at home, we foolishly acceded to the disarmament of West Germany, the only force the Russians really are scared of.

We also foolishly disarmed Japan, the only Asian nation capable of effectively opposing the Red Chinese. During the years we enjoyed a monopoly of nuclear weapons and could force solution of various problems by exercise of tough diplomacy, we refrained from throwing our real weight around and permitted the Soviet Union to trick us into inaction by peace propaganda until it could create a powerful nuclear force.

It is undeniably true that we weakened our European and British allies by supporting the Socialists' and Communists' decolonization policy. It also is true that European and British Socialists and Communists had just as much to do with the decolonialization as we, perhaps much more. Today, though, all the former colonial nations are worse off than they were before World War II.

Be all that as it may, the United States abandoned for 21 years virtually all effort at getting any quid pro quo in its international dealings. Instead of forcing a showdown on whether the nations do or don't wish to have a United Nations organization, we have borne an entirely disproportionate share of the cost in all U.N. undertakings—political, social, economic and humanitarian. While we register mild, smiling objections, the British sell whatever they please to Red Cuba, but demand we enforce sanctions against Rhodesia.

While we buy an enormous amount of French manufactures and spend millions of tourist dollars in France, we tolerate without strong protest the anti-American defamation campaign conducted by the French Government in the offices of the Quai d'Orsay.

While we feed one out of every three Indians, we sit back and permit the leaders of the Government of India to carry on an anti-American, neutral-to-the-left foreign policy.

For years and years, we Americans permitted ourselves to become patsies for aid without strings attached to nearly a hundred nations. What this propaganda really means is the demand that we put up and shut up. While we put up for Tito of Yugoslavia, he uses both our dollars and food in pursuit of his own devious Communist policies. While we put up money and food in Egypt, Nasser conducts intrigues with our worst enemies.

Benefits of National Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary of our National Aeronautics and Space Council is without doubt the best salesman this country has ever had insofar as our space program is concerned. He has an uncanny ability to reduce the technical aspects of this intricate program into language understandable by the layman and place it in a perspective so that even an outspoken critic has difficulty in arguing against it.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the text of Dr. Welsh's remarks before the Twin Cities section of the AIAA at St. Paul, Minn.

BENEFITS OF THE NATIONAL SPACE PROGRAM

(Address by Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council, before the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Twin Cities section, St. Paul, Minn., February 14, 1966)

At the request of your distinguished Congressman and my good friend Joe Karth, I agreed to brave the anticipated cool weather of this time of year in your great metropolis and talk with you about the benefits of the national space program. I am confident that a group such as this is well informed about space projects and the many scientific, engineering, and managerial complexities which combine to make them successful. However, you have a great responsibility in addition to that of understanding or even performing space technology. You should join in the job of explaining to the general public—to the general taxpayer—why we should be investing so much in the space program. Consequently, I chose to review with you today some of the more important reasons for our national drive to attain space competence.

While I would make the statement anywhere, it seems particularly appropriate for me to point out here that one of the major forces which makes our space activities so beneficial to the Nation is that it has a Joe Karth devoting his very considerable talents to the program. As I am sure you all know, he is one of the very best in the business and is recognized as such by those fortunate enough to associate with him in Washington.

In fact, Minnesota has made some tremendous contributions to the space success of this Nation. On the Senate side of the Congress, the space committee there has been immeasurably strengthened by the addition of Walter Mondale. And, I know I need not remind you that our Vice President is the Chairman of the Council which advises and assists the President across the board on space and aeronautics matters. Hubert Humphrey is so able, so knowledgeable, so energetic, and so personable that I would be almost certain to understate the case if I started to talk about him.

I have already referred to the national space program and perhaps it would be well if I explained what I mean when I call it that. All the industrial, academic, and governmental resources devoted to space activities combine to make up the national effort. This includes the research, the development, and the operations of NASA, the Department of Defense, the AEC, the Weather Bureau, as well as other agencies. It is the efficient employment of all our space assets which has enabled us to overcome so much of the great headstart the Soviets were permitted to obtain over us. No one agency of the Government, no one company, and no one group of experts has a monopoly on our space capability. It is a national resource, which can be used for the peace and progress of mankind.

I would now like to refer briefly to some of the major benefits which are flowing and will in the future flow in even greater numbers from the national space program.

ECONOMIC

I mention the broad economic contributions first in order to help clear up misunderstandings which sometimes exist. At the outset then, we should make it clear that space activity is productive and creative. Some of our most valuable resources, such as skilled manpower and modern facilities, are at work producing, creating, doing. Most of these resources represent investments by taxpayers. These investments are in turn paid out in the form of wages, salaries, and profits to people throughout the whole country.

It should not be necessary for me to point out, but I will do so anyway, that all of the U.S. space money is spent here on earth rather than out on the moon or some other heavenly body—despite careless assertions to the contrary—and almost all of it is spent right here in the United States. Some people would have you believe that space budgets are funds which just disappear or are wasted. The opposite is true.

Space money stimulates the economy with a multiplier effect, at the retail store as well as at the steel mill and the aerospace plant. Some of the money goes through the process of salaries and dividends into savings accounts and stocks and bonds; some goes through the process to purchase clothes or finance college educations; some goes to build new laboratories, new facilities of all types—to increase our country's productivity. Practically all of it goes to broaden the base and increase the size of our gross national product and, in so doing, to lessen not the size but the burden of taxation. A major economic aspect of the space program is that it develops methods, techniques, and procedures which can increase the efficiency of much of our Nation's business.

What I have just said is probably rather obvious and elementary. In a sense, it adds up to the fact that the space program is similar to other productive activity in our society, but perhaps more so.

INNOVATIONS

Having pinned the "productivity" label on space business, we might pause to identify a few things that it produces. I could summarize by saying that it produces progress through the development of new materials, new products, improved services, new productive processes, and more effective managerial techniques. But let's be just a little more specific.

In the field of medicine alone, the benefits are impressive. Medical instrumentation, improved as a result of electronic applications from the space program, are beginning to revolutionize the equipment of clinics, hospitals, and doctors' offices. For the first time, healthy—impressively healthy—individuals, the astronauts, have been studied thoroughly under a variety of adverse or hostile conditions. The resultant addition to medical knowledge is considerable.

Other direct benefits come in the form of such important services as wideband transoceanic communications, global weather reporting and forecasting, improved forest fire fire detection, and high accuracy navigation. Or, we might note many improvements and developments in metals, alloys, ceramics and other materials, with great potential for improving our standard of living. And I can go on with such useful things as accelerated use of liquid oxygen in steelmaking, new coatings for temperature control of buildings, detergent filters, and fantastic strides in more effective, more reliable, and more compact electronic equipment.

Separate and increasing attention is being given to the application of space developed methods, managerial techniques, systems engineering, and other innovations to solving or at least to help solve near-space problems in this complex society. The range of problems to which aerospace experience looks promising is indeed wide, stretching from air pollution, traffic congestion, garbage disposal, to the elimination of many other ills of city living.

There are those, of course, who say such benefits as I have here mentioned are greatly exaggerated or would have come along anyway. The skeptics do, however, find it increasingly difficult to play the ostrich act and pretend these benefits from space technology just aren't there.

Remember this is a young—a very young—program and it is already producing or promising manifold benefits, some of which are material and measurable and some are not. I might say somewhat parenthetically that I find myself at odds with those self-appointed critics who discount the importance of our space program because they cannot measure precisely in quantitative terms many of the benefits flowing therefrom. Actually, there are few more blind than those who believe only those things exist which can be measured and weighed and packaged. Such a state of mind points to the inadequacy of the measurer and not to the nonexistence of the benefits. But, let us move along, as there are more categories of benefits to mention.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The maintenance of our democracy and of our private enterprise system requires that we be strong in our ability to defend ourselves. More than that; it requires that everyone should know that we will use that strength in response to aggression and that we will not use it for aggression against others. The national space program makes important contributions to this state of national security.

Keep in mind that by law and by policy all of our space activities are to be directed to peaceful objectives. And surely no activity is more peaceful in effect than that which discourages war.

Alertness on our part and awareness by others of the certainty of a prompt response to aggression discourage war. Our peaceful application of space competence to national security takes such forms as support for our terrestrial Armed Forces in better communications, more accurate knowledge of weather, more effective mapping, earlier warning of impending dangers, knowledge of nuclear explosions in space or in the atmosphere, etc. In addition to the direct national security advantages from space competence, the Nation is also strengthened through our large investment in modern facilities, in experience, and in trained personnel which can be devoted to a wide variety of purposes as we seek peace.

EDUCATION

In at least three different ways the space program has shown major benefits for education. First of all, the obvious: it has added immeasurably to the total available knowledge of man, of the earth, and of the solar system. Second, funds have flowed from NASA, for example, to our educational institutions in the form of scholarships and fellowships, in the form of new laboratories, and research opportunities.

It is estimated that from this one source about 1,000 new Ph. D.'s are added annually to this resource of the Nation. And third, the space program has been a catalyst and a stimulus to education throughout the whole country. It has encouraged young people, particularly in science and engineering, but also in other fields as well.

In a short period of time, the space program has given more impetus to improved education than has almost any other major activity. In fact, the space program can properly be called the "antidropout" program.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Some people tend to minimize the international prestige benefit resulting from our national space program. Maybe it is just the term "prestige" which offends. In any event, we should be concerned with the impression people of other countries have of the United States. We gain from a "prestige image." The ideal picture is that of a Nation of vitality and strength in ideas, in technology, in freedom, in standards of living, in education, in opportunity, and in objectives for peace.

The space program, effectively and imaginatively conducted, contributes positively to such an international picture. Currently, we are cooperating in some aspect of space performance with some 70 countries around the world. Our astronauts carry exciting information about their country and its space program to distant lands.

All too few in this country are aware of what a successful job the USIA is doing in distributing the truth about our space achievements throughout the globe. Our handling of exciting portions of our space program out in the open for all to see has done much to give an excellent impression of our democratic system. In fact, few activities of the United States have reflected as favorably on our great Nation as has the space program.

CONCLUSION

The national space program is a seedbed of invention, a spur to our economy, a source of insurance for our safety, a stimulus to education, and a worldwide ambassador for peace. Let us support this dynamic effort and give it full credit for the healthy impact it is having on our great Nation.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, today we join with freedom-loving people everywhere in commemorating the 48th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. On February 16, 1918, Lithuania was able to proclaim its independence following more than a century of subjugation by czarist Russia. Unfortunately, their freedom was short lived, and after an all-too-brief 22 years of independence, the country of Lithuania again fell under the yoke of Soviet oppression.

The Lithuanian people, however, fervently remember the glorious period when they were masters of their own fate and able to breathe deep of the fresh air of freedom. Although they remain oppressed by the totalitarianism of Soviet communism the Lithuanian people are silently resolute and determined to regain their independence no matter how difficult or long the struggle may be.

Having engaged in a similar struggle to gain our independence, we have a common bond with the Lithuanians and on this symbolic occasion we voice our hope that this small but valiant country will once more be victorious in the battle for self-determination and independence. It, of course, will not be easy, but there have been victories against longer odds in the pages of history.

Cooperative Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we will hear increasingly in the days ahead from skeptics who will speak scoffingly of programs that attempt to alleviate the problems of other countries. It will be said, and in some respects demonstrated, that our demands at home and the urgencies of Vietnam, preclude a continuing effort in foreign assistance.

May I point out a source of strength and a potential for multiplying our performance which has so far not been widely acknowledged? The people we have helped are now in a position to themselves assume some of the burdens of improving world conditions. We have for some time been urging greater participation in this great calling from our European allies. Let us not disregard the emerging capabilities of our friends in the Pacific community.

The free Chinese of Taiwan are now extending technical assistance to 20 nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The effectiveness of these technicians freshly recruited from the ranks of a country just beginning to realize the benefits of adapting to newer methods and improvements, cannot be underestimated. The underdeveloped nations which must be encouraged to stretch into the mainstream of modern industrialization can relate far more readily to those who have just gone through the experience of the major shift than they can relate to the arrived giant, America.

We can magnify at least fivefold the effectiveness of our dollars in the foreign assistance field by cooperating with technical assistance programs from Taiwan, Korea, Japan, and the Philippines whenever, and to the degree, it is possible and feasible. In my view, Mr. Speaker, it is the next logical step in the evolution of our international aid programs. At the same time it can answer positively the carping critics who maintain we cannot solve all the world's ills alone. The answer is clear. We are not alone, and we need not be alone. Let us commence a dynamic program of cooperative effort. Not only, mind you, from the most advanced countries to the least advanced, but from the more developed areas to the less developed areas. Free China has given us a classic showcase that should be duplicated and expanded.

Ribicoff Safety Bill Has Vast Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, February 17, the columnist, James J. Kilpatrick, focused attention upon the excellent highway safety proposals made by the able Senator from my State, the Honorable ABRAHAM RIBICOFF. I call the attention of the House to this perceptive article.

RIBICOFF ROAD SAFETY BILL HAILED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Well, sir, it sounds an awful lot like heresy in the ranks of the States rights religion, but the avowal has to be made. Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF's bill to create a National Highway Traffic Safety Center ranks among the finest pieces of domestic legislation now pending in the Congress. The bill offered by the Connecticut Democrat should be passed.

It may seem incredible for a card-carrying conservative to speak in this unseemly fashion of the Ribicoff bill. After all, the measure numbers among its sponsors such certified liberals as CLARK, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, MCGEE, MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and KENNEDY of New York. The bill would create one more program of Federal grants-in-aid, to be added to the 120 such programs already channeling $12 billion a year back to the subvervient States. One section of the proposed act would involve an educational "frill." On the face of it, the bill bears all the aspects of legislation we could get along without.

Yet in point of fact, the wonder is that Congress has waited so long to tackle the prodigious problems of highway safety; and the puzzling thing is that the people themselves have applied no pressure for congressional action.

Surely, if there had been and disposition in the Congress to act, a solid constitutional basis could have been laid long ago for Federal action in the field. The power to regulate commerce among the States plainly could be invoked to justify sweeping Federal regulation of our highways. Yet the Congress seldom has concerned itself with highway safety as such. A House committee conducted certain hearings in 1959, issued a largely unread report in 1961, and came up 2 years ago with Public Law 88–515, prescribing certain safety standards for motor vehicles purchased by the Government. Apart from a few small grants for research, that has been the size of the Federal interest.

A stoic and indifferent public has not asked for anything more. The American character, strange to say, seems almost averse to safety regulations. When the automobile comes in, reason departs; and the otherwise rational fellow succumbs to the automotive obsession. His mind blots out the unlovely aspects of his love—the cost, the fumes, the accident statistics. As an abstract proposition, highway safety may have some appeal. In terms of specifics, highway safety is a bore. The subject leaves him numb. He is deaf to the grisly facts.

Just a few days ago, while RIBICOFF was holding hearings on his bill, the annual report for 1965 came in from the National Safety Council. Highway accidents last year killed 49,000 persons, seriously injured 1.8 million more, and caused economic losses of $8.5 billion. These are staggering figures. But who is staggered by them? To judge from congressional mail, the public is far more concerned about the slaughter of steers. It is page 1 news when three soldiers die of meningitis, but it is ho-hum when nearly a thousand human beings are brought home dead off the highways every week.

RIBICOFF is determined to break through this stone wall of indifference. As one of Connecticut's most able Governors, he made highway safety a personal crusade. Through research, education, stringent laws and firm enforcement, he got spectacular results. Some of these same approaches are embodied in his bill.

One part of the bill would create a National Highway Traffic Safety Center, equipped to conduct major programs of research and engineering. Out of these studies would come certain national minimum standards for highway traffic safety. The assumption is that eventually these standards would be applied to the design of automobiles, the engineering of highways, the fixing of speed limits, and the training and licensing of drivers.

A second part, of the bill would provide incentive grants to the States, amounting to perhaps $105 million a year, to finance new or expanded programs of vehicle inspection and of driver training in the schools. It is not out of the question to imagine a day of Federal standards for operator's permits. Speeding on a Federal-aid highway may yet become a Federal offense, subject to trial in Federal courts. Convictions may be federally recorded as a factor in the fixing of punishment or the suspension of permits across the Nation.

Nothing so drastic may develop, for much can be accomplished by the auto manufacturers and by the States. Significantly General Motors will make collapsible steering wheels a standard feature on its 1967 models. Other design changes, aimed solely at safety, doubtless can be achieved by indirect means instead of by compulsion. RIBICOFF's bill is a moderate bill, limited in scope but of vast potential value. It merits more favorable attention than it has received from motorists thus far.

We Are Overcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the gremlins are loose again and this time they have joined the civil rights movement—at the expense of the overburdened and usually infallible corps of proofreaders in the Government Printing Office.

On the other hand, I may have uncovered a new style of subversive activity designed to unnerve both sides in the current struggle for equal rights. It may be that the Committee on Un-American Activities should consider placing this matter on its agenda for investigation when it has completed its current work on the Ku Klux Klan.

At any rate, you can understand my surprise and dismay when I looked in the 1966 Congressional Directory table of contents to find the page on which the Civil Rights Commission is listed. I was directed to turn to page 84. I was shocked, Mr. Speaker, to discover that page 84 contains the biographical listing of the Mississippi delegation.

What About the Draft and the Athletes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, of recent weeks a considerable number of words have been spoken on the question of athletes and the draft. Just this week boxer Cassius Clay has been reclassified. It seems to me an unnecessary amount of confusion surrounds this question. I agree with a recent editorial in the New Haven, Conn., Register, that asks for a policy decision and the clarification of this question. I ask the Members to take note.

A MEASURE TO DRAFT NAMATH, CASSIUS CLAY

A Florida Congressman, acting on the protest of a father who objected to the drafting of his son when Joe Namath and Cassius Clay remained draft-proof, has sponsored a bill that would permit the drafting of the Jet football star and the heavyweight champion. The Defense Department is reported as endorsing it. One may be sure that it will draw substantial public endorsement as well. Equally, one may be sure that it will be a center for extensive pro and con public debate.

In our opinion such a bill should not be necessary. Joe Namath and Cassius Clay should not be in the Armed Forces just because they are listed among the Nation's athletic greats. But, by the same token, they should not be exempt from such service because of who they are.

If it is honestly demonstrated that Joe Namath and Cassius Clay are physically and mentally capable of serving, no matter how the extent of that service might be limited they should be in uniform—pronto. But if the contrary is demonstrated, honestly and beyond points of dispute, then all this fuss and furor should be terminated.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Address of Hon. William H. Avery to Committee on the World Food Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1965, the Honorable William H. Avery, Governor of Kansas, made some interesting observations at the organizational meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis. The meeting was held in Washington, D.C., where, I might add, Governor Avery was very much at home, having served in the Congress of the United States from 1954 through 1964. I believe the Members of Congress and others who regularly read the RECORD will benefit from a reading of Governor Avery's remarks:

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY, GOVERNOR OF KANSAS, TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS, WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 9, 1965

I am honored to represent the middle west agricultural area at the organizational meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis.

After reviewing the background of the distinguished speakers on the program today, it seemed most appropriate that I should confine my remarks to the economics of the producers' viewpoint. By thus proceeding, I will defer to the other speakers the philosophical questions, particularly as they relate to moral questions and the relationship of this proposed program to foreign policy and peace crusade.

It is self-evident that before we proceed to any great extent in this discussion today, or in a similar exploration later, some stipulations must be set out.

First, are we merely discussing an accelerated distribution plan for our present food stocks, or, are we planing full utilization and employment of our total agricultural resources?

Second, speaking as one representative from the great food-producing region of this Nation, I feel we must consider the element of agricultural prices to the producer, if we are considering the full utilization of our agricultural plant.

Referring back to the first question, it is apparent that if we are merely considering the accelerated distribution of our present stocks, there isn't very much to talk about.

Due to the greater implementation of the principle of the soil bank program in the present farm program, accelerated sales under Public Law 480, and the intensified effort for dollar sales by both Government and producer organizations, our stock of cereal grains is down to about one-third of the all-time high commodity inventory that was reached in 1961.

Our present stock of wheat is less than our domestic needs, even for 1 year.

This reduction has been accomplished under favorable weather conditions. As you can imagine, we are particularly aware of this in Kansas where we produce between 16 and 20 percent each year of the Nation's wheat supply. We have a total storage capacity of nearly 850 million bushels, and this is down to about 20 percent of capacity. I point this out only to reemphasize the fact that it does not seem to me that we can logically approach the question of a food crisis on the basis that we have burdensome surpluses, or that we have any surplus at all.

The stocks of all basic commodities are no longer considered unmanageable, but have been worked down to about what is considered "prudent" for national reserves.

Parenthetically, I would like to remind you that just 20 years ago our wheat stocks were also very low, following World War II. I do not know whether we are on a 20-year cycle, or it is a relationship to the present military conflict, or for what reason that we find ourselves without surplus commodity stocks.

Now, proceeding on to the second premise that we must obviously be considering a greatly accelerated agricultural production rate, I want to make some observations.

You can probably understand, as a representative of the great middle west agricultural area, I would look generally with favor on a higher level of production. This higher level of production would considerably enhance the agricultural income of the region. It is also important to note that regardless of controls or price supports, agricultural commodities are one of the few American products that can be produced at a cost to favorably compete on the world market without a subsidy.

Before the American farmer is committed to any contemplated world food programs, it is my contention that the farmer is entitled to some assurances that he will not be expected to produce for this program at less than a reasonable return for his work and a reasonable return on his investment.

It was demonstrated last month that despite our lower inventory of wheat stock, the Department of Agriculture has sufficient inventory to regulate the open market prices of wheat by volume disposal of Government stocks. As in the more recent case of aluminum, commodity credit has also demonstrated that it could control price, in this instance wheat. With the fact of Government price control accepted as a reality, it seems only reasonable that some understanding be reached as to the price level for this contemplated agricultural production.

These hard, cold economic facts may be a little out of place in a forum such as we have here today, as I presume most of the discussion will revolve around the social and political aspects of the proposed food program. It is my contention that the economic consequences cannot be pushed aside and overlooked. Consider for a moment the factors that will be involved.

The common carrier on water or land has his rates fixed, and therefore would logically favor this production concept, because it translates into more business.

The manufacturers of farm machinery will want to sell more equipment, and probably at increased prices.

The fertilizer industry will favor the program because fertilizer is needed to produce a profitable crop in virtually all regions of the Nation.

Financial interests will be willing to extend credit, as there is every evidence that agriculture is moving into a cycle of the seller's market, and therefore, the loan is a good risk.

With all of these forces favoring an accelerated production program, it is quite possible the farmer could end up on the price structure where every other aspect of the economy would be deriving a full profit and the producer-farmer expected to contribute his resources and labor for the good of the cause.

Under this circumstance, the producer would simply be a vassal of a new system. He will do his part as he always has done, but he should not be expected to acquiesce to a price devise where other segments of the economy receive full profit, and the farmer realizes only the bare, minimum cost of production.

Regardless of price levels or of commodity supplies, there is one pattern that seems to prevail in the market structure of agricultural commodities. This factor is the continual decreased percent of the food dollar that is received by the farmer or the original producer.

In 1960, the farmer was receiving 33.8 percent of every dollar spent for food. By 1964, this had been reduced to 32.3 percent of the food dollar. During this same period the portion of the dollar received by labor remained approximately the same—29.9 percent in 1960 and 29.8 percent in 1964. The percentage for transportation remained about the same. Corporate profits before taxes increased from 3.4 percent in 1960 to 3.8 percent in 1964. Other costs, such as advertising, rent, ad valorem taxes, interests, etc., increased from 25.5 percent in 1960 to 26.8 percent in 1964.

We have had a managed farm economy ever since the Korean War, and yet the farmer's share of the food dollar has been continually decreasing each year.

And finally, I am concerned that we may be inclined to get ourselves committed to a program whose dimensions may explode before it even gets underway. The news media reports increased need for food nearly every day. It seems to me we could do violence to our foreign policy and international image of this Nation, if we inadvertently lead underdeveloped nations to become dependent on our food supply, without some economic and social adjustments made simultaneously within the recipient nations. Just last week Gen. William Draper, chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, stated, "Populations in Asia, Africa and Latin America are losing the race between people and food. In these areas," he pointed out, "populations are increasing by more than 2 percent per year, while the food resources are increasing by 1 percent per year."

I do not consider myself to be an expert in population trends, but I sufficiently understand international politics to appreciate the consequences of building a food pipeline to our own breadbasket, and then suddenly finding it necessary to shut off the pipeline in order to sustain our own domestic population.

I am not too optimistic about any great increase in food production in foreign countries in the immediate future. With all of the admitted technical and scientific progress that has been made in Russia, she has not been able to solve her food supply problem. If that nation cannot solve this seemingly simple problem, how can we expect an underdeveloped, undercapitalized nation to be successful

India has been a generous and proper recipient of United States wheat since 1957. She still receives aprpoximately 600,000 tons each month, mostly under Public Law 480.

A visiting Congressman in India just last week reported, "There will be a tremendous gap between food production and food needs and this gap must be met."

"At the beginning of February, I think we'd have to increase the wheat shipments in order to save our world brothers."

In other words, I think we have a moral obligation in the matter of sharing our food stocks. We have an obligation to ourselves, however, to make certain that our commitments do not outpace our anticipated productivity, with the result that benevolence would bring down our own house.

Partners of the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the associate director of the Partners of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Wade B. Fleetwood, spoke late last month at the annual banquet of the Wyoming Press Association at Casper, Wyo.

Mr. Fleetwood addressed himself to the progress of a partners program in Wyoming and the Brazilian State of Goias under which Wyoming gives direct assistance to the Brazilians.

Mr. Fleetwood described the Partners of the Alliance program as a "happy complement to the Alliance for Progress, the Government-to-Government program involving the common determination of all the republics in this hemisphere to raise living standards and to rally the resources and skills necessary to defeat the common enemies of poverty, ignorance, and disease."

Mr. Fleetwood's speech explains, not only the purpose of the Partners of the Alliance, but the specifics of the program as it affects Wyoming and Goias state in Brazil.

I ask that Mr. Fleetwood's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF WADE B. FLEETWOOD, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE, OF WASHINGTON, D.C., CASPER, WYO., JANUARY 22, 1966

Mr. President, newly elected officers of the Wyoming Press Association, ladies and gentlemen, I'm pleased to be in Wyoming and to have the opportunity to address this banquet meeting of the Wyoming Press Association. I'm grateful to Mr. Wallace Biggs, head of the journalism department at the University of Wyoming in Laramie for making it possible for me to think together for a few minutes with the editors and publishers of this State about the role of Wyoming in the Partners of the Alliance program.

First of all, I come to you as a fellow westerner, born in Oregon, raised and schooled in your neighboring State of Idaho. I'm here at the invitation of your State Partners' chairman to help him and his committee to broaden the base of support for the Partners' program and to interest more groups and organizations in taking an active role in your partnership with the State of Goias in Brazil. It is good to be in the West again. Though the temperature was 14 below when I arrived in Casper a few days ago, I have been warmed not only by the traditional western hospitality that this State always displays but also by the ready response of your diverse citizen organizations to take up the challenge of responsibility in the Partners of the Alliance program. The warmth of both experiences has been very pleasant indeed. Our office in Washington, D.C., is the catalyst that seeks to bring the private community groups here together with private counterpart organizations in your partner State of Goias and we know those peoples in Brazil will be elated with additional support from your citizens.

In these past few days, I have spoken to the Lions Club and Kiwanis Club luncheons in Casper, to the Natrona County Classroom Teachers' meeting here, to the International Relations Club of Natrona County High School and Casper College, to the superintendent of schools and high school and junior high officials in Laramie, to the board of directors of the Wyoming State Board of Education luncheon in Laramie, attended by President Fey of the University of Wyoming, and at sessions with other university officials. Everywhere there was evidence of new blood coming to your statewide Partners' effort with great enthusiasm and determination to respond to self-help activities underway in Goias.

Specifically, the heartening results can be summarized as follows:

1. At the Lions Club luncheon on January 19 in Casper, a visiting Lion from Albuquerque, N. Mex., requested five projects for five Lions Clubs in Albuquerque to assist Wyoming in completing self-help activities in Goias;
2. The Casper Lions, the Casper Midwest Classroom Teachers Association, the Casper Kiwanis Club, the International Relations Clubs of Natrona County High School and Casper College plan to present the Partners program to their executive boards and plan to implement projects;
3. The Kelly Walsh High School Student Council in Casper, the forensics and speech class at the same school, a teacher at a Casper elementary school, a Casper church, the superintendetn of school in Laramie, and the president of the Wyoming Life Underwriters Association have accepted projects to implement;
4. The president of the Board of Directors of the Wyoming State Board of Education, Mr. Tom Stroock, was named to represent the State board of education on the Partners of the Alliance Committee and coordinate educational and cultural exchanges with Goias;
5. The University of Wyoming, upon determination of specific needs, has undertaken to gather lab equipment and technical and scientific books for the University of Goias, to seek additional foreign scholarships, and to consider adding Portuguese to the language department;
6. A Casper theater owner has offered to show films on Goias and send quarterhorse semen to Goias.

I know I will encounter a similar reaction when I go to Cheyenne on Monday and speak at East High School, a general assembly at Central High School, and to the Cheyenne Lions Club luncheon because I am convinced that the people of Wyoming want to participate in a program that honors self-help and makes good sense. The operation of the Partners program in 29 U.S. States and 29 areas of Latin America in 12 Republics is ample proof that direct participation at the grassroots level is not only desired but sought by the poeple of your State and by people from Oregon to Connecticut and from Minnesota to Texas.

You are in good company. Eight other U.S. States are matched State for State in Brazil—Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. Each, in its own way, is representative of their peoples' effort to take a hand in foreign aid. Last year, when your Governor Hansen called a conference in Cheyenne of representatives from service groups, business, labor, education, medical association, and other diverse facets of your State, I had the pleasure of explaining how Wyoming could become a partner in a nationwide program. This initial meeting to launch your Partners program had then and still enjoys the full endorsement and support of the entire Wyoming congressional delegation. I explained that I was glad the meeting was held in the house chamber of the Capitol Building for two reasons: one, had it been held in the senate chamber, I might have been inclined to filibuster, and, second, because the house represents people. The Partners program is a program of, by, and for the people of this State in concert with people in Goias.

I would like to introduce a man who has indicated his willingness to bring the concept of partnership to the grassroots of this State. In Laramie yesterday, the Wyoming Partners of the Alliance Committee selected him as the new State chairman. He is a teacher in Casper at Natrono County High School, a respected citizen and community leader, a man I have counted as my friends for 10 years, Mr. Edwin C. Brennan. He is here tonight. Also, and editors please note, I would call your attention to a first in the national Partners program. Brennan's wife was named by the commitee to serve as executive secretary. I want you to know Mary Nell Brennan. They are both willing and eager to serve this State with dedication and initiative. I submit that they will do an outstanding and highly creditable job toward uniting and coordinating the efforts here so as to cause the program to move forward at a rapid pace.

The Partners program is a happy complement to the Alliance for Progress, the government-to-government program involving the common determination of all the republics in this hemisphere to raise living standards and to rally the resources and skills necessary to defeat the common enemies of poverty, ignorance and disease. The Charter of Punta del Estes that set the Alliance in motion also declares that the energies of all the peoples of the hemisphere be utilized toward this objective.

The overall Alliance program is moving forward and making significant and noteworthy progress. Thousands of teachers are being trained, sewage systems are being completed, potable water has been brought to hundreds of new areas, medical services are being extended, agricultural credit and loans are being made available to increasing numbers and housing is being made ready for new occupants. But it takes time to institute an extension service in rural Latin America, it takes time to train doctors and nurses to help combat disease, it takes time to train teachers to do the basic job in the early grades and it takes time to make credit available to all who need it. Look at the United States. It took time to develop our institutions to reach the people of this country. So it will take time to reach everyone in our hemisphere. And as President Kennedy said in his inaugural address, the United States will assist men and governments for as long as is necessary because it is right. President Johnson announced in his state of the Union address on January 12 that our Government would take new steps to assist the Alliance for Progress.

In the meantime, the Partners program seeks to reach out and touch the man and woman and child in the rural and slum areas of Latin America who are presently practicing self-help until the benefits of the larger economic development programs reach them. The needs of Goias are basic needs. The people need desks and blackboards for their slum and rural schools; medicines and instruments for their health posts and clinics; and pumps and pipe for community wells. They have supplied the labor and materials and have done 70 or 80 or 90 percent of a job but need a boost to complete a job. Since their finances are meager, they can't raise locally the funds to make up the difference between a completed and usable unit and an abandoned project. For $100, $200, or $300, groups and organizations in Wyoming can give the assistance required to help progress. When Wyoming private funds are earmarked for an impact-type project, the people of Goias will know that it is the people of Casper or Laramie or Cody who have reached them.

The Partners program is a two-way street, allowing private groups in Latin America to participate with dignity in true partnership. We expect and are receiving a flow back of benefits from Latin America. We have much to learn from our neighbors in this hemisphere. Costa Rica sent 12 educators to Oregon to help upgrade high school Spanish classes and serve as resource people in social studies. Oregon has gained most from this partnership activity in reverse. An art collection from Venezuela is now touring the galleries in their Partner State of Tennessee. A Brazilian instructor conducted a course in Portuguese in Ohio for Spanish teachers which resulted in new interest in the language in college curriculums.

Each U.S. Partner State is looking to its own Partner in Latin America for areas in which they can be assisted in a real sense with this reverse flow of culture and resources. We were pleased with the chairman of the Iowa Partners Committee when he announced recently that Iowa was "happy to join the traffic" in their two-way street partnership with an area in Mexico.

From the response experienced here in Wyoming these past few days, we feel confident that the people of your State desire to move forward in this program. We sense that they want to reach out to the grassroots of Goias and make telling impact in those rural areas to let their Brazilian partners know that a ground swell of interest and concern has begun here. The people have shown a commendable responsibility in wanting to share their know-how and resources with those who are exhibiting much self-help.

The newspapers of Wyoming were paid a fine compliment by an editorial in the Casper Star-Times yesterday. It said that the papers of this State "became permanent partners in the growth of the areas they served." We know that this is true. It is our hope that your great press will join in supporting the partnership between Wyoming and Goias.

Voting Record of Congressman Wayne L. Hays on Major Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my voting record on major bills to come before the House of Representatives during the 89th Congress to date. I have done this since I have been in Congress and mailed out copies so that my constituents could have a convenient method of checking my record. As voters in the 18th Congressional District they have the right to know how their Congressman represented them in Washington and how I voted on the major issues. The record follows:

How I voted	Issue	Status
Yes	Appalachian Regional Development Act authorizes aid to revive economy of Appalachian region.	Enacted.
Yes	Public Works and Economic Development Act authorizes loans and grants in economically depressed areas.	Enacted.
Yes	Extension of Manpower Development and Training Act for 3 years	Enacted.
Yes	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 authorizes $1,300,000,000 to improve elementary and secondary education.	Enacted.
Yes	Higher Education Act of 1965 authorizing grants for college students with exceptional financial need, fellowships for teachers, and a National Teachers Corps.	Enacted.
Yes	Reduction of excise taxes	Enacted.
Yes	Social Security Act amendments to authorize medicare and 7 percent increase in social security benefits.	Enacted.
Yes	Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 extending public housing, urban renewal, and community facilities laws and authorizing grants to communities for water and sewer facilities.	Enacted.
Yes	Establish a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development.	Enacted.
Yes	Voting Rights Act of 1965 to enforce the 15th amendment	Enacted.
Yes	Abolish national origins quota system in immigration	Enacted.
Yes	Authorize $1,800,000,000 for fiscal 1966 for antipoverty program under Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.	Enacted.
Yes	Federal Water Pollution Control Act to strengthen control over water pollution and increase aid for community sewage projects.	Enacted.
Yes	Establish a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities	Enacted.
Yes	Provide average 10.4 basic pay increase for uniformed military personnel	Enacted.
Yes	Provide 3.6 pay increase for classified, postal, and other Federal employees.	Enacted.
Yes	Increase veterans' disability compensation	Enacted.
Yes	Foreign aid bill providing economic and military assistance	Enacted.
No	Resolution proposing constitutional amendment for Presidential continuity.	Adopted.
Yes	Establish effective controls for depressant and stimulant drugs	Enacted.
Yes	Cold war GI bill	Approved by Congress.
No	Asian Development Bank Act	Passed House.

Safe Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a poem which I think goes a long way toward expressing in rhythm what many think in prose.

The poem is as follows:

SAFE SURRENDER

Is it true, must we surrender;
Are we better "Red than dead?"
What of those who've gone before us,
Who hoped and fought and bled?

Was it not inventive genius,
And the courage of the free;
That built this mighyt Nation,
Gave it then to you and me?

Our leaders talk of war, in years;
Of containment, so they say,
Contain but not to conquer him,
Just keep the foe at bay.

How must our young men feel today,
In the murky jungle deep?
Our bombers not allowed to strike,
The enemy we keep.

Why choose this distant Asian land,
To blood-wash this disease;
While near our shore this enemy.
We coddle and appease?

Disarm. Disarm. appease appease
Our great planners do insist.
The enemy will not attack,
If we cannot resist.

So remove defensive missiles,
Take the bombers from the air;
Yes, limit every phase of war,
To not arouse the Bear?

Let the cream of this great country,
Waste and fight and die betrayed,
With weapons of the ancient past,
Because we are afraid?

Afraid to use the might that's ours,
Win and end this futile strife.
And stop this cancer at its source,
Before it takes our life.

Will our sovereignty surrendered,
And our banner tightly furled;
Loose shackles, foolish cartels placed,
On men throughout the world?

—JACK KANE.

Got Problems? Learn To Share

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, again the master satirist, Mr. Arthur Hoppe, had a very good column in the February 15 San Francisco Chronicle, relative to this Government's position on cigarette smoking.

The column follows:

GOT PROBLEMS? LEARN TO SHARE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

The smooth interworkings of our Government agencies have never been better demonstrated than in the great smoking battle. No informed citizen can deny that in their constant efforts to protect us all these agencies are holding their own.

For years, as you know, the Department of Agriculture has been subsidizing farmers to encourage them to grow more cigarette tobacco. Which was fine until another agency, the Department of Public Health announced that cigarettes probably caused cancer, heart disease, and chronic coreopsis.

An alarmed Congress, concerned with our welfare above all, took the momentous step of ordering warnings printed on all cigarette packages that the coffin nails therein might be bad for us. It then voted continued subsidies to the farmers to go on growing more cigarette tobacco.

But many a smoker, on viewing the warning, cried: "Good heavens. Cigarettes may be bad for me. I never would have thought it." And, naturally, the cigarette industry was gravely concerned.

The dilemma seemed insoluble. But the Department of Agriculture has now stepped into the breech. It's spending $210,000 on a filmed commercial entitled "The World of Pleasure." It's designed to stimulate more cigarette smoking. But that's OK, because we're only going to show it abroad.

The Department says the film will be shown in Japan, Thailand, and Austria as part of a "promotion program to help buffer any damage to American tobacco sales" caused by the cancer scare at home. The Department did not say what the rest of the program consisted of.

Actually, I'm in receipt of another chatty letter from the noted CIA agent, Homer T. Pettibone, Yale 1907, which may shed further light on this interesting new concept:

"I've been in Japan these past few months on loan to our new supersecret EOP Service, old bean," he writes. "That stands for Export Our Problems and I don't mind telling you it's been pretty dreary work—hanging around schoolyards offering these Japanese kids fags.

"Frankly, I didn't care much for it. 'Pssst, kid.' I'd say. 'Want a new thrill? Not a cough in a carload.' And while I realized I was serving my country in the finest traditions of the EOP Service, I never could stand all that coughing and spluttering.

"So when the Chief called me in to offer me a new assignment, I was ready. 'We're giving you a bigger job, Pettibone,' he said. 'Pushing marihuana.'

" 'Marijuana, sir?' says I.

" 'Right, Pettibone,' he says. 'After all, the world supply of marihuana is limited. The more we can get smoked up over here, the less there will be for those beatniks at home. So get out there, for the glory of your country, and hook those kids.'

"Well, I can't tell you what a joy it is to see the way these kids' eyes light up. It shows you the value of sharing, doesn't it? But I must say, I do hope the Chief doesn't take me off marihuana and put me on the heroin detail.

"To tell the truth, the motto of us dedicated agents in the marihuana branch appeals to me most: 'For the good of America, help the world go to pot.' "

Vote on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, Saturday's Washington Post contained an editorial which presents a clearcut statement of the alternatives facing us in Vietnam. I should like to commend the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

VOTE ON VIETNAM

Policies that the United States is pursuing in South Vietnam have emerged out of convictions matured over a generation. They are based on the settled policies of one government after another. They rest legally and constitutionally on the resolutions and appropriations and actions of Congress.

The hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, especially in the testimony of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, have reminded the country of how we arrived at these convictions. They have focused attention on the premises upon which we have acted. They have made clearer the continuity of American policy. They have reminded Congress and the country of the legal and constitutional framework of our policy.

The southeast Asia resolution of August 10, 1964, was inspired by a particular crisis but it did not initiate a new doctrine, depart from precedent, discard any prior commitments, or introduce anything novel in American policy. And it was and is a fair statement of this country's intentions over decades. It said:

"The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

Senators are right to say that Congress did not thereby forfeit its responsibility, but they are not right to attack the Government for not abandoning the policy approved on August 10, 1964. This remains the policy of the United States until, under the terms of the resolution, the President declares the peace of the area secured or the Congress terminates the policy by concurrent resolution.

The appropriate path has been made clear for those who now wish the policy changed. The policy has had an adequate review in the hearings before the committee. Those who dissent from it ought to embrace the invitation of Secretary Rusk to vote. Such a vote could be had by the introduction of a concurrent resolution to terminate the authority which the Congress gave the President 18 months ago.

It will be a grave choice, as Secretary Rusk has pointed out. But the Senate has the duty to make such grave choices. It cannot properly neglect or abdicate its responsibilities and then reproach the executive department for disregarding the Senate's constitutional duty to give its advice and consent on foreign policy. The country will have a right to regard the failure of the committee to now recommend any amendment of the concurrent resolution of August 10 as a solemn reaffirmation of policy.

In broad principle, Congress and the executive spokesmen may not be as far apart as they imagined when the hearings commenced. Resistance to aggression has been a central element of national policy for a long time. As far back as 1946, Senator FULBRIGHT himself pointed out that "a basic principle of our foreign policy must be that there is a point beyond which we cannot, in justice to ourselves and to the civilization of which we are the heir, permit any nation to expand without offering resistance by force."

The general policy has been in effect since the Truman doctrine was proclaimed. Its application to the particular crisis in South Vietnam was affirmed in August 1964. Congress has the power to reaffirm or to change the general policy or the application of that policy in South Vietnam. It should do so, at the end of the Senate hearings, in a manner that eliminates all uncertainty as to the national purpose.

Rural America Must Not Be Shortchanged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Congress should give serious consideration to a statement issued by the National Farmers Union Executive Committee. Rural America must not be shortchanged, as such neglect would have grave consequences so far as our national welfare is concerned.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL FARMERS UNION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING IN DENVER, COLO., FEBRUARY 8, 1966

The Johnson administration's new budget, if put into effect, would be a slap in the face for America's hard working and already disadvantaged farm and ranch families. We fail to see any reasonable justification for the heavy cutbacks in funds for soil conservation, the commodity programs, farm and home loans, rural electrification, vocational agriculture and the land grant college and extension education when a hungry world is crying for food. The slashing of school milk funds is a tragic oversight.

Few people realize most of these moneys, except for agricultural education, are on matching funds or reimbursable lending basis and contribute importantly to the gross national production in addition to adding strength to rural living. Yet these vital functions are being seriously weakened while there has been no such cutback in Federal aid to the big bankers, as the budget shows this interest item for the Federal debt has been set at the astounding level of nearly $13 billion annually.

We call upon Members of Congress to remove these gross deficiencies in the Johnson budget that adversely affect agriculture and:

1. Provide sufficient matching funds to step up the valuable conservation of soil which concerns the future of the Nation.

2. Increase the authorizaion for Farmers Home Administration permitting that agency to go on with the job of making low-cost credit available to undercapitalized rural areas.

3. Put sufficient funds into the price support programs with an upper limit on loans and payments so that larger-than-family farms and city-oriented agribusiness will no longer have an undue advantage over family-type farmers and ranchers and enable the latter to overcome the deficiency of their 77-cent dollar.

4. Appropriate at least $680 million for desperately needed rural electric loans and establish a revolving REA loan program permitting the repeated use of the millions of dollars in advance repayments diligent farm associations are making on their obligations, and to maintain the 2 percent REA interest rate.

5. Make available further public investment for agricultural education and research commensurate with the growing con-

sumer demands of the 20th and 21st centuries.

6. Restore and even increase the public underwriting of the school milk and school lunch programs to permit America's little children to have at least the basic nutrition an affluent society can easily afford.

We respectfully urge Members of Congress and the appropriation committees to correct the social and economic errors of the budget and bring priorities into balance. Anything less gives a phony ring to the much-heralded Great Society.

The statement was signed by the entire National Farmers Union Executive Committee: James G. Patton, president, NFU; Glenn J. Talbott, vice president, NFU; and State Presidents Ed Smith, North Dakota, chairman; Leonard Kenfield, Montana, vice chairman; Edwin Christianson, Minnesota; Ben Radcliffe, South Dakota; Gilbert Rhode, Wisconsin; George Stone, Oklahoma; and Lail Schmidt, Rocky Mountain (Colorado-Wyoming-New Mexico).

Gulf Coast Shrimp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr Speaker, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior put out a fancy news release the other day announcing that "Americans are eating more shrimp than ever before."

It says that on a per capita basis Americans are eating about 75 percent more shrimp now than in the years just after World War II. The release goes on to say that "there appears to be no single answer to why Americans are consuming more shrimp."

Perhaps it is true that there is no single answer. But surely there is one fact that makes up a big part of the answer. The reason is that much of the shrimp comes from the wonderful waters of the Gulf of Mexico, caught by the highly competent seafaring men operating out of the ports along the coast of southwest Alabama.

The people engaged in shrimping and in related activities along the gulf coast are hard-working, imaginative people who are making real contributions to the improved quality of shrimp which consumers all over the Nation are coming more and more to know and enjoy.

I want to join in recognition of the growing shrimp industry and to highlight the fact that southwest Alabama shrimpers are a major part of this growth.

Shrimp is a delicious food. People everywhere enjoy this delightful repast frequently, and it has never been better than today.

The text of the Fish and Wildlife Service release follows:

SHRIMP DISHES GROW IN POPULARITY

The Department of the Interior's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries reports that Americans are eating more shrimp than ever before. Total consumption in 1965 is estimated at 323 million pounds, compared with 299 million pounds in 1964.

On a per capita basis, the Bureau reports, Americans are eating about 75 percent more shrimp than in the years immediately following World War II.

The Bureau says there appears to be no single answer to why Americans are consuming more shrimp, but rising purchasing power, growing consumer preference, development of new products, wider distribution, improvement in quality, and increased product promotion have all been contributing factors.

The domestic shrimp industry is primarily in the Gulf States. The United States also imports large quantities of shrimp. Mexico and other Latin American countries, along with India, have been supplying increasing quantities in recent years.

"John F. Kennedy on Education"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the impending publication of a new volume entitled "John F. Kennedy on Education" compiled and edited by William T. O'Hara, now assistant dean of the University of Connecticut School of Law. The volume bears a preface written by my dear friend and distinguished colleague JOHN BRADEMAS. I commend it to you as an introduction to Mr. O'Hara's fine volume:

"JOHN F. KENNEDY ON EDUCATION"

(A preface by Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana)

"Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress," President John F. Kennedy told Congress as he began his special message on education of January 29, 1963. Kennedy went on to present the most sweeping program for Federal help to education ever advocated by an American President.

Yet, as Arthur Schlesinger has recently reminded us, "Little disappointed the Kennedys more in domestic policy that their failure to make significant progress in Federal aid to education." ("A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House," Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1965, p. 662.)

Schlesinger's judgment, while accurate, must be tempered. For less than 3 years after Kennedy's 1963 message, nearly every education measure which he had then pressed Congress to enact had become law.

President Johnson's leadership, substantial margins in Congress committed to education and widespread public support—all these factors helped produce the extraordinary record of education legislation of 1963–65; the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Acts of 1963 and 1965, the Health Professions-Educational Assistance Act and major amendments to the Vocational Education and National Defense Education Acts, to cite only a few of the principal measures.

William O'Hara's book, "John F. Kennedy on Education," is a valuable documentation of the contribution of President Kennedy's leadership to the remarkable educational achievements of the 88th and 89th Congresses.

For despite the tragedy of the assassination and despite the hurdles which frustrated the passage of education bills during the 3 years of his Presidency, Kennedy, by his vigorous advocacy of increased Federal support of education, helped make possible the later achievements.

By providing excerpts from Kennedy's public statements on education during his years as a Representative and Senator as well as during the 1960 campaign and the presidential period, Mr. O'Hara has illumined a significant aspect of Kennedy's entire political career. These speeches and articles reveal Kennedy's continuing interest in education, in the broadest sense of the word. They reflect his profound concern with the quality of American life, his respect for intelligence and ideas, his rapport with the academic community, and his preoccupation with the problems of young people.

Again and again Kennedy speaks of improving the dialog between the politician and the scholar, of the responsibility of the young to prepare for leadership in a democracy, of the value of education not only as a national resource in the cold war but as essential in enhancing the quality of the life of the individual.

Mr. O'Hara, now assistant dean of the University of Connecticut Law School, was, as counsel to the special subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee from 1962 (April) to 1963 (November), a direct participant in work on most of the education bills Congress considered during President Kennedy's administration and is therefore well qualified to undertake this highly useful compilation.

Kennedy's interest in education as a public issue grew and matured over the years—from the Congressman's proposal to improve selection procedures for service academy appointments to the Senator's opposition to the loyalth oath requirement in the National Defense Education Act to the President's plea to Congress for Federal aid to education over a broad spectrum. As a member of the two congressional committees with primary jurisdiction over education bills, the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Kennedy was exceptionally well schooled in the politics of education by the time he came to the Presidency. As a legislator, he saw first-hand the major obstacles confronting advocates of education bills: the issues of civil rights, aid to church-related schools and Federal control.

All these issues are, in one way or other, still with us but all have, in at least one respect, been overcome: Congress is passing major education bills and the role of the Federal Government in support of American education has grown substantially in the last few years. Indeed, during my four terms in Congress, especially as a member of Congressman Kennedy's old committee, Education and Labor (and presently holder of his old seat as second-ranking member of the subcommittee which handles elementary and secondary school bills), I have myself witnessed this significant change.

Congress and the American people have been taking seriously President Kennedy's observation in his first message to Congress on education, on February 20, 1961. "The human mind is our fundamental resource." President Johnson has long shared this conviction and the Nation is now investing more in this most valuable of all our resources. Mr. O'Hara's book traces the Kennedy commitment to that investment.

The book moves from the congressional years to the 1960 campaign and the presidential years and concludes with a section on that most successful of all John F. Kennedy's appeals to American youth, the Peace Corps.

The appendices will be useful to students of Kennedy's domestic policies. They list education bills he introduced while in Congress and those enacted into law during his administration.

Rural Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Many of us in this Chamber today are sons of farmers or ranchers or at least we were, when we were growing up, country boys.

None of us would want to exchange the pleasure we once knew in the open fields and streams where we fished or the haystacks on which we tumbled for the sidewalks of New York.

Yet, today, countless thousands of the poor are leaving our rural areas and moving into big city ghettos because rural areas somehow are not offering its struggling poor a good life or even the promise of one.

The Nashville Tennessean has praised "the long awaited Federal program for overcoming rural poverty."

The paper said:

> The message offers a satisfactory indication that the President is by no means unaware of the difficulty of establishing poverty programs that fit the needs of urban and rural areas.

Yet, what is important is that studies and planning are developing in this area. Many will hail the editorial to which I have referred, and I would like to ask permission that it be included in the RECORD.

RURAL POVERTY AID SOUGHT BY PRESIDENT

The long awaited Federal program for overcoming rural poverty began to take shape yesterday in a special message from President Johnson to the Congress.

The seeming inability of the existing war on poverty to reach effectively down into the rural areas first received public attention last summer. At that time 23 Senators from States with large rural populations called for fresh efforts pinpointed to rural needs.

Since that time practically all of the President's poverty program advisers from Mr. Sargent Shriver, chief of the overall task force, to Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, publicly acknowledged that existing weapons seem inadequate for a rural poverty war.

The President made clear in his message that the first year of his administration's new poverty effort will be largely a year of study and planning.

A few action programs will be initiated in pilot areas while all rural areas interested will be organized into community development districts. In these districts an attempt will be made to plan on a multiple county basis, many public services and improved governmental functions.

The message offers a satisfactory indication that the President is by no means unaware of the difficulty of establishing poverty programs that fit the needs of urban and rural areas.

Both the Secretary of Labor and Mr. Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity have expressed concern recently at a fresh wave of migration from rural sections of big city ghettos.

In such situations there seem to be few hopeful possibilities. One of these is the knowledge gained in pilot manpower training programs scattered over the rural South in the past 2½ years. It has been demonstrated that rural citizens who could not be pushed into vocational or indoctrination for city life courses once they arrived in the urban center, gladly will enroll in such courses when they are offered at home.

Regardless of the problems and complexities facing Mr. Shriver, it is encouraging that the President has pushed new life into this most important domestic issue.

Poland's Millennium Celebrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the year 1966 marks the 1000th anniversary of the embracement of Christianity by the Polish nation.

In the year 966, about 40 generations ago, the conversion of Mieszko to Christianity was an event which led to the entry of all of the Polish people to the Catholic Church.

In connection with this millennium celebration, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in this honorable body an essay written by Mr. Stefan Korbonski on this subject.

Mr. Korbonski is a noted Polish journalist and vice chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations. He is the author of two widely acclaimed volumes, "Warsaw in Chains" and "Fighting Warsaw," and soon he will publish his latest work, "Warsaw in Exile."

Mr. Korbonski's essay on the "Polish Millennium" represents an eloquent synthesis of Poland's history and I commend it to the attention of the Members of this Congress.

Mr. Korbonski's essay follows:

POLISH MILLENNIUM—PART I

(By Stefan Korbonski)

The year 1966 ushers in the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland. If one looks at the spirit of its history and its contribution to the progress and acheivement of mankind from the perspective of this anniversary, the following reflections come to mind.

The fact that the Polish Prince Mieszko espoused Christianity in the year 966, was of great civilizational and national, as well as religious significance. It changed Poland from a pagan country to a nation modern for those times, belonging to the great family of Christian Western nations within the orbit of Rome.

The adoption of Christianity took the pretext away from neighboring Germanic rulers who attacked Poland under the watchword of converting the pagan Slavic tribes to Christianity. The new religion took hold quickly.

The son of King Boleslaw Krzywousty, Henryk Sandomierski (1135–65), together with his knights, took part in the Crusades.

Assuming an important religious mission in the East, Poland achieved in 1386 the conversion to Christianity of Lithuania and Samogitia through the marriage of Polish Queen Jadwiga to Lithuanian Prince Jagiello.

In time the Catholic Church language, Latin, became the official, literary and educated-class language in Poland; in Polish achitecture in turn the Romanesque, Gothic and Baroque styles prevailed. The Italian renaissance was reflected in Polish science, culture and art. Polish youth which sought learning abroad studied mainly in Italy (universities in Padua and Bologna), and in time in France. The roads linking Poland with and in the so-called October Revolution of 1956.

MONGOL INVASION

Owing to its geographic position, Poland was exposed to attacks of the Moslems, who sought to conquer Europe, and by warding off these attacks it became a real "bulwark of Christianity." When the Mongol hordes invaded Europe from Asia, their way was barred by Polish armies headed by Polish Prince Henryk Pobozny (the Pious).

Although Henryk fell in the battle of Legnica in 1241 together with his knights, the Mongol invaders suffered heavy losses, and were forced to retreat to Asia.

During later wars with the Moslems, the King of Poland and Hungary, Wladyslaw Jagiellonczyk, fell in battle with the Turks in 1444, near Warna, in Bulgaria. And in 1683 King Jan the Third Sobieski who went to the aid of Vienna under siege by Turks won a big victory which put an end to Turkish expansion in Western Europe.

BATTLE OF WARSAW

Poland played a similar role of "bulwark of Europe" in 1920 when, after the victorious battle near Warsaw popularly known as the "miracle on the banks of the Vistula," the Polish army led by Marshal Jozef Pilsudski arrested the march of Bolshevik armies on a Germany defeated in the First World War, helpless and anarchized.

This battle, called by Western historians "the 18th most important battle in the history of the world" at that time saved Europe from communism.

Finally, in 1939, Poland was the first to oppose Hitler in his drive to conquer Europe.

Polish resistance in 1939 gave England time to arm, and contributed to the victory over Hitler. Poland played an important role in the Second World War.

BATTLE OF BRITAIN

The historic air battle of Britain in August 1940 was won with the outstanding help of Polish fighter pilots.

The Polish Army was the third largest, after the American and British (the 100,000—strong Second Corps led by Gen. Wladyslaw Anders—besides an armored division, parachute brigade, Carpathian brigade, as well as the more than 300,000-strong underground home army led by Gen. Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski, officially considered an allied and combatant army).

Poles fought in guerrilla battles in the country and in Warsaw uprising, as well as in the famous battles of Narvik, Tobruk, Arnheim, Falaise, Monte Cassino, Ancona, Bologna and many others on land, sea, and in the air.

And although at the end of World War II Poland found itself under Soviet domination, the same indomitable spirit was revealed in such incidents as the Poznan uprising in June 1956.

POLISH MILLENNIUM—PART II

SPIRIT OF PROGRESS

During the course of its history Poland became a pioneer in modern internal and external constitutional forms. In 1385, through the marriage of Jadwiga to Jagiello it formed the first union of two countries—Poland and Lithuania—in the history of the modern world. When the Germanic Order of Teutonic Knights continued the German "Drang nach Osten," King Wladyslaw Jagiello defeated it in the battle of Grunwald in 1410. The "Drang nach Osten" was arrested for many years, and only stirred again during the reign of the Prussian kings.

When the son of King Zigmunt the Third, Prince Wladyslaw, was chosen czar of Russia by Russian Boyars, Poland tried to form a union with Russia, but this did not bring positive results. In this period (1566–1632) the Polish Armies under the leadership of Hetman Stanislaw Zolkiewski, occasionally occupied Moscow and the Kremlin.

In 1920, Poland, with future federation in mind, helped Ataman Semen Petlura to form an independent Ukraine, and in a battle with Soviet armies, the Polish forces liberated the capital of the Ukraine, Kiev.

FIRST REPUBLIC

As for internal constitutional forms, from the year 1573 the Polish nobility began to elect its kings, and thus Poland became the first republic, although only nobiliary.

Political freedom flourished, manifested by such outgrowths as "Pacta Conventa," or argeements made by the nobility with the elected kings which imposed various political and financial obligations on them, and "Liberum Veto," which made it possible for only one deputy to parliament (the Sejm) to dissolve the parliament and annul it's resolutions. (In a sense the veto in the United Nations Security Council can trace its ancestry to Poland in the 17th century.) This led to an anarchy in political life and the collapse of the inner strength of the nation and contributed to the partitions of Poland.

Nevertheless, it was an expression of the spirit of freedom. Finally, the modern constitution of May 3, 1791, did away with this anarchy, restoring hereditary monarchy and a strong government and canceling the "Liberum Veto." Three years later, on May 7, 1794. Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko issued the Polaniecki Manifesto which served to partially free the peasants from serfdom while during the 1863 uprising against Russia the National Government freed them from these duties completely.

COUNTRY OF FREEDOM

During the course of history Poland became the country of religious freedom and tolerance, insured by the Warsaw Confederation of 1573 which guaranteed the free worship of any religion. Arians, Lutherans and Calvinists, Poles and foreigners, enjoyed this freedom. From the 11th century Jews settled in Poland in their flight from persecution in other European countries. Before the Second World War more than 3 million Jews, enjoying full rights, lived in Poland. Jewish religious life flourished. The most important Hebrew universities and publications were to be found in Poland (Jeszybot in Lublin). The Hitlerite occupation put an end to this—at this time the Polish Jews were exterminated, except for 300,00 hidden by the Polish people, although they were threatened with the death penalty for helping them.

In present-day Poland there is no room for religious tolerance, but nevertheless the Catholic Church and the Polish people successfully oppose the religious persecution by the Communist regime.

POLISH MILLENNIUM—CONCLUSION

SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTION

Poland's contribution to the scientific achievement of the world is considerable. Here may be mentioned the Jagiellonian University founded in 1364, which celebrated its 600-year anniversary a short time ago, the first ministry of education in Europe founded on the basis of the Constitution of 1791, or scholars such as Mikolaj Kopernik (1473–1543), Ignacy Lukasiewicz (1822–82) the inventor of the kerosene lamp, a process of distilling oil and the founder of the world's first oil mine near Krosno, Ludwik Zamenhoff, the inventor of the language of esperanto (1887) and Maria Curie-Sklodowska (1867–1934) Nobel Laureate for the discovery of radium.

In the field of literature the following writers gained recognition: Wladyslaw Reymont (1867–1925), who received the Nobel Prize mostly for his novel "The Peasants"; Henryk Sienkiewicz (1846–1916), who also received this prize mostly for his epic "Quo Vadis," and Jozef Conrad-Korzeniowski, a Pole writing in English, an author of world fame.

In music Fryderyk Chopin (1810–49) is one of the world's best renowned composers; besides him there are Stanislaw Moniuszko (1819–72), Ignacy Paderewski (1860–1941), and Karol Szymanowski (1882–1937). In the theater and cinema Helena Modrzejewska-Modjeska (1840–1909), Pola Negri, born 1897, gained world fame.

POLES IN UNITED STATES

At the time of the Polish partitions, Polish life also began to develop outside of Poland, particularly in the United States, where thousands of people emigrated. Poles took part in the American Revolution.

The first five Poles arrived in America on the English ship *Mary and Margaret* landing in Jamestown on October 1, 1608.

General Tadeusz Kosciuszko came to America in August 1776, and General Kazimierz Pulaski in 1777, and both of them took part in the Revolutionary War under the leadership of George Washington.

At the end of the war Kosciuszko was called "the father of American artillery," and Pulaski, who fell in the battle of Savannah, was called "the father of American cavalry." The American people honor them to this day. Statues of Kosciuszko may be found in the square before the White House, in West Point, and Pulaski's on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, and in many other places. Many towns, bridges and highways in the United States bear the names of these American heroes.

During the Civil War 168 officers and about 4,000 men of Polish extraction served in the Union Army, among them Generals Wlodzimierz Krzyzanowski, Jozef Karge and Albin Schoepf, and in the Confederate Army there were 17 officers and about 1,000 men of Polish extraction, among them General Kacper Tochman.

Approximately 900,000 Polish-Americans served in the American Army in World War II.

In 1860 the Polonia in the United States numbered 30,000; at present it numbers more than 10,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, and the capital of Polish-American organizations comes to approximately $500,000,000.

There are more than 50,000 members of the Polish-American intelligentsia (professors, attorneys, judges, doctors, engineers, journalists, etc.). In the present U.S. Congress there is 1 Senator of Polish extraction, EDMUND MUSKIE, and 11 Congressmen.

From the perspective of the thousand-year existence of Poland as a Western Christian country, 31,500,000 Poles at home and 10,000,000 Poles abroad living all over the world can view proudly Poland's role in the history of the world and its part in the progress and achievement of mankind. The indomitable spirit of Polish history is a guarantee that this country, halted in its progress through the Communist regime, imposed on it by force by Russia, in time will throw off its shackles and will regain its freedom and independence.

To Build Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speeker, the Communists have let loose an idea in southeast Asia which cannot be stopped by bullets—but only by another idea, more appealing and more meaningful to the hearts and minds of the people.

Because of this, it was wise of this administration to realize that the Vietnam war is a war on two fronts, and both must be waged at the same time.

The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of February 8 had a thoughtful editorial along these lines the other day, and it pointed out that:

> The task has always been understood. The difficulty was and remains a related problem, how to protect the civilian aids in areas still open to Vietcong attack.

Yet, the editorial continued—

> Protection and progress must go hand in hand. That will require a massive effort, in which the Saigon government seems disposed to try to play a more effective role, with greater resources, than it was ever able to play before.

The need for, and the problems of reconstruction and a general building up of homes and schools and crops in this land of agony is one which concerns us all, and because of this, the editorial—so enlightening on the subject—is offered for the RECORD.

RECONSTRUCTION IN VIETNAM

As Premier Ky has expressed it, the central problem for the Vietnamese Government is "not only to root out the Vietcong from the rural areas, but also to root ourselves in."

This means, as it has for the past 10 years, the training of thousands of young Vietnamese to go out in teams to isolated villages after the army, with American assistance, has cleared the area. Their purpose will be to replace the sinister and shadowy domination of the Vietcong with something visibly better in the way of health and sanitation, school construction, police, crop management, land reform, and local self-government.

The task has always been understood. The difficulty was and remains a related problem, how to protect the civilian aids in areas still open to Vietcong attack. Over the years, the Communists have relied on a cold-blooded campaign of assassination, which has bled South Vietnam of thousands of trained young workers. Combined with sabotage, it has effectively terrorized the villagers.

Not until they know that participation in Government reconstruction will not bring savage reprisals from the Vietcong will the farmers of South Vietnam and their families be able to join wholeheartedly in rebuilding their community life in peace. Protection and progress must go hand in hand. That will require a massive effort, in which the Saigon Government seems disposed to try to play a more effective role, with greater resources, than it was ever able to play before.

School Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in this problem of poverty that the President would have the people of America believe he is desperately fighting, the one group of people that need help the most are the youngsters of America, and yet in his budget message the first group of people whom he proposes to cut are the youngsters who are getting a warm school lunch at noon and who are getting a glass of milk.

Of all the worthwhile, established programs, Mr. Speaker, the school lunch program is the best, and does the most good and, of course, this is a ripe plum to be picked by the welfare state in order that they may substitute some fancy newfangled political program, not with a view of aiding the poor, but with a view of aiding some poor politician who may get himself a real nice salary out of it.

I have a letter from a superintendent of schools in my State who has described this cut in the school lunch program much more eloquently than I.

The letter with the name and the school district stricken is as follows:

> On behalf of our school patrons and board of education I am writing to ask that you use all of your influence to obtain reinstatement of the funds which have been taken from the school lunch program.
>
> This program has long since proven itself to be highly worthwhile and valuable to schools in South Dakota. We have kept the costs to a remarkably low level of 25 cents per pupil in order to keep it within the reach of nearly all families. For those who cannot afford even this low charge we gladly furnish lunches entirely free while still others are given some sort of minor work detail whereby they can earn their lunches. Surely no one can question the value of a hot lunch which supplies all the nutritional needs, to every child.
>
> We cannot possibly maintain this program without an increased charge or through general fund subsidy which would increase the school tax that is already at or near the legal limit in most of our schools. If we increase the per pupil cost we will shut out some who cannot afford it and are too proud (thank God we still have some such) to take a "dole" or "handout."
>
> It was a nip-and-tuck battle to make ends meet at the 5 cents per meal and 4 cents per one-half pint of milk reimbursement plus the commodities which we once received. With a cutback in the latter, from 5 to 4 cents per meal and a 10-percent reduction in the milk program we cannot continue the program without one or the other of the above-mentioned policies.
>
> Why have these cuts been made in the face of the liberal appropriation under 89–10 for title I and others? How can one justify cutting back programs which are tried, tested, and proven valuable on the one hand and then turn around and offer the money for something new which must still be tested?
>
> I take the liberty of enclosing a bit of my own thinking on the whole Federal aid concept. Frankly, I am sick to death of the "giveaway" program and scared to death of the controls which most assuredly will follow in due time. I don't care to hand my children and grandchildren an inheritance of Federal controls and socialism which seems to be the direction in which we are heading all too fast.

The 37th Anniversary of League of United Latin American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with a warm appreciation of the good works of the League of United Latin American Citizens, popularly known as LULAC, I join in the laudatory comments of my colleague from Texas [Mr. WHITE], in this Chamber on Thursday last, the 37th anniversary of the founding of the organization, that as Congressman WHITE says has become one of the outstanding groups of our Nation for the fostering of good citizenship.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to participate with the members of the league in the patriotic observances that annually are a vibrant feature of the Fourth of July holiday in the district that I am honored to represent in this body. American citizens of Latin blood are a numerous and proud part of our community, and they hold a high and dignified place of eminence in all the activities of our people. The brilliant record of one of the leaders of LULAC, the Honorable David Cerda, as a judge in the courts of Cook County, has been a source of great satisfaction.

National Security and the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, an effective statement of what the U.S. merchant marine means to our national security was delivered recently by Capt. J. W. Clark, president of the Delta Steamship Lines, and chairman of the Committee of American Steamship Lines.

Speaking on February 8, to the Mississippi Valley Association here in Washington, Captain Clark highlighted in excellent fashion the need for action to bring our merchant shipping capability to the level required by the national security.

His remarks serve to reinforce statements made by several members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House recently, including mine of February 16.

I am inserting Captain Clark's statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—KEY TO NATIONAL SECURITY

(An address by Capt. J. W. Clark, president, Delta Steamship Lines, Inc. (New Orleans), (chairman, Committee of American Steamship Lines), Mississippi Valley Association's 47th annual meeting, Washington, D.C., February 8, 1966)

American-flag shipping is a key to our national security, and our national security involves not only the defense aspect, but also the commercial aspect—the ability of our manufacturers to effectively compete in international commerce with foreign products.

American-flag shipping is today, however, only a "skeleton" key to national security (although we can still open many foreign trade doors), and I say this because our maritime authorities have permitted this important key to national security to be reduced from its former proud position of first merchant fleet in the world to the status today of a poor sixth—we rank far behind Great Britain, Norway, Japan, Russia, and Liberia.

Most of you, no doubt, are aware of the controversy currently boiling around proposals to revise our national maritime policies and to restructure the so-called subsidy programs. On October 7, 1965, there was issued a report entitled the "Interagency Maritime Task Force Report." This is frequently referred to as the "Boyd report," after my fellow panelist, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Alan S. Boyd. The interagency report was followed promptly by a report prepared by the President's Maritime Advisory Committee. The interagency report was prepared by Government personnel; the principal architects were the Maritime Administrator and his planning staff.

Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson is a brilliant young law professor, with considerable charm, who has the oratorical delivery to sway almost any lay audience to his point of view—and in this case his selected mission has been to "sell" the interagency report.

The MAC report was prepared by professionals, drawing heavily on the maritime industry for advice, including shipowners, maritime labor, and shipbuilders.

Secretary of Commerce Connor publicly stated on January 25, that "if the Government had been fulfilling its obligations toward building up the merchant marine over the years, the balance-of-payments problem would be resolved because there would be adequate American-flag tonnage to haul American commerce." Secretary Connor serves as chairman of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee, and has been a consistent supporter of American-flag shipping.

Under Secretary Boyd, on the other hand, in a recent article in the U.S. News & World Report, stated that only intuition causes him to feel that we need an American merchant marine. He further stated that ships built today in foreign shipyards cannot be registered under the American flag. This is not so; they can be "imported"—and without duty. There are practical problems which discourage such practices. Under Secretary Boyd has also made the statement that the only valid reason for financial assistance to American-flag ships is for reasons related to national defense.

In all fairness to Mr. Boyd, I must say that we suspect that the interagency report was probably completed before he assumed his present position of responsibility. In assembling the information presented in the controversial interagency report, the MARAD planning group conferred with Government experts in various departments and agencies. Professional shipping men view these largely theoretical recommendations of these experts as impracticable, and we draw the conclusion that this is primarily due to lack of experience and practical knowledge.

Thinking of these "experts," I am reminded of the story about the fellow who was appearing on the television show, $64,000 Question."

After going through all of the preliminary questions and reaching the final $64,000 question, the gentleman was advised that he could have the services of an expert to assist him with the final question. As the question involved was one with three parts, dealing with the subject of love, our friend thought long and hard and finally decided that he would obtain the services of a Frenchman well known for his romantic expertise. Came the big night and our contestant faced the master of ceremonies. The first part of the question was given to him as, "if you were walking in a forest and came up a clearing, and you saw a beautiful chalet in a most romantic setting, and a lovely, blossomy young lady appeared in the doorway, completely in the nude, what would you do?" Our friend, without any hesitation whatsoever, promptly responded, "I would say 'hello.'" The master of ceremonies said, "You're absolutely right." The second part of the question was, "and then what would you do?" Our lad, again without hesitation, answered, "I would introduce myself." "Absolutely right," said the questioner.

Then he went on to say that in view of the critical importance of the final part of the question, the contestant should think long and hard, and should seriously consider seeking the advice of his "expert" before answering. The last part of the question for $64,000 was—"and then what would you do?" So, our contestant, realizing the situation, conferred with his noted adviser.

The Frenchman, with face somewhat red, advised: "You had better answer for yourself, I was wrong on the first two questions."

I would like to make it clear that I certainly mean no disrespect to Under Secretary of Commerce Boyd, or to his expert advisers, but at the same time I cannot agree that they have been right about even the first two questions concerning the maritime industry.

American-flag shipping contributes almost $1 billion yearly to our balance of payments. Our Casl Lines alone contribute in excess of $500 million a year in favorable payments.

In addition to this, as I have already pointed out, our Casl members are engaged in extensive trade promotional activities, spending $17 million a year of their own resources to increase the foreign trade of the United States.

By comparison, we regret to say that the Maritime Administration, which is charged specifically by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to promote the foreign commerce of the United States and the American Merchant Marine, has publicly displayed little interest in this mandate of Congress. To the contrary, the public statements of the Maritime Administrator, however well intentioned, have resulted in considerable confusion not only among industry members, but also among international traders and the public.

It has been alleged that American-flag shipping is excessively subsidized, and that American-flag operators display little initiative in advancing technological development.

All of this simply is not true, and I only wish that I could take enough of your time to refute each and every criticism of American-flag shipping.

But, briefly, let me answer loud and clear a few of these inferences.

First, American-flag shipowners do not receive one penny of subsidy. Costs ashore, such as overhead (including my salary), cargo-handling expenses, and the vast multitude of expenditures incurred in operating steamship lines, and representing 75 percent of all of our costs, are for the sole account of American shipowners.

Steamship operators merely channel Government wage differential subsidy payments to American seamen to offset lower wages paid on foreign ships. American plants abroad can use low-cost local labor—we cannot—our "plants" must compete in the world market while employing high-standard-of-living American personnel.

The same applies to the construction-differential subsidy, which is paid directly to U.S. shipyards to make them competitive with foreign shipyards, and to assure their availability for construction of ships in times of national emergency.

We have no guarantee of profit whatsoever, and we must actively compete with foreign-flag competitors for every dollar of revenue that we receive. Our profits are modest and generally average less than 5 percent.

Our contributions to the national economy, especially when you consider the usual economic multiplier of three, are overwhelmingly on the plus side in comparison to the Government wage differential subsidy paid to American labor. We are required by statute and regulations to build and repair our ships and to purchase all of our supplies and equipment in the United States. These expenditures, along with the salaries paid to our American citizen employees, constitute a major contribution to the Nation's economy and security.

Conversely, when foreign-flag shipping is used, 73 cents of every freight revenue dollar is taken away from the United States. It might interest you to know that we recently made a study of the purchasing and repair practices of one of our Scandinavian competitors. We found that this line regularly obtains the greater part of its supplies from foreign sources, even foodstuffs. When major repairs and drydocking are required, their ships are sent back to Europe on a voyage charter. Most of their seamen's low wages are sent back to the old country in the form of family allotments. In other words, these people spend as little dollar exchange in this country as they possibly can, and drain away "invisible" payments (dollar exchange) in the form of freight revenues.

American-flag lines have displayed real initiative in developing and programing technical advances such as multihatch ships, automated machinery, barge ships, containerships, and many other design features which are now being copied by our foreign-flag competitors. This has been accomplished by American-flag steamship lines with negligible Government assistance. We have used our own money in the development of these new design features. What has the Maritime Administration done to help technological development? As I understand it, the Maritime Administration's limited research and development funds have gone principally into the *Savannah* program, initiated 10 years ago, but a substantial amount has gone into such exotic developments as the hydrofoil and air-cushion vessel projects, which primarily involve small craft and are related to national defense or short-range passenger transportation. I personally know of no single major project involving large ocean-going vessels to which the present Maritime Administration has made any significant contribution.

CARGO PREFERENCE

For years our foreign-flag competitors have clamored long and loud in protest against our cargo preference laws which require that 50 percent of all Government aid or Government financed cargoes be transported by American-flag vessels. The interagency report recommends elimination of these cargo preference statutes, and it does so with a very naive approach. I was amazed to learn that few of our high Government officials realize that there are two considerations affecting cargo preference—(1) routing preference and (2) rate preference. The interagency report recommendation that cargo preference be eliminated is confusing and is based on the false philosophy that elimination of cargo preference and payment of "incentive" subsidy would enable a new bulk carrier fleet to successfully compete with foreign-flag competition. This is absurd. There is no objection to the phasing out of "rate" differentials as new bulk carriers are placed in operation, but it is absolutely imperative that preferential "routing" be retained or there will be little opportunity for the transportation of any bulk U.S. aid cargoes. It is a well-known fact that foreign governments will divert aid cargoes to their own vessels for "political" reasons. Further, the trade missions and foreign freight brokers appointed by foreign Governments to handle these shipments are highly susceptible to nationalistic control. With bulk imports largely controlled by industrial giants who favor their own "flags of convenience" fleets, and the complete lack of any assurances that American-flag bulk carriers would participate in U.S. aid cargoes, it can hardly be expected that any responsible owner will venture the necessary risk capital.

The proposed elimination of cargo preference, including PR 17, would leave us to the tender mercies of foreign Governments and there would remain no effective instrument for leverage in assuring fair and equitable treatment for U.S.-flag vessels. There is ample evidence that the elimination of many discriminations against U.S.-flag vessels has only been accomplished through cargo preference leverage. To the contrary, the routing aspects of cargo preference legislation should be made more effective.

If U.S.-flag vessels do not carry such cargoes then obviously they will be carried by foreign-flag vessels to the detriment of the U.S. economy through adverse balance of payments and national income.

Our cargo preference laws and maritime policies have been adequately defended in the past by the U.S. Government. The defense of our present statutes is a matter of international record.

There is a further misconception that cargo preferences result in higher freight rates. This is basically incorrect with regard to all cargoes which move in the liner trades. Freight conference rules and rates apply equally to American- and foreign-flag vessels, and freight conferences are strictly controlled by the U.S. Federal Maritime Commission.

As to the proposed Russian grain deal, there is no assurance that Russia or any of the Communist satellite countries would regularly purchase large quantities of U.S. wheat when and if the Government restriction imposed for the use of American-flag vessels is eliminated. It is my opinion that Russia has seized upon the 50 percent ship American policy as a propaganda tool to stir up further trouble with our NATO allies. It should be recalled that several of these European countries, notably Germany, have recently protested against the aggressive use of Russian-controlled vessels to break prevailing freight rate structures.

Russia is building up a large merchant marine and, by her own admission, intends to utilize her shipping as an instrument of foreign policy without regard to cost. If the Russian objective is achieved in building up a huge merchant marine and utilizing same to force down international freight rates, the maritime nations of the world would soon find their respective fleets without cargoes and facing virtual bankruptcy. Therefore, only through an effective and active U.S. merchant marine, operating with minimum Government restraint, yet with adequate Government protection in the direction of cargo routing, and with Government backing to eliminate foreign government discriminations, can we avoid putting ourselves completely at the mercy of Communist-dominated shipping.

In view of the affinity of our NATO allies to serve the Communist trades in Cuba, the Middle East, Communist China, North Vietnam and Russia itself, it follows that in consideration of charters and the concession of participation of Communist trades, foreign-flag shipping could be influenced to assist the Communist program to dominate American foreign trade.

DOLLARS AND CENTS ECONOMY

As to commercial justification for the American merchant marine, the administration will undoubtedly be greatly influenced by the dollars-and-cents costs of American-flag shipping operations. While we disagree with many of the interagency projections, I would like to spotlight one glaring question mark on the part of the people who prepared the interagency report.

The projected high savings frequently refered to by interagency report advocates is highly questionable. This is largely based on a projected increase in Government aid cargoes and a doubling of the rate differentials, amounting to a projected savings through 1985 of almost $2 billion ($100 million a year). In the first place, we have been given no explanation whatsoever for the projected doubling of the rate differentials applying to cargo preference cargoes.

Recent analyses and reports on merchant marine policy have unanimously agreed that the current tramp ship program is ineffective and that, with provision for cost differential subsidy payments, a modern and competitive bulk fleet can be developed and rate differentials paid to tramps can be phased out.

Further, there are no known plans for an increase in foreign aid tonnage. Just last week, in fact, President Johnson strongly emphasized self-help as a basis for administering our foreign aid programs. Although the United States has emphasized self-help for years in administering aid, no President has stressed it as strongly as President Johnson.

The President indicated a change in foreign aid policy primarily in the direction of making it harder for aid beneficiaries to qualify. When you add to this reports that our surplus grain stores have been greatly reduced in the last few years, it is clear that foreign aid cargoes may decrease rather than increase. If you take the projected savings away from the interagency report calculations, then there is little merit to any claim for economy on the part of the interagency task group report, as compared to the MAC report. Add to this the fact that American-flag shipping wage support subsidy per ship should be drastically reduced through automation in the next 10 years, and the relative cost projections, and results, are highly debatable.

NATIONAL SECURITY DEFENSE ASPECTS

As to the importance of merchant shipping to our national security, several eminent naval officers in recent months have spoken out in favor of the tremendous contributions of the American merchant marine to the defense effort in Vietnam, and to the outstanding qualities of our modern vessels which participated in the "steel pike" landing exercises off the Spanish coast.

Let us, for a moment, reflect on World War II and the fleet of American-flag merchant ships which supplied the logistical support for our major campaigns in Europe and in the Pacific areas.

American-flag ships played a major role in the Korean conflict and, as usual, the merchant marine is heavily involved in the Vietnam conflict. It is disturbing to note the lack of cooperation received from our NATO allies in the Vietnam war and, just as in the case of Cuba many of our fair-weather friends are serving Communist masters contrary to U.S. interests. On checking through recent issues of Lloyd's "Shipping Index Voyage Supplement," I learned that ships flying the flags of Great Britain, Norway, Greece, and other European countries have been calling at Haiphong and at Chinese and Russian ports. A typical example of one of these voyages involves the Norwegian ship *Herborg*, as listed in the January 21, 1966, issue of Lloyds. This Norwegian ship sailed from Hong Kong on October 12, and remained in Haiphong until October 18, then proceeded to Nakhoda (Russia), then back to Hong Kong on December 22, and thence to Port Said, Egypt. It is recalled that in the Cuban crisis our NATO allies flagrantly violated our embargo, and some still do. At one time, the Norwegian Prime Minister publicly stated that Cuba was an "American affair."

It was the U.S. merchant marine which was promptly called into service to supply vessels for the Vietnam emergency, just as we have been the first to go to war during so many previous emergencies, and it is a pathetic circumstance that foreign crews have refused to carry U.S. military cargoes to Vietnam. This bears out the good advice of high-ranking naval spokesmen who have repeatedly warned that the interest of foreign-flag shipping during periods of emergency might not coincide with the national interests of the United States.

Secretary McNamara has recently reiterated the Department of Defense's 1962 position that "the reserve fleet plus the vessels in service plus the construction program that has previously been outlined (1962) as a tentative program appear adequate." On January 28, Secretary McNamara was quoted as saying that "the national defense reserve fleet is adequately serving the purpose for which it was planned and, in conjunction with our active merchant fleet, it is doing a fine job." Further, he is quoted as saying "the responsible reaction of the merchant fleet together with reserve fleet reactivations in the current Southeast Asia emergency confirms the adequacy of our sealift."

While we appreciate the kind remarks of Secretary McNamara as to the effectiveness of American-flag shipping cooperation in the southeast Asia area, I am sure that the Department of Defense must now be well aware of the poor condition of our reserve fleet. A great many of the ships which have been broken out of the reserve fleets, mostly World War II Victory type vessels, have incurred excessive reactivation costs averaging $400,000 each, and the frequent breakdowns experienced, indicate that these over-age vessels cannot be considered reliable.

The Department of Defense has hailed the development of the giant cargo aircraft, the C5–A—scheduled to be placed in operation, sometime in the early 1970's—as a great advance in logistical support. This aircraft is being developed at a cost of approximately $2 billion—paid for by the Department of Defense—and predictions have been made that this 360-ton flying "Holland Tunnel" will promote a tremendous increase in future air-cargo services. Strangely enough, the principal commercial airlines of the United States who are usually the beneficiaries of heavy subsidization in plane design and development through Defense Department contracts, are reported to be lukewarm on the project. The C5–A could be another "Great Republic"—the oversized and ill-fated clipper ship of a century ago. According to a November article in Fortune magazine, the C5–A "will liberate the Army from dependence on sea transportation except for low cost bulk items such as fuel." There are certain practicable considerations which immediately come to my mind. In the first place, these planes are expected to land on relatively short runways in remote areas under adverse circumstances, and such runways are subject to damage or destruction by enemy action. These planes would also make a nice fat target for enemy aircraft and missiles. By comparison, seaborne transports provide highly flexible logistical support—with naval support—ships can be moved from one port to another and are not necessarily dependent on fixed facilities for delivery of war material. As troop carriers, giant planes such as the C5–A could carry 600 to 700 fully equipped troops, but malfunction or enemy attack on this relatively slow aircraft would be a great risk. As a skipper of cargo and troop ships during the last war, I participated in landing operations, I saw ships go down—including one of my own. Sea rescue operations, however tragic and dangerous, afford a much greater probability of recovery than do aircraft disasters.

At the present time, sealift is supplying 98 percent of all logistical support to the Vietnam theater and a high percentage of personnel. The First Cavalry Division, of which you hear so much about these days carrying on operations in Vietnam, was transported to Vietnam entirely by ship along with all of its equipment, including 400 helicopters.

The U.S. shipping industry is affording full cooperation to our military people in the Vietnam conflict. Our seamen have offered to assist in unloading operations, and labor leaders have visited the area and suggested ways and means of overcoming labor bottlenecks in the ports. Our Committee of American Steamship Lines has offered to supply fully qualified professionals, at our own expense, to assist in overcoming port and harbor problems related to ship and cargo operations.

The role of American shipping as a key to our national security, both as to the commercial and defense aspects, will greatly depend upon the administration's program and the consideration which will be given by the second session of the 89th Congress. As professionals, we sincerely believe that American-flag shipping can play an increasingly important part in the Nation's best interest.

The Committee of American Steamship Lines supports the President's Maritime Advisory Committee report. We trust that administration and congressional leaders will give us an opportunity to participate in constructive maritime policy planning.

Editorial by William Mathews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, of Tucson, has traveled widely in the Far East. He has studied its people, its governments, and has well-formed ideas concerning the appropriateness of our actions in that part of the world.

In the Arizona Daily Star, of January 30, 1966, Mr. Mathews published an editorial which is so well considered that I am sure it should be read by every Member of the House and Senate.

The editorial follows:

MAKE THE BEST OF A TRAGIC MESS

(By William R. Mathews)

Rather than shed more tears about the President and Vietnam, the time has come when our Nation should unite to make the best of what unmistakably is a tragic mess.

The President's peace campaign, unrealistic as it has proven to be in bettering things in Vietnam, has produced the positive results of improving the image of the President throughout the world, as well as at home. It has damaged seriously the image of the Peiping Communists and North Vietnam by making themselves appear to be rigidly unreasonable. Johnson has neutralized those who posed as negotiators, conferencemakers, peacemakers, and so on by seriously trying to do what they pleaded he do.

The uncompromising attitude of North Vietnam leaves no other alternative than to wage war in traditional American manner. That it amounts to sheer stupidity on the part of North Vietnam, becomes more apparent.

If, for instance, North Vietnam had responded to the President's pleas, it could have caught him out on a limb. He promised over and over again unconditional surrender. Yet when he was pinned down by his fellow countrymen and others, he insisted on imposing the original conditions of American policy. This seems to have gone over the heads of most of the people of the United States and other countries, too.

If the Vietnamese had stolen the ball from him by offering to negotiate unconditionally, they would have driven him into a corner. But such an attitude on the Communists' part seemed to defy the centuries-old tradition of the Chinese and most orientals, to take their time and make haste slowly.

Time would have been on their side, if they had restrained the Vietcong and themselves to the point that would have made American military forces no longer necessary. Within a few years the odds would be greatly on their side. In a few years they could win by subversion, which would have allowed them to make communism appear to be a peaceful political philosophy.

That they abandoned their basic political philosophy of confidence in time, apparently has been caused by the corrupting of Marxism of the West, which calls for glorifying violence and actual war.

The world, not just America, should take note of this change. It confirms how uncompromising and unreasonable Communists are. It confirms how undependable their word is. Their violation of their own proposed cease-fire amounted only to a trap to bring in more supplies and regroup their forces. That Lenin himself made a peace in 1918 with Germany, in order to give time to consolidate the Russian revolution, these oriental Communists seem to forget.

As to the role of China, it appears more and more as a great big bluff. It is worth noting how she withdrew from her invasion of India, when India showed her will to fight. We have to do the same thing. If President Johnson limits the bombing of targets in North Vietnam, we are confessing our fear of China. If the President extends bombing to strategic targets like electric generating plants, oil storage tanks, and various industrial complexes, we are definitely calling the Chinese bluff. We will be shortening the war, not prolonging it. Of course, tactical bombing against railroads, bridges, and other military targets must continue with an increased tempo.

China does have vast manpower, but she can supply North Vietnam, and the Vietcong, with only a part of the weapons they use. The latter have to depend upon supplies from Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. At the present time, China has only a few atomic bombs. If she dares make use of them, we must retaliate until we break her power to make nuclear and other weapons.

It is hard to believe that China would run the risk of being completely destroyed now, when she knows that by keeping at peace she will grow stronger daily and yearly. She will keep on bluffing as long as we evade calling her bluff by strategic bombing in North Vietnam.

Georgia Land Is Mine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Elise Boylston, is a charming lady now in her 80th year. She was art director of the Atlanta public schools before her retirement and has written several textbooks. She is still an active member of the Atlanta Pen Women.

Among the many lasting contributions she has made are her lyrics to the song, "Georgia Land Is Mine." Mrs. Lynda Moore wrote the music for this song.

I insert this in the Record in the hopes that many more will enjoy it as I have.

GEORGIA LAND IS MINE

(Lyrics by Elise Boylston, music by Mrs. Lynda Moore)

1

If I were a poet with a magic loom,
  I'd weave a banner of gold;
And I'd tuck a wish and a loving thought
  In the midst of each shining fold;
I'd snare me a sunbeam and fasten it tight
  In the threads of the silken band;
And I'd weave a legend for all to read—
  Georgia, by cherished land!

CHORUS

I'm weaving a song of Georgia land—
  The land that I adore;
Her smiles and tears throughout the years
  Make rainbows evermore.
My shuttle hums a merry tune
  As heart and loom combine
To weave a prayer of thankfulness
  That Georgia land is mine.

2

I'd catch the spark of a baby's smile;
  The joy of a love devine;
The rippling sound of a singing brook;
  The scent of a jasmine vine.
I'd match the carmine of the soil
  With the blue of a distant hill;
I'd capture a wild bird's melody,
  And the sing of the whippoorwill.

Ho Chi Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the latest developments in the mass confusion over our foreign policy is the dangerous advice being given by the radical left Members of the U.S. Senate.

The Chicago Tribune commented editorially on this situation in this morning's issue, and I am inserting their editorial in the Record:

HO CHI KENNEDY

Senator BOBBY KENNEDY has reached a level of irresponsibility without parallel even for him in suggesting that the way out of the war in Vietnam is for the United States to accept a coalition government in South Vietnam which would admit the Communist Vietcong as a ruling element.

Mr. KENNEDY could only advance an idea of this sort if he was entirely ignorant of history and experience. We conclude that he is utterly deficient in both.

The record of coalitions with communism demonstrates that any coalescence of this sort leads inevitably to a surrender to communism. Czechoslovakia, after World War II, tried the experiment. It led to a complete Communist takeover.

Gen. George C. Marshall was dispatched to China after the end of the same war with instructions written by State Department appeasers to force the Nationalist China of Chiang Kai-shek into a coalition with the Communists who had been fighting his government for 20 years. When Chiang refused this suicidal deal, the United States cut off all supplies to his forces for a year and a half. Meanwhile, the Communists, armed with weapons taken from the Japanese army which had surrendered to the Russian Communist forces in Manchuria, were gathering the strength to conquer the country, as they did.

Most recently the coalition formula was invoked in Laos, which, like Vietnam, is a splinter state out of the former French possession of Indochina. In that country an uneasy combination was attempted among disparate elements of the pro-Western and anti-Communist monarchy, a neutralist element of the military, and the Communist Pathet Lao. The Comunists have taken over great areas of the country and intend to take it all. The idea that such antagonistic forces will or can cooperate is a myth—the myth promulgated by the Kremlin that "peaceful coexistence" is a means of reconciling sheep and wolves.

Mr. KENNEDY might be dismissed as the demagog that he is if he were ignorant of this history, but he may not be excused for his ignorance of the origins of the war in South Vietnam. If he had read the statement of Secretary of State Dean Rusk last Friday, he would know that the Communist Vietcong, and its political sponsor, the so-called National Liberation Front, are not indigenous elements of a civil war in South Vietnam, but are the deliberately contrived "fronts" of the Communist government of North Vietnam under Ho Chi Minh.

The third conference of the North Vietnamese Communist party in Hanoi decreed, in 1961, that South Vietnam was to be abolished as an independent state and rendered subject to the Communists. For this purpose, a dummy political arm, designated as the National Liberation Front, was established as a pretender to authority in opposition to the noncommunist regime in Saigon. The Vietcong became the military extension of this invented political cat's-paw of Hanoi. It has no more standing as an authentic element in the political or social organization of South Vietnam than the Hebrides Islands in relation to the United States.

Senator KENNEDY, out of his ignorance and political ambition, has compromised his loyalty to the United States when it is at war by subscribing to Communist myths and adopting them as his own, in opposition to a national policy, which is supported by an overwhelming majority of American citizens. He is not the junior Senator from New York. He is the senior senator from Communist North Vietnam—Ho Chi Minh's Trojan horse in the U.S. Senate.

Dickson County Doctors Are Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam conflict has inspired many acts of patriotism by civilian groups. One of the finest and most selfless acts that has been brought to my attention is described in the following article from the Dickson County Herald, "Medical Association To Offer Free Medical Care to Outpatients of Vietnam Soldiers."

By offering free out patient medical care to the wives and children of soldiers now fighting in Vietnam, the members of the Dickson County Medical Society have set an example that all Americans could do well to ponder and follow.

MEDICAL ASSOCIATION TO OFFER FREE MEDICAL CARE TO OUTPATIENTS OF VIETNAM SOLDIERS

The Dickson County Medical Association, in an unprecedented move, has agreed to extend outpatient medical care to the wife and children of servicemen engaged in this country's struggle in Vietnam, it was announced today by D. W. A. Crosby and Dr. J. T. Jackson, who drafted a resolution to this effect at the request of the association.

The Dickson County Medical Association is composed of all practicing physicians of the county.

The resolution reads as follows:

"*Be it resolved by the members of the Dickson County Medical Association,* That we are in complete sympathy with the foreign policy of the Government of the United States of America in its effort to promote lasting peace throughout the world, and we are proud of our fellow Tennesseans who are now serving and who will serve our country in Vietnam in trying to bring to an early end the fighting which has already cost the lives of many of the fine brave youth of this great State; be it further

"*Resolved,* That we here at home realize the hardships and the inconveniences that our servicemen are going through in being separated from their loved ones while on active duty in Vietnam; be it further

"*Resolved,* That we want to express our appreciation for the great effort and sacrifice being made by our fellow Tennesseans by offering our services in the following manner: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* If any man who has ever been a patient of any of the members of the Dickson County Medical Association is called to serve his country in the struggle in Vietnam, then we willingly agree to extend outpatient medical care to his wife and children free of charge so long as he remains on active duty in that theater of operations; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the proper authorities of the Tennessee State Medical Association, the American Medical Association, and to the War Department of the United States of America.

"*Signed:*

"MEMBERS OF DICKSON
COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY."

Robert Shaw in Atlanta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 Atlanta entered into major league sports with the franchise of the Atlanta Braves, and most recently with the newly formed National League football team, the Atlanta Falcons.

Last week, Atlanta, always a cultural center, scored another "big league" feat, with the Atlanta Arts Alliance announcement that the distinguished Robert Shaw has been named music director of the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra.

Mr. Shaw will resign his post as associate conductor of the Cleveland Orchestra and will assume his duties in Atlanta in 1967.

One of the world's most renowned choral directors, his famous Robert Shaw Chorale has made musical history in its tours of 48 States, and its celebrated Russian tour in 1962.

Conductor Henry Sopkin, retiring after 21 years of selfless and able service to his art and his city, leaves Mr. Shaw a carefully assembled aggregation of 80 excellent musicians—a solid foundation from which to launch further musical triumphs.

The Atlanta Arts Alliance, under the able leadership of Chairman Richard H. Rich, and Vice Chairman Lucien Oliver, Charles L. Tower, symphony president, and Charles R. Yates, chairman of the symphony executive committee; are to be commended for their painstaking search of over 100 applicants from the United States and Europe—the search which culminated in the selection of Mr. Shaw.

The late Arturo Toscanini said of Robert Shaw: "I have at last found the Maestro I have been looking for." As Atlanta Constitution Columnist Bruce Galphin noted, "So has Atlanta."

The Schools of Compton, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEL CLAWSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, a singular honor has come to a section of my constituency, the city of Compton, Calif., and I am pleased to share the recognition with my colleagues.

In a way, this honor synthesizes a number of interrelated issues which have had our attention for a long time.

We speak of poverty, of racial tensions, of law violation. There is general agreement that the heart of the matter is education and understanding—and the heart of education, we have been told many times, is "money"—as if "money" alone could buy the skill to inspire children to learn, prevent dropouts, and give to a community a deep and penetrating interest in raising the educational level of its citizens.

The fullest measure of money means little without the zeal to do, the imagination to conceive, the willingness to dare, and genuine dedication to a cause.

In this city of Compton, there are people with all these qualities—and their dedication is to education—although their wealth is modest. These are the people who administer its school system under the able leadership of Mr. Leonard C. Erickson, superintendent of the Compton city schools.

More than 17,000 pupils crowd its classes. We are advised the cost of educating each student is the lowest in all of Los Angeles County—and understandably so—as Compton is a city with a number of poverty areas—and no Federal funds are allocated for building new school structures.

Yet this community voted to increase its property tax, to increase it so that new schools could be built. The entire community voted this sacrifice. An entire multiracial community voting in favor of the future.

This, however, is not unusual.

It was decided to build the first of these schools in the area of the city where the need was the greatest. This, too, is not unusual.

But rather than merely decide to build a school that would house a specific number of pupils, the goal was more ambitious. It was decided to build a school that would be beautiful, one in which the community would take pride, one that would provide a welcome atmosphere, one that the people would cherish, one that would motivate students to learn, an oasis of knowledge—a center of learning worthy of any city—anywhere.

And all this they hoped to achieve on the slimmest of budgets.

Long, tedious hours went into the search for the answers. It would have been easy to merely press a button or two and have a school much like all other schools—and no one would complain, for they would be getting what they would naturally expect.

But the city of Compton can be proud. This school, designed by the architectural firm of Carmichael-Kemp, AIA, to be built in a section designated by Los Angeles County as a hard-core poverty area, has just received a national award for its excellence in architecture—its beauty, its warmth, its color—and its functional use in education, from the American Association of School Administrators' Architectural Jury of the National Education Association. This architectural jury is composed of three of the Nation's leading architects selected by the American Institute of Architects, and three of the Nation's most eminent educators.

This is no small school. It is 2 stories with more than 30 classrooms, and gentlemen, the cost of building this school will be well within the budget set by the State of California as the average cost for similar size structures. It is fitting, too, that this institution of learning will be named the Clarence A. Dickison Elementary School, honoring a pioneer of the city of Compton, who was not only its first mayor, but who also made his contribution to education as a teacher, vice principal, principal, and a member and president of the Compton City Elementary School Board.

And as if Compton needed further honor, the California State Department of Schoolhouse Planning is considering using this award-winning school for a pilot study relative to the savings effected by its type of structure in heavily populated areas.

This coveted award, naturally, means a great deal to Mr. Erickson, the Board of Education and to the architects, Dan Carmichael and Dick Kemp, but it means immeasurably more to the people of the area. A school worthy of the wealthiest city anywhere is theirs.

Religion in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, last year, during the 1st session of the current

89th Congress, my Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs conducted hearings on the status of religion in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe.

In the course of our hearings, the subcommittee received testimony and statements from some 50 witnesses, including many Members of Congress.

As a result of our findings, the Committee on Foreign Affairs—and subsequently the entire U.S. House of Representatives—approved a resolution decrying the persecution of religion in Communist lands, drawing special attention to the singular and tragic plight of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union, and calling on the Communist governments of the countries in question to extend to all of their citizens the right to freedom of worship and freedom of conscience.

Because of our deep concern with the issue of religious freedom, I was very much interested to read an article entitled, "Religion in the Soviet Union," which appears in the February 19, 1966, issue of America magazine.

Written by Rev. Thurston N. Davis, S.J., the editor in chief, and Rev. Eugene K. Culhane, S.J., managing editor of America, the article is a report on a special interfaith study mission sponsored by an organization entitled the Appeal of Conscience Foundation of New York City.

In addition to Father Davis and Father Culhane, the membership of this study mission included Dr. Harold Bosley, pastor of Christ Church Methodist in New York; Rabbi and Mrs. Arthur Schneier of Congregation Zichron Ephraim, also of New York; and former Congressman and Mrs. Francis E. Dorn of Brooklyn.

The report, based on firsthand observations of the members of the study mission, confirms most of the findings of my committee last year. It describes in some detail both the condition and the prospects of religion in the Soviet Union. It also calls public attention to the very serious and tragic plight of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe that this article is of great importance and interest to Members of Congress, I wish to include its text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is my impression that, in addition to the report written by Father Davis and Father Culhane, there has been or shortly will be published a separate report on religion in the Soviet Union by the entire interfaith study group which participated in the trip sponsored by the foundation. I have asked the foundation to furnish me with a copy of that report and I will include it also in the RECORD upon its receipt.

The article follows:

RELIGION IN THE SOVIET UNION

(By Thurston N. Davis and Eugene K. Culhane)

(NOTE.—The editor in chief and the managing editor of America present an unofficial report on their trip to Russia. As part of a mission sent to investigate the condition of religion in an atheistic state, they found signs of hope for the Christian religions, but little to contradict the charge of Soviet anti-Semitism.)

The seven of us who boarded a Soviet Aeroflot jetliner in Brussels on the morning of January 4 had limited expectations. We represented a modest entity, the Appeal of Conscience Foundation, which has its offices in New York City. We were flying to Moscow and Lenningrad—and later to other cities in the satellite countries—to inform ourselves and to be informed about the conditions under which believers live and work in the hostile atmosphere of official state atheism. We did not expect doors to spring open to us, but we had resolved to avoid mere tourism and to try hard to achieve the purpose of our mission. Dr. Harold Bosley, pastor of Christ Church Methodist in New York, Rabbi and Mrs. Arthur Schneier of Congregation Zichron Ephraim, also in New York, and former Congressman and Mrs. Francis E. Dorn, of Brooklyn, were our companions.

The morning after our arrival in Moscow, we went to the U.S. Embassy to greet Ambassador Foy D. Kohler and to be briefed on the state of religious people in the Soviet Union by several Embassy specialists, who said there was little hope we would be able to reach the key persons we wished to talk with. But developments of the next few days surprised us and probably the Embassy doubters.

After several approaches and seeming rebuffs, we succeeded in making contact with the government. Our In-tourist guide announced that she had set up an appointment for us the next day with a member of the Soviet Council on Religious Cults, Peter Makartsev. We drove to Makartsev's office for a meeting at 5:30 p.m. and spent a full hour with him on January 6, which happened to be the Russian Christmas Eve. He said he was an atheist. Until recently, he had been charged with relations between the Soviet state and the Russian Orthodox Church. Now, under a plan to reorganize the Council, his responsibilities were to be wider.

Makartsev answered our questions fully and clearly. He propounded the official Soviet view of religion, stressed that faith was strong only among aging "believers," and outlined the constitutional limits within which religious organizations are obliged to work in the Soviet Union. He did not try to hurry us. He heard us out, realizing that we were there not to make protests but to gather facts. After setting a date with Mr. Makartsev for the following day, and getting him to agree to come with us to the Russian Orthodox midnight mass (Rabbi Schneier said: "How about coming to church with us tonight?"), we went away with the impression that from here on we would find few closed doors.

Our hotel was within walking distance of several churches and of the main synagogue. Rabbi Schneier kept in touch with the chief rabbi of Moscow, got Government clearance to deliver a message in the synagogue the following Sabbath, and had ample opportunity to investigate the conditions of Jewish religious life.

We all went together to the jampacked, 3-hour Christmas Eve service in the Orthodox Cathedral, presided over by aged Patriarch Alexei. Our Intourist guide, a declared atheist, who told us how she and her Communist father had finally persuaded her believing mother to take down her ikon from the wall, went along with us, saying that this was only the second time she had been inside a church. There was an immense crowd. Old ladies were crushed and fainted for lack of air. One was carried out to the side door at the front where we stood. She was revived by a young man who had some brandy in his pocket.

Afterward, in the sacristy, we met the Metropolitan of Moscow and newly consecrated auxiliary bishop of Juvenal, 30 years of age, who had been one of the official Russian Orthodox observers at the Vatican Council.

Readers may be interested in how we happened to get into the sacristy. During the long service, we had noticed a particularly devout gentleman standing near us, singing and praying in old Slavonic. He introduced himself after the Mass. He was Dr. Alois Hertes, First Secretary of the West German Embassy in Moscow, and a Roman Catholic. It was Dr. Hertes who took us to the sacristy and made the introduction. Later he told us he had 12 more hours in the Soviet Union, since he had been ordered to leave the next morning. A religious news service bulletin, which we found waiting for us when we returned to New York, said that Dr. Hertes had been accused of spreading anti-Soviet propaganda and of gathering information for Opus Dei, a Catholic secular institute. Dr. Hertes is reported to have denied these charges and to have declared he has never been a superior of Opus Dei.

In Moscow, we two priests said mass at the church of St. Louis, whose pastor is Father Michael Tarvidis. We had a long talk with him. In Leningrad, we said mass at the church of St. Mary, where a 29-year-old Latvian priest, Father Jan Butkiewicz, received us cordially. We met several times with Father Eugene La Plante, an American Assumptionist, who is in Moscow to serve Catholics attached to our Embassy and certain other embassies. Between them the two pastors in Moscow and Leningrad serve approximately 12,000 Catholics of Lithuanian or Polish origin.

OTHER CATHOLICS TO THE NORTH AND SOUTH

Because there were no other Catholic priests to visit, we can say that our survey of the Catholic Church in this part of the Soviet Union was complete. It should be remembered, however, that 1954 statistics show 740 priests in Lithuania, 126 in Latvia. Two bishops there were consecrated in 1955, a third in 1957.

In the Ukraine, approximately 5 million Ukrainian-rite Catholics are deprived of freedom to practice their religion. Just before the end of Vatican Council II, a statement was issued in Rome by 15 Ukrainian-rite bishops. It was addressed to all the fathers of the council, asking them to pray for the Catholics of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. It urged the council fathers to take up this matter with their countries' officials, so that intervention might be made with representatives of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic at the United Nations. Unfortunately, we were not able to visit the Ukraine and to report on it at firsthand.

Dr. Harold Bosley, who had earlier made the acquaintance of Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad through the World Council of Churches, initiated plans to have our entire group visit with this prelate before our departure. We succeeded in doing this both in Leningrad and later in Moscow, and at both meetings we were warmly welcomed by the young, bearded churchman, who plays a unique role in maintaining relations between the Russian Orthodox Church and other churches, and has undoubtedly been instrumental in setting up what appeared to him to be satisfactory relations with the Soviet Government.

Dr. Bosley and Rabbi Schneier went with us to visit the well-known Baptist Church in Moscow, whose father-and-son pastors, Jakov and Michael Zhidkov, gave us places of honor during their 2-hour Christmas service and later conferred with us in private.

In Leningrad, we were given a gracious welcome to the Russian Orthodox seminary, where the rector and vice rector showed us through their establishment and introduced us to some visiting seminarians. In the same city, we visited the museum of atheistic propaganda housed in the beautiful Cathedral of Our Lady of Kazan.

In the course of a touristic visit to mammoth Moscow University, where we inspected classrooms, living quarters (6,000 students reside there) and specialized (and much used) libraries, we sat in on a seminar with a gruff professor who holds a chair of philosophy of religion in the graduate department of the university. With his graduate students around him, all eager to see and hear the visiting Americans, we exchanged ideas on Marxism-Leninism, discussed Whitehead, Alexander, and Sidney Hook, and learned that one of his students was doing a dissertation on the psychology of religion in the United States, while another was anxious to gather material for a thesis on Father Pierre Teilhard de Chardin.

We kept our second appointment with Mr. Makartsev, of the Council on Religious Cults, and on this occasion found him prepared to discuss some of the particular questions that touch Jewish religious practice. Again, he was not only correct but quite cordial, and we might well have gone back for a third visit with him had time permitted.

Briefly, here are the points that Makartsev made in our two discussions. The U.S.S.R., he said, is an atheistic state that carries on a program of antireligious propaganda. He did not need to tell us how effective the state had been in eliminating from public life any and all vestiges of religious tradition. This was evident. We were in Moscow at the Christmas season, but all the holiday atmosphere that was centered around the protracted celebration of New Year's Day, with decorated trees, Father Frost and the Snow Maiden as stage props. Outside of the churches, of course, the words Christ and Christmas appeared nowhere. A big Father Frost celebration was held for children at the Kremlin palace, where they were entertained by ballet dancers and top Soviet clowns.

Mr. Makartsev told us we should visit the churches that were available in Moscow and see for ourselves how freedom of religion thrives.

He went on to point out that since all property is owned by the state, religious groups are obliged to apply to the state for the use of church buildings, and that they pay a small rental and insurance fee for such use. Ministers of religion pay taxes on their personal income. All moneys for religious activity must be raised by the churches from the gifts of believers. Their financial records are inspected by the state. All temporal affairs of the religious groups are in the hands of parish committees of laymen, who act as the liaison agency between the churches and the Council on Religious Cults, which itself is the go-between for working out church affairs with the state.

Makarstev insisted that all reasonable needs of religious groups are fulfilled by the state, but that applications for these acts of cooperation with religious groups have to be made through the church or synagogue committees. Religious organizations must take the initiative, he said. The state will do nothing on its own to encourage their activties, but it will do its part. Thus, the printing of prayerbooks or bibles, the baking of matzos for Jewish Passover meals, structural repairs of church buildings, etc., are provided by the state, and paid for by the religious congregations, after approval of applications to the Council. All groups, he was insistent in pointing out, are treated equally according to constitutional norms.

We realized that we were seeing only the top of an immense iceberg. We were visiting only 2 cities, which, despite a combined population of over 10 million, do not give a visitor any insight into the state of religious life throughout the Soviet Union. Moreover, it is obvious that the Soviet Union, which hopes to maintain good relations with tourists, would see to it that some few religious showplaces be open as a refutation of the charge of persecution.

With these reservations in mind, here are some highlights of what we were able to learn about the state of the different religious groups in the Soviet Union.

WE GO TO VISIT WITH THE BAPTISTS

The Baptists of Moscow make a good starting point. The word "Baptist," when it is used of this thriving congregation, has a somewhat loose sense, since those we visited are in reality a combination of several fundamentalist Protestant strains, including Seventh Day Adventists. We witnessed the second 2-hour service held on Christmas Day, and we were impressed by the tone of cohesiveness and devotion that prevailed in the congregation. The large teen-age choir sang beautifully, mostly to Western hymn tunes, and our collective judgment was that about a quarter of the congregation was under 45 or 50 years of age. There was, as we found to be the case in every church, a great swell of older women, crowding every available foot of space, singing and praying with great relish. Preaching, prayers, and hymns alternated throughout the long service. There was a strong Biblical and instructional content to the discourses of the band of elders and ministers who preached. Some in the congregation had printed hymnbooks, but others had hymnbooks that were written out by hand. The Baptists regularly conduct six services a week.

After the service, talking with 80-year-old Pastor Emeritus George Zhidkov and with his son, Michael, who had received theological training in the United States and Canada, we learned that they felt things were going along rather well and that they had a measure of freedom in which to regulate their internal affairs. They spoke of an edition of the Bible in Russian, printed for them on state presses about 10 years ago with plates furnished from the American Bible Society in New York. They said that they were able to publish a journal, Brotherly Herald, for distribution among their people, and that the press run is currently 5,000 copies. Young Pastor Zhidkov told us there are approximately 5,000 Baptist congregations—all of them native Russian—throughout the Soviet Union. We had, of course, no opportunity to verify this statement or to visit any of these congregations. If they get along rather well, it is partly because the Russian Baptists have no international ties. Connections abroad are extremely suspect in the xenophobic U.S.S.R.

One of us proposed a question to the Baptist ministers. If a band of U.S. Texas Baptists were to collect sufficient money for such a project and train themselves in the Russian language, we asked, would they be allowed to come to Moscow and set up another chapel, designed to extend Baptist influence within the capital city and the Soviet Union The answer was no—absolutely no.

The Baptists have no seminary. The training of future ministers and preachers for their church is done by correspondence courses and by actual practice in preaching and prayer.

The Zhidkovs are proud of their handsome leather guest book, which contains the salutations of the thousands of visitors who have come to see them over past years. Prominent among the signatures, and marked with special ribbons in the book, are the greetings of the late Eleanor Roosevelt, the late Adlai E. Stevenson, and former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson. Many American groups have visited the Baptist center and signed that guest book. It seems significant that the Zhidkovs have calling cards printed in English.

RUSSIAN ORTHODOX RECEIVES US CORDIALLY

Despite its long history of association with the homeland, the Russian Orthodox Church claims that it enjoys no special privileges in the Soviet Union. There are those, however, who assert that it is dealt with more favorably than others, and even that it is manipulated as an instrument of Soviet foreign policy. This charge was made most recently by Metropolitan Philaret, Primate of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, in a five-page documented statement that he issued in New York. The Metropolitan is primate of 22 Orthodox bishops with dioceses in the free world.

During our visit, we were unable to obtain evidence that would prove or disprove the charges of those who assert that the Russian Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union is seriously compromised. One item, however, should be noted. The day we arrived in Moscow, Patriarch Alexei who is the 88-year-old head of the church, issued a Christmas message that was published by Tass, official Soviet news agency. The patriarch, in his references to the United States, repeated the official Soviet line on the war in Vietnam. He said: "In these days of Christmas, our eyes turn to the country whose people experience great suffering. Strangers are waging a bloody war in South Vietnam, making air raids on the territory of a sovereign state, democratic Vietnam * * *. In the name of what, has a power with old democratic traditions such as the United States of America embarked on the road of trampling justice underfoot and preventing by violence the Vietnamese people from settling their domestic affairs themselves?"

We find it hard to believe that the aged man we saw officiating at the midnight Mass in Moscow is the actual author of this document. But he lent it his name.

Although this historic church might dare to count as many as 40 million adherents throughout the territories of the U.S.S.R., there is no way for the transient visitor, who stops only in the major cities. To tell how well served (if served at all) the faithful of the towns, villages, and countryside may be. We learned that in Moscow there are at least 40 Orthodox churches, each with 3 or 4 priests. In Leningrad there may be as many as 16 churches. Metropolitan Nikodim said that there are enough priests to go around (we can presume he means for those churches that the state allows to function), and that the three seminaries that remain open provide as many new members of the clergy as are needed. The seminary at Zagorsk, near Moscow, has approximately 300 students; the one in Leningrad, 200; a third, in Odessa, 100. We were not able to verify these figures. A total of 600 seminarians would seem a pitifully small number for so vast a country, where, at least in some areas, there are so many adherents of the Russian Orthodox faith.

During an extended visit to the seminary in Leningrad, we inspected the chapel, where the students attend and help to conduct a 2-hour service in the morning and another 2-hour service at night. We were shown through the student library and reading room, and we noticed among new accessions three shelves of theological works in English, most of them from Anglican sources. Usually, professors of theology in the Russian Orthodox Church are laymen. A long line of framed photographs, hung in the corridors each year to commemorate graduating classes, shows the lay faculty with those clerical students who have finished course work. We noted, in one recent group photo, the face of newly consecrated Bishop Juvenal, whom we had met in Moscow. Since we visited the seminary in Leningrad during the Christmas holidays, we had no opportunity to meet the students, who were away on vacation. But we did meet several visiting seminarians from Zagorsk, some of them from Uganda and others from Lebanon.

Incidentally, a recent report in the London Spectator, written by a Moscow resident, tells of a church opposite Gorki Park on which about 60,000 rubles have been spent for renovations. Whether these funds came from the state, and were made available to preserve the artistic and architectual features of the church buildings, or from the donations of the faithful, is not known. The writer also mentioned the refurbishing of two smaller churches, one on each side of the giant new hotel Rossiya, which we saw to be nearing completion near the Kremlin, and which our guide said would be the largest hotel in Europe (6,000 rooms).

Russian Orthodox priests usually wear their traditional black robes and black hats in the streets. We mingled with a large group of them in Leningrad, where 15 or more were holding some sort of luncheon or reception in the Hotel Europa on a Sunday afternoon. The age level of the group was low. They were well dressed, dignified, reserved in manner. Some appeared shy about talking with foreigners.

The two receptions accorded us by Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad—one at his home in Leningrad, the other in a large office that he occupies in Moscow—left nothing to be desired from the standpoint of warmth, cordiality, and openness. He answered our questions in detail. He spoke of the large congregations that worship in his churches in Leningrad; 1 cathedral there, he said, can contain as many as 12,000 worshipers. We got the impression from him that the working relations of the Russian Orthodox Church with the state are tolerable and even satisfactory.

The church, he explained, is able to support itself through offerings given for candles, which are manufactured very cheaply, and through the sale of crucifixes and other religious articles. It publishes the scholarly Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate. Nikodim stressed the fact that his church has traditionally never had any special organizations for youth, and that thus the Government's proscription of special programs of religious formation for youth has not caused them to curtail such practices. The questioner, of course, is left to wonder where future believers are to come from in a society that does everything possible—through its Komsomol and other organizations—to attract the loyalty of youth to atheistic ideals.

Metropolitan Nikodim entertained us in a spacious office and reception room, where he proudly showed us a photograph of himself with Pope Paul VI, taken during his recent visit to Rome for the closing session of Vatican Council II. With us during the interview was a distinguished lay theologian, Dr. Alexander Kasem-Beg, who acts as theological adviser to Patriarch Alexei and is closely associated with the Metropolitan. Dr. Kasem-Beg, who taught for more than 10 years at Connecticut College during and after World War II, has a great interest in the work of the Vatican Council. He said he had written about 2,000 typed pages of commentary on its decrees. He has not been on a visit to Rome in several years, but frequently visited there in earlier times.

VISITING THE PRIESTS IN MOSCOW AND LENINGRAD

Our visits with the two Catholic parish priests in Moscow and Leningrad were extremely fraternal. Father Michael Tarvidis of Moscow has an active parish. He is quick to point out that this part of the Soviet Union is not a Catholic land, and that those few Catholics who are to be found there are immigrants from Lithuania or Poland. He says that he gets along well with the government, that religious leaders are occasionally invited to receptions in the Kremlin, and that when he was recently asked by Pope Paul to come to visit the Vatican Council as the Pope's special guest, government officials congratulated him on this invitation and urged him to go. He, too, proudly showed us a photograph taken with Pope Paul during his stay in Rome.

Father Tarvidis told an interesting story about a radio program he taped a year ago last Christmas for an Italian network. He asked for state clearance to make this program, and was requested to say what he was going to talk about. He said he planned to speak about peace, love, and the Pope. "What are you going to say about the Pope?" he was asked, and answered: "I am going to say that the Pope is in favor of peace and has great love for all men." He then proceeded to tape the talk, which presumably was broadcast in Italy. This, he said, was the only act of control the Government has exercised in his case during his 2-year tenure in Moscow. In fact, he said that officials had recently asked him whether he did not wish to move to a larger church, formerly a Lutheran Church, now no longer in use. Father Tarvidis had not decided to leave his present church, just around the corner from Lubyanka Prison.

Young Father Butkiewics entertained us in Leningrad over the breakfast table in his modest quarters next to the parish church. He was sent to Leningrad by the Bishop of Riga in Latvia, when Riga was asked to supply a priest to fill the place of an aging priest, now deceased, who was there before him. His is a lonely post, but he appears to have no difficulties about it, and insists that things are going along rather well and that notions held in the West about religious persecution in the U.S.S.R. are somewhat exaggerated. He says that no one prevents him from visiting the sick in the hospitals. His long, sung masses, followed by lengthy supplications done in the Russian manner, warm his cold church with hardy tones and certainly keep alive the faith of his parishioners. He was ordained in Riga several years ago in a class of nine seminarians, all the rest of whom are working in Latvia.

Thus, one came away from conversations with Protestants, Russian Orthodox and Catholics with a certain measure of hope that, even though religious life may never be allowed to flourish under the Communist regime, it still has a good chance of surviving. In fact, we heard in various places of the curiosity of younger people about religion, and even of a certain faddishness connected with their attendance at church services or wearing religious medals. The atheistic overzealousness of some officials during the previous regimes, which had been more ruthless in their fight against religion, seems to be tapering off a bit. A recent television program, we are told, even spoofed the notion of trying to root out all traces of religion from street names, native music, etc. During the program, someone advocated doing away with all names of saints that are still to be found on Soviet street signs. Another speaker replied that the Government, if it were to be consistent in pursuing such a policy, would then have to change the name of every single Soviet citizen named Popov, because popov means son of a priest.

We found evidence, too, of a certain sense of shame, or at least uncertainty, about the strident and vulgar displays of atheistic propaganda in the Leningrad Museum developed to that subject. We were told by our atheist friend, Mr. Makartsev, that we were not likely to find the museum displays "objective." The guides there hustle foreign visitors past the more gruesome displays, which include a complete set of bright, shiny torture instruments, said to have been used in the days of the Spanish Inquisition. A Soviet newspaper comment on the museum recently remarked that it is not necessary, in teaching against religion, to "insult people." The museum is certainly not "objective," but there was a long queue of Soviet citizens outside its doors, patiently waiting in the bitter cold to get into the crowded corridors. A guide told us that each weekday four to ten groups of children are shown through the museum as "background for their history courses."

Thus, there are elements that suggest confidence and other elements that make the picture very bleak. God has been taken out of public life; no religious instruction of youth is permitted; churches are severely curtailed in their activities; missionary work is forbidden. Yet, on balance, there seem to be some signs of hope for Christian groups in the Soviet Union.

WE ARE WORRIED BY THE PROBLEMS OF THE JEWS

The plight of the Jewish people is different. There are an estimated 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union, of whom about half a million live in Moscow and 330,000 in Leningrad. Because they are a nation and a culture as well as a religious group, Jews are always officially denominated as such (Yevrei), no matter from what part of the Soviet Union they come. Thus, a man from the Ukraine has his papers stamped "Ukrainian," another from Georgia has "Georgian" on his papers. But a Ukrainian or a Georgian who is a Jew has "Yevrei" indelibly impressed on his document.

Moreover, the Jew of the Soviet Union has a deep, atavistic fear of persecution. He may well explain this fear by pointing to a centuries-old record of pogroms under the czars. Anti-Semitism, always so rife in Eastern Europe, has deep roots in the Soviet Union, Stalin and Khrushchev were both anti-Semitic in their writings and attitude. The Jewish people, therefore, seem to live in constant apprehension that the "black years" of the Stalin period—1948–53, when so many of their leaders were sent off to exile and death—may return.

Everyone you ask will tell you that Jews are treated by the state in exactly the same manner as other groups. When Jews complain that certain of their requests have not been honored, the official explanation is likely to be that they have not really made clear what they require for their services. Let them take the initiative, we were told, and there will be no problem.

But it does not appear to be quite so simple. From what we could see, the Jews are afraid. They are more afraid of reprisals than any other group we spoke with. They are reported to be much more obsequious to the government in their public statements than other religious communities. If the report is justified, then such obsequiousness doubtless springs from an understandable insecurity and fear. If the chief rabbi of Moscow is the one who signs such statements, our guess is that these statements are written for him by others, probably by the minor lay official who are officers of his synagogue and who surround him like a bodyguard. The chief rabbi can rarely be visited in privacy. His lay committeemen close in on him when a visitor arrives and inject themselves into the conversation.

Our group had the experience of meeting with the chief rabbi in his office on the afternoon of the Sabbath. The little that he was free to tell us about the conditions of Jewish life was carefully tailored to the sensibilities of his lay admonitors, who were present. They were not only present, but very vocal. Interrupting the chief rabbi, they angrily asked us why we had come, why religious persons should be concerned with such questions as we were asking, why Americans daubed swastikas on synagogues, and why we did not go home and stop the U.S. aggression in Vietnam. They overplayed their role, whatever it was supposed to be, and made a very bad impression all around.

We left Moscow for Leningrad after our interview with the chief rabbi, promising that we would return for another visit the next week. On our return, the chief rabbi was unavailable. We were told that he was in the hospital, that he was ill, that he was "in quarantine," and that it was impossible for the lay officers of the synagogue to reveal where he could be visited. Rabbi Schneier was allowed to talk with him on the phone. The chief rabbi said that he was doing all that he could in the situation, that he was not free to say where he was, and that he sent regards to his brethren in the United States.

Undoubtedly, in the case of the Jews—as in that of the Roman Catholics—special difficulties arise because of their "outside" connections. Judaism, if not actually persecuted as a religion, is suspect because it is the faith of an international group of believers all over the world who are dispersed but cohesive, and who can command financial help and the effective support of propaganda from many influential quarters. We caught a whiff of official resentment when Mr. Makartsev looked at a clipping we showed him from a New York paper, in which a prominent rabbi assailed the Soviet Union because of restrictions he said were being leveled at Soviet Jewry. Markartsev brushed it off as "anti-Soviet propaganda."

One possible key to the plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union lies in what was to us the ominous activity of the lay committeemen who surround the few aging rabbis. It is difficult to believe that these salaried laymen are not government agents. If they are not formally such, their attitude of fear and servility seriously compromises the cause of religious freedom of the Jewish community and prevents necessary initiatives that would help to solve the problems that face Judaism in an anti-Semitic land. Some of them actually told us: "If you say anything, say only what is favorable."

Specific complaints with respect to the state of the Jews in the Soviet Union cover a wide field: the availability of matzos, the printing of liturgical books, the manufacture of prayer shawls and phylacteries, the need for Jewish burial grounds, the reestablishment of a seminary, the wider authorization of books in Yiddish, the need for a Yiddish press and a Yiddish theater. Some of these needs are religious, others cultural. A recent "Special Report" of the B'nai B'rith International Council (1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., 20036), entitled "The Status of Jews in the Soviet Union," supplies excellent, factual background. The report was published in August 1964.

Can Judaism survive in this unfriendly atmosphere? The remaining rabbis are so old; the Jewish community lives in such apparent fear and insecurity; there seems to be so little hope that a seminary will be established. There is no question but that the Jews of the Soviet Union need the prayers of their fellow believers—and of us all.

We started our trip home by flying from Moscow to Budapest. Hungary is a satellite country, but the change in atmosphere struck us immediately. Priests walked the streets in their cassocks. The churches were open and crowded. The chief rabbi of Budapest met us at the airport. But that is another story.

Friday Night Telecasting of Pro Football Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the greatness of our country can, in part, be attributed to our spirit of competitiveness and our knowledge that teamwork is important in obtaining our goals and retaining our basic freedoms. One of our scholastic sports, namely football, has always been regarded as a vehicle useful in the learning of the value of teamwork and useful also in fanning the spark of competitive spirit.

I would hereby warn my colleagues in the House of Representatives of the possible demise of scholastic football and its component parts of teamwork and competition. This demise will come about if and when professional sports are allowed to compete with scholastic sports for attendance figures and/or television viewers.

I have unanimous consent to insert the following letter into the RECORD so that all who read it will be cognizant of the importance of voting wisely on S. 950, an act to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission applicable to organized professional team sports.

LANCASTER CITY SCHOOLS,
February 10, 1966.

The Honorable Congressman W. H. MOELLER,
Lancaster, Ohio.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOELLER: In the February newsletter from the Ohio High School Athletic Association is the following news item:

"FRIDAY NIGHT TELECASTING OF PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL GAMES

"On the basis of information we have received, both the American Football League and the National Football League will have a series of telecasts during the first few weeks of the interscholastic season. We are enlisting the support of the schools, their administrators, boards of education, coaches, newspapers, civic groups, and other interested parties in a vigorous campaign to prevent these telecasts. We are unalterably convinced that the insidious effects of such a program will have dire consequences on interscholastic football. We solicit your wholehearted aggressive cooperation. Let your Congressman know how you feel on this matter."

We feel this would have an effect on high school athletic programs and would appreciate your support on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
LARRY PETERSON,
Director of Physical Education and Athletics.

Ewa Elementary and Intermediate School Children Outstanding in Lincoln Day Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege on February 11, 1966, to participate in a program commemorating the 22d anniversary of the unveiling of a statue erected in honor of Abraham Lincoln at Ewa Elementary and Intermediate School in Hawaii. The annual function has drawn national attention and has been featured in national publications. Under the guiding hands of its principal, Mr. Ross Bachman, who, incidentally, was my high school teacher in chemistry and physics, the school has kept up a traditional practice of paying tribute to the honored, and the bronze likeness of our 16th President is annually draped with floral leis.

The program this year also featured Lydia Goto, a sixth grader, who read a poem which she herself had composed, entitled "Abraham Lincoln." The program was highlighted by Gail Omiya who delivered her winning essay which bore the challenging title, "How Do We Compare With Abe Lincoln?"

Both compositions reflect the tremendous impact which the life of Abraham Lincoln is continuing to exert on our young Americans. It was deeply reassuring to me to find that even our schoolchildren of tender years have the capacity to recognize and admire the fine personal qualities that Lincoln possessed.

I was asked to this Lincoln Day observance as the principal speaker to provide some food for inspirational thought, but it was I who came away from it all the richer because of the experience.

Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman from Hawaii, I am proud to share Lydia's poem and Gail's essay with the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Their respective original compositions follow:

HOW DO WE COMPARE WITH ABE LINCOLN?

(By Gail Omiya)

A man's heredity, environment, appearance, and education do not make him successful or famous.

Abraham Lincoln lived in a log cabin with not much furniture. Children nowadays live in comfortable furnished homes and are still asking for more things like color television sets, stereos, and transistor radios. Abraham Lincoln was thankful for what few things he had.

Children of today fuss about the use of their study desks by their younger brothers or sisters. They complain about their using them too often and messing them up. Abraham Lincoln had no desk, so this determined boy had to lie on the floor and study by the fireplace. He had no pencil or paper like we have today, but he was satisfied with charcoal which served as his pencil and a smooth board which served as his paper.

Many of us complain about walking a block or two to school and have to ride to school. Abraham Lincoln walked 2 miles to school with his sister. They did not complain because they believed it was a great privilege to attend school.

Children nowadays want fashionable clothing. Girls want the English type of dresses with the high waist. Boys like to wear the Beatle boots made in England. Many children like to get new things whenever a special occasion comes up. Abraham Lincoln didn't have many new things. He had no shoes except in winter when he did have a pair of home-sewn moccasins to cover his bare feet and a coonskin cap to wear over his head. His clothes were made from homespun cotton.

Abraham Lincoln was an honest lad and thus he acquired the nickname, "Honest Abe." A car, a monument, a penny, and a city, all remind us of this great man. We, at Ewa School, are even more fortunate for we have a statue on our school ground to remind us of what he stood for.

How many of you are honest with yourselves? When homework is assigned, do you let it go and then early the next day go to school and copy the work from your friends? Or are you one of those who write the answers when the teacher or students read their answers? There are many children who are taking these short cuts in school work. It is a shame that the children have to cheat themselves. What will the future be for these children?

Some children feel that they can't do well in school because they come from homes whose parents are not very well educated.

But look at Abraham Lincoln. Both of his parents could neither read nor write. He did well because he wanted to learn. Everyone who has read his Gettysburg Address knows what a fine writer he was.

Abraham Lincoln taught us a lesson which we sometimes tend to forget, that what a person can do and what he has to say are far more important than what kind of parents he has, or what kind of house he lives in, or what style of clothes he wears. We must learn to make the most of what we have and do what is right. And as we look at our statue each day, let it continue to inspire us with all his virtues, so we can all be better persons in the tomorrows to come. Let us not let this statue be here in vain.

Abraham Lincoln

(By Lydia Goto)

Born in the great year of 1809,
Fate showed wisdom in his line.

Poor boy, ragged clothes, his feet were bare,
To lead a life of tender care.

'Twas in a log schoolhouse he was to learn
That for education he would forever yearn.

In 1816, a move to Indiana
What hardships they endured, Abe and Sarah.

To grow up on the frontier was a challenge indeed
A life of his own Abe was to lead.

He did different odd jobs, but none were near
The end of the line for the search of a career.

For political office then Abraham ran
And soon he was elected Congressman.

Lincoln, the President in 1861
At last his great desire Abraham had won.

The Civil War began during Abe's administration
But he tackled this problem with great determination.

So we pay tribute to this great God's hand
Who helped to create our free honest land.

Louisiana Council for Music and Performing Arts, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, percentagewise, Louisiana has forged ahead of her sister States in industrial development and in raising the per capita income of her citizens. Our progress along material lines has been matched by renewed interest and emphasis in Louisiana's long and varied cultural background.

A distinguished group of government officials, civic leaders and private citizens have banded together to form the Louisiana Council for Music and Performing Arts, Inc. The laudatory purposes and aims of the new group are succinctly stated in a brochure prepared by the council which I now read for your consideration:

For years our State has needed an organization of many citizens of good will, to enrich the existence of our cities and towns and smaller areas, in music and performing arts—the good things of life which encourage the realization of values by which men live.

Now, after long advance efforts in many parts of Louisiana, we are launching a careful, well-prepared movement toward that end.

The purposes are several:

1. To stimulate greater statewide interest in music, in the theater in its many forms, and in the wide variety of related arts in which the adults and the young have always joined to their mutual benefit.
2. To give concrete, vigorous encouragement to the development of Louisiana talent in these fields.
3. To advance the provisions for suitable performing facilities throughout Louisiana.
4. To work steadily and effectively in drawing new visitors and new industries to the State.
5. To help in creating the best possible cultural image of Louisiana in the eyes of the Nation and of the world.
6. To assist in obtaining the former Civil Courts Building on Royal Street in New Orleans, for conversion into a great Louisiana Center for Music and Performing Arts—as a major center, but not the sole one, in the furtherance of this statewide goal.

Rival cities of the South are succeeding in many instances in overtaking the leadership long claimed by Louisiana. For our own continued cultural advancement, as well as for the realization of our opportunities, we must be prepared to supply a present gap, an unfortunate lag in our community life.

Then, too, we must be prepared to provide opportunities which the thousands of newcomers to our State expect of their new places of residence.

Toward these ends we will work for the following detailed goal:

Development of a cultural exchange plan throughout Louisiana; the listing of talent and organizations in this field, so that each community can note what it has to offer and what other communities provide; encouragement of booking of one or more cultural attractions from such lists, thus giving artists new incentive to remain in Louisiana and at the same time allowing Louisianians to benefit by enjoyment of the talent remaining in our State.

Such encouragement and increased audiences would, we feel, raise the level of concerts, productions, and other presentations.

Local units, to be headed by leading citizens of each community, will be formed in every parish, city, and town, to unite cultural interests and encourage the sharing of many benefits. Such units will stimulate additional interest and develop greater community pride in local talent—and also give impetus to further cultural opportunities and attractions.

We will work to develop an accurate, comprehensive calendar of events, in order to interest more Louisianians in the musical and performing arts in our State; to draw additional visitors to Louisiana; to increase the prospects of tours and circuits by individual artists or groups of performers; to encourage more and better events of greater variety in festivals, individual events, and related activities in every part of the State; to show business and industry additional reasons for locating in Louisiana.

We will work steadily, with energy and imagination, to encourage the extension of the work of the many existing schools and organizations which deal with music and performing arts.

We will cooperate with colleges and educational leaders to explore all possibilities for enrichment of the life of our Louisiana communities.

We will give particular stress to the development of cultural appreciation among our young people.

We will work vigorously to bring forth, or widen, the range of programs for schoolchildren.

Not least, we will cooperate with all other groups or individuals to foster a high level of presentation and an ever-enriched talent which will attract audiences and be of lasting educational value for Louisiana.

Throughout America our people are becoming steadily more and more aware of the need for realization of their cultural opportunities. The national trend of interest in music, the performing arts, and related subjects is revealed graphically in the soaring sales of books, musical instruments and records, and the ever-increasing attendance at plays, symphony, opera, operetta, folk music, jazz concerts, dance groups, theater and musical festivals, and many, many other kinds of performances.

Louisiana has a long and varied cultural background. This is the birthplace of jazz. The first opera in the Nation was here, and regular professional theatrical performances were held in the State as early as 1791, or earlier. One noteworthy aspect of our rich Louisiana advantages stems from the fact that cultural activities come in a wide variety of forms—not least of them—folk singing and creative writing. In each of these aspects Louisiana has contributed exponents who have won national fame.

Many businesses place a high emphasis on cultural and recreational offerings of a region being considered for potential location of a plant. Often employees, ranging from top management to unskilled worker, find that cultural and recreational facilities affect employment decisions. We must forget none of these facts in our labors to bring Louisiana back to her rightful place as one of the major cultural centers of America.

In the former Civil Courts Building on Royal Street we feel certain that we have a major asset, a splendid structure to provide a magnificent setting for our work. Its use for this purpose, after conversion, has been declared entirely feasible; the costs of such conversion would be comparatively small—the benefits to the State would be tremendous. Thousands of groups and individuals favor developing a music center in the Vieux Carre because of its tourist appeal and have given their warm support to the Royal Street building as an ideal setting for a State center for music and performing arts, and for use for advertising purposes for the many attractions in all other sections of Louisiana.

We solicit your cooperation and support. We invite you to join the Louisiana Council for Music and Performing Arts. For the betterment of our State, let us take this step forward together.

For further information and membership application address: Louisiana Council for Music and Performing Arts, Inc., 865 Commerce Building, Post Office Box 4775, Baton Rouge, La.

Louisiana Council for Music and Performing Arts, Inc., Baton Rouge, La.

Officers

The Honorable John J. McKeithen, Governor of the State of Louisiana; State capitol, Baton Rouge; honorary chairman, board of directors.

Mrs. Earl K. Long, chairman, board of directors, 7449 Boyce Drive, Baton Rouge; wife of late former Governor of Louisiana.

Mrs. Edwin H. Blum, president and founder, 7534 St. Charles Avenue, New Orleans.

Senator Michael H. O'Keefe, first vice president, American Bank Building, New Orleans; attorney at law and Louisiana Senate floor leader.

Mrs. John B. Fournet, vice president, Roosevelt Hotel, New Orleans (and Jennings, La.); wife of the chief justice of Louisiana.

Congressman EDWIN W. EDWARDS, vice-president, 1266 North Avenue, J., Crowley; Member of U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Edward M. Carmouche, vice-president, 1111 Bayou Oaks Lane, Lake Charles; attorney at law.

Mr. Roy Theriot, corresponding secretary; State comptroller, State capitol, Baton Rouge (and Abbeville).

Mrs. Ellen Bryan Moore, recording secretary; registrar of State lands, State capitol, Baton Rouge.

Mrs. Thomas J. Martin, treasurer, 1129 Eleonore Street, New Orleans.

Mr. George Piazza, parliamentarian, 1807 Pere Marquette Building, New Orleans; attorney at law.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. Lionel Adams, 2402 Octavia Street, New Orleans.

Mrs. George W. Bernard, 1671 Octavia Street, New Orleans.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. H. C. Bezou, superintendent of schools, Catholic Archdiocese of New Orleans, 724 Camp Street, New Orleans.

Mr. William T. Brown, manager, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. public affairs, southern area, 420 Oil and Gas Building, New Orleans; industrial development advisor to Gov. John J. McKeithen.

Mrs. Edgar Burns, 1321 State Street, New Orleans.

Mr. Victor Bussie, State president of Louisiana AFL–CIO, Post Office Box 58, Baton Rouge.

Mr. Henry Zac Carter, president, Avondale Shipyards, Inc., Avondale, La.; residence: 1300 Valence, New Orleans.

Mrs. Russell Clark, 1680 State Street, New Orleans.

Mrs. Pierre Clemenceau, 465 Lowerline Street, New Orleans.

Mrs. Hugh Coughlin, 2939 Albert Street, Alexandria.

Mr. Charles C. Crawford, 1315 First Street, New Orleans.

Councilman Henry B. Curtis, City Hall, Civic Center, New Orleans; councilman of New Orleans.

Mrs. Joseph B. David, 2728 St. Charles Avenue, New Orleans.

Mrs. E. Allen Davis, 505 Haring Road, Metairie, La.

Mrs. Charles de la Vergne, 472 Walnut Street, New Orleans.

Mr. Vail Deloney, speaker of the house, State legislature, State capitol, Baton Rouge; residence: 1002 Lake Street, Lake Providence.

Mr. William J. Dodd, State superintendent of education, State capitol, Baton Rouge.

Mrs. Malcolm C. Downs, Military Highway, Pineville, Alexandria.

Mr. T. Sterling Dunn, 201 Baronne Street, New Orleans, group manager, Sears, Roebuck & Co. in New Orleans, past president of International House of New Orleans (1965).

Mrs. Crawford H. Ellis, 5411 St. Charles Avenue, New Orleans.

Mr. Robert Ewing, Jr., Shreveport, editor, the Shreveport Times.

Mr. Paul Fabry, International House, 607 Gravier Street, New Orleans, managing director, International House of New Orleans.

Mr. Darwin Fenner, 915 Common Street, New Orleans; president, board of administrators, Tulane University.

Mr. Murray C. Fincher, 1215 Prytania Street, New Orleans; vice president, Southern Bell Telephone Co.

Dr. Joel L. Fletcher, Lafayette; past president (1965), University of Southwestern Louisiana.

Mr. Harold Forgotston, Whitney Bank Building, New Orleans; immediate past president, Cultural Attractions Fund of New Orleans.

Mrs. Muriel B. Francis, 1525 Louisiana Avenue, New Orleans.

Mrs. Richard W. Freeman, 295 Walnut Street, New Orleans.

Mr. W. Crawford Fullilove, Shreveport; chairman, cultural affairs committee, chamber of commerce, Shreveport.

Mr. James Gardner, Shreveport; former mayor of Shreveport.

Mr. Camille Gravel, 611 Murray Street, Alexandria; attorney at law.

Mr. Maurice Grundy, National Bank of Commerce, New Orleans; president, Maurice W. Grundy Lumber Co.

Mrs. Charles E. Hamilton, 1124 St. John Street, Lafayette.

Mrs. Joseph Haspel, Sheraton-Charles Hotel, New Orleans.

Mrs. Venus D. Helis, 2322 Prytania Street, New Orleans.

Mrs. Hunt Henderson, 1410 Second Street, New Orleans.

Mr. J. Paul Hewitt, 1312 Louisville Avenue, Monroe; chairman, Louisiana Commission of Culture and the Performing Arts.

Mr. Homer L. Hitt, office of the chancellor, LSU at New Orleans; chancellor, LSU, New Orleans.

Mrs. Elayn Hunt, Raymond Building, Baton Rouge; attorney at law.

Dr. John Hunter, Baton Rouge; president, Louisiana State University.

Mrs. Hamilton P. Jones, 2423 Prytania Street, New Orleans.

Mrs. Thomas L. Jordan, 1415 Third Street, New Orleans.

Mr. Harnett T. Kane, 5919 Freret Street, New Orleans; author, president of Louisiana Landmarks Society.

Mr. Herbert A. Kenney, 12 Maryland Drive, New Orleans; vice president, Maison Blanche Co., New Orleans.

Mrs. E. James Kock, 2525 St. Charles Avenue, New Orleans.

Mr. Jules F. Landry, 348 Lafayette Street, Baton Rouge; attorney at law.

Mrs. Harry Latter, Pontchartrain Hotel, New Orleans.

Dr. Herbert E. Longenecker, 12 Audubon Place, New Orleans; president, Tulane University.

Mr. Mark P. Lowrey, 509 Orleans Street, New Orleans; architect, president, Vieux Carre Property Owners, Inc., New Orleans.

Mr. Wade O. Martin, Jr., State capital, Baton Rouge; secretary of state.

Mrs. Richard T. McBride, 1623 Dufossat Street, New Orleans; wife of Judge McBride, court of appeals, State of Louisiana.

Mr. Edwin R. McDonald, Newellton; cotton planter.

Mrs. J. Edgar Monroe, 5531 St. Charles Avenue, New Orleans.

Mr. Alfred J. Moran, 1448 Fourth Street, New Orleans, chairman of board, Thomas J. Moran & Sons, Inc.

Mrs. James Morrison, Hammond; wife of U.S. Congressman MORRISON.

Mr. Joseph Mullins, Monroe; dean, School of Music, Northeast Louisiana University, Monroe.

Mr. J. Freyhan Odenheimer, 4 Dunleith Court, New Orleans; president, New Orleans Philharmonic Symphony Association.

Mrs. Duncan Parham, 4833 St. Charles Avenue, New Orleans.

Mr. Fred Preaus, 110 North Franklin, Bastrop; attorney-at-law.

Mrs. Michael Provosty, 1111 Jefferson Avenue, New Orleans.

Mrs. W. Boatner Reily, Jr., 2221 Prytania Street, New Orleans.

Mrs. W. Boatner Reily III, 34 Pelham Drive, Metairie.

Mrs. O. N. Reynolds, Columbia, chairman, Folk Festival of Columbia, La.

Mrs. Peggy Richards, State Museum, New Orleans; director of Louisiana State Museum.

Mayor Victor H. Schiro, city hall, civic center, New Orleans; mayor of the city of New Orleans.

Mr. Clem Sehrt, 5870 Canal Boulevard, New Orleans; president, National American Bank of New Orleans.

Mrs. W. E. Simms, 1427 Fourth Street, New Orleans.

Very Reverend Andrew C. Smith, Loyola University, New Orleans; president, Loyola University.

Mrs. George M. Snellings, Jr., Monroe; attorney-at-law.

Mrs. Frank P. Stubbs, III, 1415 Third Street, New Orleans; president, State Youth Group of the Louisiana Council of Music and Performing Arts, Inc.

Mr. B. B. Taylor, Louisiana National Bank Building, Baton Rouge.

Mr. John F. Tims, 615 North Street, New Orleans; president, the Times-Picayune Publishing Co.

Mr. Calvin Watts, Louisiana Department of Public Works, State Capitol Annex, Baton Rouge; assistant director, department of public works.

Mr. Gus Weill, State Capitol, Baton Rouge; executive secretary to the Governor of Louisiana.

Mr. Philip Werlein IV, 605 Canal Street, New Orleans; president, Werlein's for Music.

Mrs. L. Kemper Williams, 2618 Coliseum Street, New Orleans.

Mrs. Francis A. Woolfley, 932 Solomon Place, New Orleans.

The Will To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam was going on for some time before we got into it. The war in Europe raged for years before we made an all-out effort to put an end to the atrocities. To show any less of a desire or passion to help our oriental friends who love freedom and democracy, would be discrimination.

We have had to make these decisions in the past, and until a better world is built, we probably will have to make similar decisions in the future. The following editorial points out that our basic will must remain the same in order to discourage future conflicts and shorten the present one. Under unanimous consent, I include the aforementioned editorial:

WAR POLICY: THE WILL TO WIN

In the argument between the "hawks" and the "doves" over conduct of the Vietnamese war, the basic principles and all the lessons bought in blood from the past are being ignored once again.

"Hawks" who want to blast "all out" in a total destruction of North Vietnam's industry, agriculture and commerce are as wrong as the "doves" who want to buy peace with appeasement.

Neither works.

The task of diplomacy and of policy remains the same even though they have degenerated to the use of war as a tool. War is not a purpose in itself. Victory, even, is not an end in itself.

Ever since Clausewitz first expressed it, every student of war has agreed and recognized that the purpose of war is to change the enemy's mind. It is a contest of will, and it is his will we seek to break, and our will that he seeks to break,

It is costly to forget this simple fact.

We forgot it in World War II with our demand of unconditional surrender that lengthened the war substantially.

We did even more damage with the Morgenthau plan, another civilian stunt that horrified professional military people. In France, the German armies were crumbling—a remnant with only flashes of the German fighting spirit—until the plan was revealed to reduce Germany to one big pastureland.

Then, in the bulge, German officers and men, veterans and tenderfeet, fought like tigers once again. The threat of total destruction revived them to furious battle.

Russian armies surrendered by the hundreds of thousands of soldiers, with little sign of any fighting spirit when the Germans slashed into the Ukraine, but after the German command treated all Slavs as slaves, Red troops and partisans fought, even in small units and surrounded, to the death.

More recently, the Arabs' loud boasts and threats boldly calling for the extermination of the Jews in Israel contributed to the fierce and desperate fighting spirit of the Israeli troops and civilians alike, and contributed to the Arab defeat.

It does not help victory to wage a war of extermination or seeming extermination. It merely provides you with a desperate nothing to lose enemy who makes victory harder.

It is his will you are at war with in the first place. Your strategy must not be to make it stronger, but to make it weaker.

Appeasement also fails because it whets the appetite of the aggressor and strengthens his will to take more and more by force. It certainly doesn't weaken his will.

The League of Nations declined to act against Japan in Manchuria, and the Manchurian adventure was promptly expanded to an attempt to seize all China and eventually into the attack on all southeast Asia covered by the attack on Pearl Harbor.

We now know, that because of our previous conduct, the Japanese launched their attack on Pearl Harbor on the calculation that we simply wouldn't have the stomach for a long war in the far Pacific and would negotiate a peace in which they would get all that they really wanted.

The Japanese success in Manchuria was the signal for Mussolini to hit Ethiopia, knowing now that the League of Nations wouldn't really interfere.

The neutrality of the Democratic world (which meant no arms for Republican Spain) emboldened Hitler and Mussolini to send arms and troops to Franco in the Spanish Civil War—and the Communists to take over the Republican defenders.

Western eagerness to understand, make concessions, and let bygones be bygones led directly to Hitler's bolder and bolder adventures—and ultimately to World War II.

This is a course, or series of courses, not only charted by history in terms of public events, but available for study from detailed accounts from inside both German and Japanese regimes which reveal the processes of thought and reaction, and how our appeasement did influence them directly to the course of ultimate disaster and major war.

The problem of policy and of war is the same. To influence the will of one's opponent.

How is that done?

1. He must be convinced that your will is not weakening, that he cannot change your mind.

2. He must be convinced that he cannot physically achieve victory.

3. And he must be convinced that peace will not be too bad.

There have been a lot of other clever ideas about the nature of a challenge at arms, but, unhappily history is littered with the wreckage of the empires that tried to meet aggression with other, more clever means.

China itself, once a great and powerful civilization, decided it wanted nothing but peace, and figured to be so much more intelligent than the barbarians on its borders that it could persuade and sometimes bribe them to peace (and even hire some of them to police the borders). China promptly fell to the Mongols like a ripe plum.

And that success stirred the Mongol leader, Genghis Khan, to rampage on across half the world.

Today, the Reds by their actions in battle and by their words and propaganda, are trying to achieve victory by convincing the American people that (1) their will is unbreakable, (2) we cannot win on the battleground, and (3) surrender would make things better for us. This is their road to victory. They expect to win by bending our will.

And some folks in our midst are trying to convince us of precisely the same things.

It certainly handicaps us in accomplishing the necessary conditions for an end to Red aggression. There is, actually, no question but that we can beat them, and no serious question but that all we ask is for them to top grabbing. But the question of our basic will remains.

They are counting on it. It provides them the indispensable motive for continuing an otherwise hopeless war.

Yet convincing them of our determination is the only way to peace. Appeasement merely provides the ideal conditions for a new and larger attack. All-out destruction only provides the conditions for an all-out defense.

The way left to us to shorten the conflict and discourage future ones both is to apply powerful military pressure at the front—and an open escape hatch behind it whereby they can stop the war and escape without too serious harm.—C. L. DANCEY.

Noted Harvard Professors Say the President Is Wrong on Section 201(a) of River and Harbor Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on October 26, 1965, when the President of the United States signed into law the bill, S. 2300, which subsequently became the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1965, he voiced strong opposition to one of the sections, section 201(a) of the legislation which requires only committee approval of water resource projects costing less then $10 million rather than congressional approval.

The President's strong statement directing the Secretary of the Army to refrain from exercising the authority which section 201(a) vests in him and accusing the Congress of enacting legislation which, in his opinion, runs counter to the Constitution of the United States came as a profound shock to the Congress and to many authorities in the area of constitutional interpretations.

Inasmuch as similar provisions are contained in at least two public laws from which similar authority is derived: Public Law 86–249, the Public Buildings Act of 1959 and Public Law 83–566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; it came as a surprise to legal authorities. Some have said that it indicates the power hungry nature of the Chief Executive to exercise complete domination of the Federal Government.

There appeared an interesting article in the Washington Post of Sunday, December 26, 1965, prepared by two outstanding professors of Harvard University on this very issue. The article, prepared by Dr. Arthus Maass, a professor of government at Harvard, and Dr. Joseph Cooper, an assistant professor of government at that same institution, clearly puts into perspective the issues involved in this conflict.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this article as a part of the RECORD. I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Congress will follow through in seeing its intentions regarding section 201(a), which it had when it enacted the law last fall, are carried out. More importantly, I hope that the President will recognize the appropriateness of the procedure set forth in section 201(a) and direct the Secretary of the Army to implement the section.

PRESIDENT'S HARBOR ISN'T SAFE—CRITICISM OF CONGRESSIONAL PUBLIC WORKS POWER SHOULD BE TAKEN BACK

(By Arthur Maass and Joseph Cooper, professor and assistant professor of government, respectively, at Harvard University)

When President Johnson signed the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Act, he strongly objected to a provision giving the Secretary of the Army authority to construct small water resource projects, costing less than $10 million, but requiring that the Public Works Committees of both Houses approve specific projects by resolution before money can be spent. The President said this provision "would dilute and diminish the authority and power of the Presidency" and that he had not been elected "to preside over its erosion." He said he had instructed the Secretary of the Army not to exercise the authority and promised to seek repeal when Congress meets again.

The President's position is of more than ordinary significance. In the last two decades, Congress has been developing and experimenting with a new and promising mechanism of legislative oversight—a legislative veto which authorizes an executive officer to take a specified action, but requires that it not go into effect until subjected to some form of congressional assent.

The mechanism is well suited for modern government in situations in which the executive is better suited than the legislature to formulate a specific decision, but in which the legislature feels that the decision is too important to be delegated outright to the executive. Perhaps the most noted example of this concerns the grant of power to the President to reorganize agencies and functions in the executive branch. The President makes reorganization plans, but they do not go into effect until they have been before Congress for 60 days—when either House can disallow them by a simple majority vote.

We feel this mechanism is constitutional and that it would be deplorable to strike it down on the basis of a civics book interpretation of the Constitution. The purposes for which the veto is used and the forms through which it is applied should be judged by criteria based on policy considerations, and in this instance the purpose is desirable and the form not inappropriate.

President Johnson holds that the provision is repugnant to the Constitution because it "dilutes and diminishes" the powers of the Presidency. It is true that the President could not veto committee decisions under the provision, just as he cannot veto congressional decisions that overturn his reorganization plans. But these congressional actions are not "legislation" and need not be approved by the President. They are simply actions established to govern the authority granted to the Executive.

The provision does, of course, interfere with the free exercise of Executive authority. But this does dilute Executive power in such a way as to violate the provisions of article II of the Constitution that vest Executive power in the President? To say that it does is to rule out all forms of legislative oversight, for these too impose conditions and restraints on executive officers.

Moreover, the requirement for committee approval in the provision is attached to Congress appropriations power. In a strictly legal sense, the veto exists only as a condition of appropriation. Is it to be supposed that Congress cannot structure the appropriations process in this way? Why can it not require that legislative committees as well as appropriations committees approve requests for money, since Congress can refuse to appropriate any money for programs that it has authorized? The legislative veto may make it more difficult for the President to obtain appropriations, but if difficulty were the test of constitutionality, many congressional procedures would be unconstitutional.

Even among Presidents, the case against constitutionality of the legislative veto is not universally accepted. If the river and harbors provision is unconstitutional, so is the executive reoganization law—which has been on the books since 1939 and had the consistent support of Presidents. Indeed, it was renewed in the last session of Congress on the recommendation of the Johnson administration.

Finally, the committee-action veto might be objected to on the ground that it allows a part of Congress to "legislate" for the whole and, therefore, violates article I of the Constitution. This argument is invalid, we believe, because veto decisions are not "legislation." But President Johnson has not raised this point.

The disputed provision is not unconstitutional. But the President can and should "veto" legislation that, though constitutional, is in his view undesirable because of its provisions on policy or procedure. Thus, if the rivers and harbors provision would in practice dilute and diminish to any significant degree the authority and powers of the Presidency, President Johnson would have strong justification for his "veto." But the facts do not support the President's conclusion.

The present procedure for water projects is as follows: The Corps of Engineers prepares a report on a proposed development; this report and the recommendations of other Federal and State agencies are scrutinized by the Bureau of the Budget. If the Bureau objects, the corps ordinarily will make modifications and then submit the report to Congress. However, the corps may stick to its original report, providing it informs Congress about the Budget Bureau objections. The congressional Committees on Public Works eventually put together an omnibus bill authorizing projects they approve.

This is called the biennial pork barrel bill by most critics, but the bill is more the President's bill than is much legislation, for almost all projects in it have been recommended by the President. Congress hardly ever includes a project on which the corps has reported unfavorably, and seldom one which the corps favors over the objections of the Budget Bureau.

The President also has the initiative in appropriation of funds. Many more projects are authorized than are funded. The President selects the projects that are to be in his budget; Congress reviews his proposals, cutting some and adding others. The President can veto the appropriations bill if he is displeased with Congress changes, or he can impound funds for a project that he considers undesirable.

What changes in this procedure does the rivers and harbors provision provide? The only change is in the form that Congress can use to authorize projects that cost less than $10 million. These projects can either be included in the biennial omnibus bill or they can be approved by resolutions of the Public Works Committees of both Houses.

Clearly, Congress reason for adopting this alternative was not to "dilute and diminish the authority and powers of the Presidency," but rather to expedite the consideration of small projects.

The President did not say how this provision is a challenge to Presidential authority. We can think of two reasons that could be adduced to support the President's position, though we find neither significant in the full picture. First, while the President can veto an omnibus bill, he cannot veto the resolutions of congressional committees. Second, in terms of the President's informal influence with Congress, it may be harder for him to work his will with a committee than with a whole House.

It is hard to find the dangers that the President fears; the reports before the committees for their approval will, in the vast majority of cases, be ones the President has recommended; his objections will be well known and documented if any reports to which he objects are submitted to Congress; and the President will retain all his discretion over the budget, and the right to impound appropriated funds.

Furthermore, because the President would be most unlikely to veto an omnibus rivers and harbors bill because he objected to a small project in it, the loss of the formal veto power on small projects is of little consequence.

The principal problem with the procedure for authorizing water resource projects is not that Congress has whittled away Presidential power, but that the President has failed to use his power.

The statutes do not include standards and criteria adequate to guide the Corps of Engineers in planning water projects, or Congress in reviewing and authorizing them. Without such standards, the committees and Congress are forced to rely, especially for small projects, on the personal opinions of Congressmen in whose districts the projects are to be built.

This, of course, is not desirable, but the fault lies not so much in the procedure for approving projects as in the lack of standards against which to judge them. And the Presidency is largely responsible for this shortcoming. Since World War II, no President has initiated legislation to establish a consistent set of standards and criteria for the design of water resource developments.

In want of Executive leadership, certain committees of Congress tried in the 1950's to initiate such legislation, but failed. In such a complex field, Congress is virtually dependent on the Executive for the extensive staff work required to develop legislative proposals. Several new policies relating to the design of water projects have become law since World War II, but all originated in committees of Congress, working sometimes clandestinely with Executive bureaus. None came from the Chief Executive.

The reasons for this are complex, but the principal one is that the President's advisers in the Executive Office do not trust Congress in the area of standards. So they have issued a partial set of standards in the form of budget circulars and Executive orders, not subject to congressional approval, and not necessarily accepted by Congress.

If there were legislated standards, as we believe there should be, Congress could use an array of procedures for reviewing and authorizing reports that had been prepared by the Corps, reviewed by other agencies of interest and cleared with the President. For large river basin developments, authorizing legislation would be in order; for smaller projects, authorization could be left to the Executive (as is now the case for projects involving less than $500,000 in Federal funds); and for those in between, congressional action could be in the form of a one-House veto, committee resolutions or simply a waiting period after which the project would be authorized automatically.

When and if the President initiates standards legislation, it would be entirely proper for him to propose the types of congressional action that should match the different types of projects, and he might well prefer something other than the committee resolution. Until then, however, he has no good reason to virtually "veto" the committee-action form, especially when it represents a desirable attitude of flexibility on the part of Congress.

In the House debate on the conference report of the rivers and harbors bill, Representative JOHN F. BALDWIN, Republican, of California, said representatives of administrative agencies had warned some conferees that they would recommend that the President veto the bill if the committee resolution provision were retained. The President has followed this advice, without striking down the whole bill.

We believe his action was wrong as regards both constitutionality and desirability. The President should withdraw, or simply ignore, the statement he made in signing the bill and order the development of standards for the design of river projects that he can propose to Congress—thus putting to use the leadership powers that are unquestionably his.

Justice on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the February 2 issue of the Dallas News an editorial which is very timely and reflects the thinking of a great number of Americans. It raises unanswered questions as to why there has been no prosecution of three Americans who traveled to Hanoi in January, obviously for the purpose of giving aid and comfort to our enemy—even as American lives were being lost in the struggle against Communist aggression in Vietnam.

The three who made the trip were: Prof. Staughton Lynd, of Yale University, Herbert Aptheker, an avowed Communist, and a leftwing founder of the Students for a Democratic Society, named Thomas Hayden.

The leader of that motley trio was Aptheker. It was admittedly a Communist-inspired trip. In Hanoi they condemned the United States and praised the Communists.

That trip was made in open defiance of a law which prohibits travel to Hanoi without approval by our Government. While other laws were probably violated, there appears to be no doubt about guilt in failure to obtain approval of the journey.

Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are asking: Why has nothing thus far been done about prosecuting these characters?

The editorial follows:

Justice on Trial

There must be no justice, in the minds of those two GI's who sold their uniforms to some East Germans who wanted to go over the wall. The Army has scheduled a court-martial where the two could draw as much as 2 years and 4 months in jail and dishonorable discharges.

The soldiers broke the law. So did the three East Germans who bought and wore uniforms against Western Allied regulations. But what of some other recent lawbreaking incidents?

Remember those three "factfinders" who dropped in on North Vietnam not long ago? Well, they're back home now. One, a professor, has been all over the newspapers and television with his inside tips on how to get out of Vietnam: Give up and throw ourselves on the mercy of the Communists.

The "factfinders" have Communist and other leftist affiliations that fill several typewritten pages. They blatantly defied a State Department ban on travel to North Vietnam and are subject to 5-year prison sentences and fines of up to $5,000. So far, no prosecution or reprimand.

And what of the Transit Workers Union which violated two State laws with an illegal strike that cost New York City at least a billion dollars? The charges were dropped when the strike was settled, and the lawbreakers, instead of drawing stiff fines, got fat pay raises.

Yet the Army is preparing to punish two young men for helping a small group of Communist captives flee to freedom. Is it justice?

The answer lies in the Western concept of law and order. Under our system, laws are made to be enforced, and agencies are set up to handle enforcement. Police departments fall into this category, and so, in a larger sense, do the Armed Forces.

Law enforcement should begin with those who enforce the law. Thus it is that policemen are suspended and soldiers court-martialed for breaking laws and regulations.

Because enforcers of the law should set an impeccable example of law and order, the Army's course of action is just. Hopefully it will be contagious.

Peoria Unions Pledged to Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include the following editorial from the February 9, 1966, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

An Interesting Union Proposal

A group of Peoria union chiefs are spearheading a plan which, if the details can be ironed out, looks like one of the most progressive programs to come down the road in a long time.

It is a bold, imaginative, pioneering effort that might make central Illinois a national model for peace in the construction industry—a condition that should do a great deal to further stimulate economic development here and make construction work plentiful.

The idea is simple. The details are terribly complex.

Construction is complicated on the one hand by the extremely flexible system of a general contractor and a series of subcontractors, brought together on the basis of the specializations needed on each given job.

On the other hand, construction workers are organized into a variety of specialities, each with its own union and its own jurisdiction.

One of the problems for all concerned has been the fact that often when a dispute over which union jurisdiction is appropriate rears its head the contractor, the unions directly involved, and all the other union worker groups employed on the job are apt to suffer as the job lies idle for all concerned while the dispute is ironed out.

Most of those injured are innocent bystanders—the unions not a part of the dispute who would otherwise be working, the contractor, and the preson who is counting on the factory, dwelling, or commercial building he is paying for and has contracted for but which isn't getting built.

Yet, for a union to yield jurisdiction in such a dispute means not only the loss of work involved in the one case but might prejudice all such jobs in the future.

Indeed, in a craft union, if jurisdiction is chipped away the union is out of business and ceases to exist—and its members are without work.

With the variety of unions involved and the variety of contractors and subcontractors involved, a variety of such problems have arisen and the overall problem has become very serious.

So serious that a great deal of sober and responsible effort has gone into the problem of how to fairly decide and consistently resolve such disputes—and establish fixed and known and stable jurisdictions.

These efforts were climaxed in the establishment of a national joint board and an appeals board for the specific settlement of jurisdictional disputes in the building and construction industry.

Further, basic agreements and decisions that have been made are compiled in what the trade calls "the green book" for the guidance of all concerned so as to avoid the same dispute erupting twice.

This structure was hammered out by the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO and the two major contractor associations with the President of the United States as witness.

It is a significant step forward, but far too often this machinery doesn't come into play until a job is underway and the job itself is held up until the procedures for settlement are completed.

What is now proposed, at the initiative of local leaders in the construction unions, is a general meeting of all interested parties, contractors, union representatives, and others—such as bank finance people.

The purpose would be to iron out a further step, providing for procedures whereby the plans and work outline of any job, once contracted, would be made available in advance in a "plan room" or by some other arrangement.

Within 1 week of this availability, the various unions would be required to formally claim which work fell into their jurisdictions. If claims overlapped, creating the conditions for a dispute, a hearing would be scheduled in an attempt to iron it out, and when all the hearing evidence was in regarding past agreements, past decisions in like cases, and if need be, lacking such case histories, reference to past local practice, the contractor would make his decision as to which of the disputing unions he believes has the best claim of jurisdiction.

The union in contention may then, if it chooses, appeal that decision to the already established and presently functioning national joint board.

In the meantime, the contractor's decision stands and the work must go forward without disruption or a work stoppage. If the national joint board agrees with the contractor, he goes forward as is. If it reverses him, he must shift the work over to the designated union.

In either case, there is a pledge of no work stoppage because of the dispute.

In short, the local leaders propose to take a further step on present procedures designed (1) to detect a jurisdictional dispute or problem in advance, (2) to settle it by orderly and recognized processes, and (3) to get this done before the work commences so it will not interfere with the work, and in any case to outlaw a work stoppage during the procedural steps if the matter does go to appeal at the present national joint board level.

Such a purpose, and such initiative among union leaders in this area, can only be applauded. The complex details of an effective "plan room," of signatories to such an agreement, and of the rights of appeal—all involving in some way both many unions and many contractors may pose problems, and differences of approach.

But it is certainly worth while to attack those details and try to work them out fairly. Success in such a conference would produce a labor landmark of national significance.

It would be a leadership step here in this area that would focus the attention of the entire industry, and a climate that would encourage development in this area to the joint benefit of contractors and construction unions—as well as the community as a whole.

It could also be a classic example of how people engaged in the same basic activity in different ways can make much more progress by finding those areas where pulling together provides a mutual advantage, rather than fostering differences to mutual disadvantage.

And it is significant for the potential future of this area that the initiative, the energy, and the responsible study bringing forth this effort has come from the ranks of labor.

—C. L. Dancey.

M. Gerard Deschaseaux, Promoter of French-American Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, because much has been made of recent differences between our Government and the Government of France, I take particular pleasure today in unfolding to you and to my esteemed colleagues a heartwarming story of friendship between the United States and France. Although this friendship is probably not one that would lead to world-shaking decisions, it should serve as an inspiration for those of us who are continually striving to promote good will among the different peoples of the world. For, after all, are not Governments made up of people?

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the steadfast friendship that exists between the people of the State of Hawaii and the citizens of the city of Bruyères in far-off France. Perhaps some of my colleagues will recall that Bruyères is one of the French towns which were liberated by the men of Hawaii's 442d Infantry Regiment and the 100th Infantry Battalion in World War II. Having been a member of the 100th Infantry Battalion, I am greatly pleased that out of the fierce struggle for Bruyères among the forested foothills of the Vosges Mountains has come about a lasting friendship between two peoples. Many of our brave fighting men were felled in Bruyères, and they too would rejoice that they did not die in vain.

Although the relationship between the people of Hawaii and the citizens of Bruyères had a dramatic beginning. I am sure that "Bruyères" would today be a mere memory of a battle, had it not been for dedicated individuals who have devoted much time and effort in the intervening years to keep this friendship alive. I stand before you today to pay tribute to a man who has done so much to foster this friendship. He is a French citizen and a councilman in the city of Bruyères M. Gerard Deschaseaux.

The unselfish devotion of Councilman Deschaseaux has been movingly recounted in a recent letter I received from Mr. Wilbert S. Holck, deputy clerk of the city and county of Honolulu. As one who also has been instrumental in promoting this friendship and the sister city affiliation between Honolulu and Bruyères, Mr. Holck points out that the Hawaii State Senate and House jointly, the City Council of Honolulu, and the 442d and 100th Infantry Clubs in Hawaii intend to pay tribute to Councilman Deschaseaux.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am inserting in the Record the inspiring story of Mr. Deschaseaux's accomplishments as related by Mr. Holck:

"Councilman Deschaseaux is one of the many who are instrumental in creating the congenial pro-American attitude among the citizens of France, particularly within the Vosges area. His newspaper articles describing our citizens of the mainland United States and Hawaii during a visit in 1963 was most revealing. His articles provided the French citizens with a most intimate understanding of the people of our Nation.

He has established close contact with the U.S. officials in the people-to-people program. Today there are three cities in France participating and cooperating with the United States people-to-people program. These are Marseille, Strasbourg, and Bruyères. Individuals in charge in each of the three cities arrange for our young U.S. students to live in the privates homes of their cities for a few days. Mr. Deschaseaux, who is responsible for Bruyères, also takes in two U.S. students each year.

In addition to the above, Mr. Deschaseaux has been unselfish in giving his time, energy, and money in providing for visitors from Hawaii. He personally entertains all Hawaiians and arranges for all 442d and 100th veterans to tour former battle areas and meet old wartime friends. Any Hawaiian visiting Bruyeres is immeditaely made to feel at home by many citizens of that town until Mr. Deschaseaux arrives to take over. Hawaiian servicemen and women and their families in Europe are welcomed by the people there because of Mr. Deschaseaux's untiring efforts to maintain good will and his sincere beliefs in the Honolulu, Hawaii-Bruyères, France sister city relations.

The people of Bruyères honor the men of the 100th and 442d Infantry killed in the battle to liberate their town on the third Sunday of every October. Since October of 1961 they also celebrate the anniversary of their sister city affiliation with Honolulu, Hawaii. The celebrations really commence on the day before and terminate on the evening of the third Sunday. Mr. Deschaseaux, being the chairman of the Bruyères, France-Honolulu, Hawaii, sister city committee of Bruyères, is also program chairman. He arranges for hotel and private home accommodations for all visitors (primarily from Hawaii) and coordinates the celebration activities.

Since 1961 Mr. Deschaseaux has made arrangements for all students of Bruyères to have a pen pal in Hawaii. This pen pal association continues till this day with high school students from Farrington Castle, and the Catholic schools. His goal is to educate the young people of France and other nations through correspondence so that better understanding and good will can be developed. He long-range plan is to have an exchange of young students such as that undertaken in the U.S. people-to-people program.

Mr. Deschaseaux is of high moral character and a well-respected man in the Vosges area. Although he could be elected in higher political offices, he has refused only because of devotion to his ocupation. He is an engineer of natural resources (forestry, water, and game) in the Vosges area.

Mr. Speaker, the world would be a much better place in which to live if we had more men like M. Gerard Deschaseaux, I take great pleasure and deem it an honor to pay tribute to this great Frenchman and world citizen.

L.B.J.'s Big Week Left the World Gasping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's untiring efforts to make this a world of stability and peace were hailed by the Kansas City Times, which noted that he "made the 7 days of February 6–12, 1966, a week to remember. The President was positively dazzling in the pace and breadth of his personal performance."

The paper noted that in Honolulu:

> The military campaign was played down. The greater emphasis was on the struggle against poverty, disease, and illiteracy in South Vietnam. The Saigon government was represented as pushing social-economic betterment programs with the enthusiastic support of the Johnson administration.

As a summary of efforts to attain peace the "big week" as reviewed by the Times is noteworthy, and I am including it in the Record:

L.B.J.'s Big Week Left the World Gasping

Lyndon B. Johnson made the 7 days of February 6–12, 1966, a week to remember. The President was positively dazzling in the pace and breadth of his personal performance.

On very short notice he flew into Honolulu for a whirlwind conference that refocused the picture of the U.S. efforts in Vietnam. The military campaign was played down. The greater emphasis was on the struggle against poverty, disease, and illiteracy in South Vietnam. The Saigon government was represented as pushing social-economic betterment programs with the enthusiastic support of the Johnson administration.

The Johnson style demands more than words, however. The President summoned Vice President Hubert Humphrey to meet him at the Los Angeles airport for a rundown on the Honolulu conference. Then Mr. Humphrey was whisked off across the Pacific to dramatize the administration's peaceful intentions in Vietnam. Orville Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture, was also dispatched to Vietnam on a food-counseling and inspection trip that had been scheduled earlier but fitted perfectly into the Johnsonian timetable.

Upon returning to Washington, President Johnson scarcely paused before sending Congress a message outlining a 5-year American food-for-freedom program, with the promise of expanded foreign food assistance based on a requirement that hungry areas help themselves.

Late Friday President Johnson called a press conference to discuss, among other matters, the U.S. military operations in Vietnam. He placed his own interpretation on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, which some people thought the President wanted to consign to the shadows by the drama of his newsmaking trip to Hawaii. Mr. Johnson commented that the two chief-witnesses, retired Army Gen. James Gavin, and George Kennan, a former diplomat, both said that they did not want "to escalate or get out" and "that's how we feel." But he also said that American troops would be sent to Vietnam as needed by the field commanders.

Still full of spizzerinctum, Mr. Johnson announced that he has picked a new man to be his press secretary, a new Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and a new Comptroller General—all highly important posts.

The average American must have felt worn out from just trying to keep up with President Johnson's performance last week. As for L.B.J. himself, he gave the impression of not even being winded. Nevertheless, even for him, this man of such amazing energy and inventiveness surely made it a memorable 7 days.

The Federal Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in the other body, Senators question the judgment of military policymakers in an active confrontation with North Vietnam, and they criticized the advice and direction of the State Department in defining and pursuing a national policy in regard to that conflict. They are carrying out a basic responsibility of the Senate in foreign affairs. We in the House have the fundamental power of the purse. It is well that we should carry on a dialog over the judgment of the Federal Reserve and criticize the advice and directives of the Treasury.

Foreign policy and economic policy: These two subjects now before the Congress and the people are both of awesome proportions and equally fraught with dangers for the future of our land and the position of our Country in world affairs.

Personally I am not so well qualified that I would care to substitute my judgment for those who have the prime responsibility for decision. However, there should be no hesitancy to raise questions as they appear and to seek comment and explanation wherever these seem appropriate. I have before, Mr. Speaker, joined Mr. Henry Reuss from Wisconsin in voicing concern over recent actions of the Federal Reserve. Their action on monetary policy uncoordinated with our fiscal decisions was unquestionably within their powers. But we have not only the right but also the obligation here in the House of Representatives to critically weigh the effects of their decision and question its impact on the Country.

Let us state the matter clearly. The Federal Reserve determined that there was an existing trend of inflation and a growing potential in the trend that threatened our economic health. There is ample data available to give consideration merit to that analysis. The Federal Reserve further determined that the remedy for the malady they had diagnosed was a heavy dose of interest increase across the board—to discourage the volume of loans they perceived to be overheating the economy and feeding inflation. Watching the patient over these passing months, I can agree with the finding on the symptoms, but the medicine has had some dangerous side effects.

One very disturbing side effect is the following: The report of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis released February 11, 1966, reports that in the recent refunding of the Federal debt the average maturity or due date on our Federal notes are shorter than in 1965. In 1965 the average maturity was 64 months, and that lengthing had come through great effort on the part of Mr. Dillion and Mr. Rossa, and others, of the Treasury. Now we are slipping.

The latest report is that average maturity is now 60 months. The shorter the maturity of the public debt the more inflationary will be its influence. Short-term debt is more liquid and it, therefore, represents a more liquid asset in the hands of those who hold it. The more liquid people's assets are, the more likely they are to spend. If we do not now raise the long-term interest rate above the present 4.25 ceiling, we will continue to shorten the maturity rate and tend to lower long-term interest rates in relation to short-term rates. This will make plant and equipment loans more attractive and feed inflation. Here it appears interest increase will feed interest increase for some time to come.

The Fed stated they were acting to discourage business loan expansion in commercial banks. Look at what has happened. Last year in November when the Fed took the plunge, these loans were running at an annual increased rate of 21 percent. Now with over 3 months passing since the Fed's decision, business loans are increasing at a 26-percent annual rate, an increase of 5 percent. The deterrence sought did not occur; the fact, the action probably accelerated loans in fear of further increases by the Fed which is not unlikely.

We turned over $23 billion in our recent refinancing by the Treasury; 6.5 billion were on notes for just under 5 years for a "magic" 5-percent return, the balance was turned over at a maximum interest rate. This has meant almost $3 billion increase in our Federal debt service, up from 10 billion per annum to 13 billion. This outflow of Federal funds has the least dynamic effect in the economy and would not be consciously sought as a proper fiscal choice.

Let us look at where the full impact of the Fed's interest rate increase was felt. Not in the business loans as data discloses, but in the field where decreased activity was already a problem—the homebuilding and other construction fields. In California alone private single dwelling construction has decreased an alarming 40 percent from last year at this period. The traumatic effects in the mortgage market have all agencies scrambling to raise interest rates where already other deterrents were effectively dampening construction. This building field happens to be one of the most dynamic and provides maximum velocity in the economy. So a serious brake on this segment leads to grave and justified concern.

I would raise this question loud and clear, gentlemen. Is the Federal Reserve really up to date on the patient? They may be quite correct about symptoms but the old medicine does not have the right reaction on the patient. Is it fair to point out that the age of change has demonstrated not only that all things are changing, but that they are changing at an increasingly rapid rate. Does the Federal Reserve appreciate that the commercial banks are not only drastically different than they were as institutions 15 years ago, they are also dramatically different than they were 5 years ago.

Is there any doubt that the various facets of our economy respond with a different timing and a different degree of reaction than was the case when our national economy was simpler and dominated by fewer leading segments.

It is time to go back to anatomy, gentlemen, of the Fed. Your medicine kit is out of date and may be downright dangerous. We do not need nostrums like the old patent medicines that cured everything from chilblains to hoof and mouth disease. We need remedies more selective in their amelioration and more effective in meeting the new diseases from which old symptoms seem to flow.

The intermix of fiscal and monetary policy also seems highly desirable. The Treasury must put on a bolder front not only in seeking the cooperation of the Federal Reserve, but equally and perhaps even more painful, it should counsel the Congress on selective tax increases. Can we expect to meet the competing and expanding demands of the war abroad and the efforts at home without restraints? The answer seems clearly negative. But I am confident that we do not need to handcuff the desirable goals of balanced growth, if mature and enlightened judgment is made as to what segments of the economy assume the burdens and suffer the restraints.

Up to now the Federal Reserve, in my judgment, has merely assured the existence of the condition they were so sure they could see coming—inflation. In addition, they have placed on segments of our economy burdens that the conditions of the times simply do not warrant. Will the gentlemen of the Federal Reserve Board please indicate to those of us in Congress if the reactions in the commercial banks were in tune with their expectations? How long has it been since the Federal Reserve has made a profile of the working institution designated as a commercial bank in 1966?

What studies does the Federal Reserve Board have relative to the velocity of various segments of our economy and the degree of response in each to interest rate change?

Why should the Fed's monetary policy operate without consideration for and cooperation with the administration's fiscal policy?

Mr. Speaker, most of the heat has been taken off the Federal Reserve because the inflation they warned about is more evident now than when they acted. What I should like to know is the following:

First. Are we sure that in its action the Federal Reserve did not, in fact, make a contribution to some of the present inflation?

Second. Can we believe that of all modern institutions the Federal Reserve is the only one unchallenged by change? Alone not required the painful adjustment to complexity; sharpening its tools and diversifying its arsenal of weapons to cope with the complexities of our economic life.

Third. Without demonstration can we be sure that the model of the banking community used in Washington is an accurate reflection of what exists in the dynamic changing environment throughout the country?

Fourth. Are we getting the full benefit of balanced choice in all the alternatives that operate to spur output in times and places of lag and to deter inflation at the time and in the places where "overheating" is a fact?

Let us keep asking questions so long as the truth appears elusive. In our time dogma is deadly and doubt must be a constant companion.

Caterpillar Shows the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include the following editorial from the February 8, 1966, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

CATERPILLAR SHOWS THE WAY ON EXPORTS

A couple of years ago it was fashionable among those whose prejudices automatically expect perfidy and doubletalk from "management" to suspect and expect the worst from Caterpillar overseas expansion.

Today, the actual performance and experience demonstrates that, in fact, Caterpillar management's explanations, projections, and pronouncements on their future operations were accurate and wise.

The latest annual report to the stockholders reveals that exports have so increased as to jump already high figures by 20 percent in the income from overseas sales. This increase they have reported in the context of the "balance of payments" and of how (responding to the crying need the President has sounded) they have contributed $461 million to a more favorable balance. The previous year it had climbed to $373 million.

This is of key benefit to the entire financial position of the United States with its delicate situation on gold in foreign trade, but the direct nature of the benefit lies in the fact that it is of good manufacture in our plants and sold overseas.

The 25 percent of overseas sales that is actually manufactured overseas has "opened doors" whereby the 75 percent overseas sales being made of products made here exceeds all previous sales put together.

Net gain is spectacular, and is precisely what Caterpillar predicted, and the gainers are not just Government with its eye on foreign trade balance but the tens of thousands of workers engaged in making the equipment here that is thus being sold abroad.

The increase once again emphasizes the plain fact that Caterpillar's success, its employment level, and its ability to meet cost levels depends on the ability of the company to make sales in other countries.

As a leader in this complex field, Caterpillar has also passed on some of its knowledge and techniques to others, and assisted Governor Kerner in his efforts to stimulate overseas sales for Illinois firms.

It is no accident that the Manufacturers News, in announcing the 1966 directory of Illinois Manufacturer's, calls attention proudly to the fact that "Illinois industry is developing new international muscle."

More than 5,000 Illinois firms now sell goods and services throughout the world. Almost 20 percent of the manufacturing and processing firms in this Midwestern State now do business overseas.

Meanwhile some 1,500 firms moved into Illinois locations during 1965 and only 3 moved out to locations elsewhere.

There is a connection.

The Governor deserves due credit for recognizing that the grassroots base for resolving economic problems, for having a base to support governmental efforts in solving social problems, and for maintaining key services lies in increased industry.

He deserves credit for working effectively in that direction, and for recognizing the key importance of export sales to it.

Caterpillar deserves credit for pioneering in this field and for giving every expert assistance to the Governor's program and to other firms interested in doing business in foreign lands.

Everyone is better off for it, just as we would all find ourselves worse off if this State had stood still in this field of activity.

Caterpillar has thus also demonstrated, with dramatic results, the honesty, integrity, and accuracy of its announcements on future plans of this kind, and its effective concern for the United States, this State, this community, and the security of its own work force.

Talk is talk, and facts are facts.

We have again been shown that the two go together at Caterpillar, and this, too, is a matter of great importance to this community.

Food for Freedom and Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, a timely editorial in the February 13, 1966, edition of the Los Angeles Times clearly defined the present world food situation.

The Time's editorial pointed out in no uncertain terms:

> Food availability and population needs are on a collision course. Something must give. The world will either move quickly to limit its population increase and enlarge its food supply, or it will face disasters of unprecedented proportion.

This is no crank prediction. This is a clear statement on a situation that poses one of the major challenges ever to tax man's ingenuity.

All of our energies and resources must be brought to bear if we are to be successful in meeting this immense confrontation with hunger. On January 12, 1966, I informed the Members of the range of alternatives available to substantially increase man's available protein sources.

On that date, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that virtually two-thirds of the earth's inhabitants were suffering from poor health and physical weakness primarily because of the absence of sufficient amounts of protein from their diets. And, I also pointed out that the world's present deficit in this most invaluable food nutrient is some 40 billion pounds.

But, Mr. Speaker, I also made clear that while there is a present protein deficit there is also, at the same time, tremendous untapped protein resources in the ocean, as well as new and more efficient means of protein production and distribution that could, within 10 years, supply a sufficient nutritious diet to feed a population 10 to 15 times the size of the present world's population.

We have not taken advantage of the promise and potential that food technology now holds; for as I stated on January 12, we have suffered from a lack of political motivation to adequately explore and take advantage of what is available.

Mr. Speaker, as the Los Angeles Times' editorial so clearly points out, with more than two billion of the world's people chronically undernourished, we can ill afford not to concentrate on providing enough protein to feed our present, and greatly increased future population.

No more important task confronts us.

At this point I wish to include the February 13 Los Angeles Times editorial. The editorial is an important contribution to the dialog now taking place on feeding the billions of men, women, and children of today, and tomorrow.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM AND SURVIVAL

President Johnson's food-for-freedom program, submitted to Congress last week, could turn out to be the opening move in the most important U.S. commitment yet made toward confronting the rapidly accelerating world crisis in agriculture.

For all its significance, however, Mr. Johnson's message still fell short of indicating adequately the awful dimensions of this crisis, and the threat it poses and will continue to pose not only to human life and well-being, but quite possibly to international peace as well.

Our preoccupation with the spectre of nuclear war, with armed conflict and political struggle in a dozen areas, has for too long distracted attention from the less dramatic but no less urgent fact that we live in an evermore hungry world. The man-food ratio is in decline; millions now and millions more in the years ahead are faced with starvation, while world population inexorably climbs higher.

Food availability and population needs are on a collision course. Something must give. The world will either move quickly to limit its population increase and enlarge its food supply, or it will face disasters of unprecedented proportion.

The United States, because of its agricultural abundance and technical know-how, can play a major role in confronting this crisis. But that role is not unlimited.

Mr. Johnson made this clear in his message to Congress when he outlined the twin approaches needed. For the United States, this involves expanding production and exports in key food areas, rice and protein-rich soybeans to begin with, other commodities later. Additionally, he wants this country to provide greater technical help, fertilizers, and pesticides to food-short nations. The program looks toward the time when U.S. farmers can sell, for hard currency, much more of their output abroad.

The second approach indicated by the President is, in the long run, more vital. This requires that food-short countries place ever greater emphasis on developing their own agricultural capabilities. For all its bounty, the United States cannot feed the world. Self-help on the part of other countries is the key to the problem.

According to U.N. estimates, the developing countries will have to increase their food supplies by 103 percent by 1980, and by 261 percent by the year 2000, simply to maintain a basic nutrition standard for an exploding population. Realistically, it must be doubted that such increases can be made. But some advance over the existing situation certainly is possible.

The immense difficulties which stand in the way of improving food supplies in the underdeveloped world can't be minimized. Problems of climate and topography, of religion and social custom, of technological backwardness and political shortsightedness all must be dealt with. Capital and know-how will not alone serve to bring solutions. Social and political awareness are equally involved.

This means that population control programs must also be started on a sweeping scale, for without them moves to increase the available world food supply will come to nothing. We are witnessing again, in India, the consequences of the food-population imbalance. Experts warn that this is only a preview of what lies ahead in Asia, Africa, and Latin America if present trends are permitted to continue.

Dr. Brady's 50th Year of Medical Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John C. Brady of Buffalo, N.Y., last week celebrated his 50th year of medical practice.

Chief surgeon at Sisters Hospital in Buffalo for 25 years as well as an assistant professor at State University at Buffalo, Dr. Brady is a devout Knight of St. Gregory and an ardent golfer.

I call Dr. Brady's anniversary to the attention of my colleagues because I think we all are aware of the great need for devoted and dedicated doctors like Dr. Brady.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Record an article from the Buffalo Courier-Express relating Dr. Brady's life and outstanding career:

Knight Keeps Oath: Dedication to Religion and Healing Marks Surgeon

(By Jim McAvey)

Daily Mass: In 1916, when he was 25, Dr. John C. Brady made a solemn pledge.

"I will preserve the purity of my life and my art," he said, as he took the Hippocratic oath.

Today, at 75, Dr. Brady goes to mass in a Roman Catholic Church at 8 every morning. He usually gets to bed between 11:30 p.m. and midnight but he makes Mass regardless of how many hours' sleep he gets.

Busy practice: On the average, he performs four operations a week in Sisters Hospital. He has a very busy, full-time practice at his office-home, 240 Morris Avenue, with office hours Monday afternoon and evening and Wednesday and Friday afternoons.

Dr. Brady is an ardent golfer who shoots in the eighties and delights in giving the younger set their comeuppance on the links. The only remote concession he makes to the possibility that the years may be taking some toll is when he says, "I used to be able to get down in the seventies toward the end of the season.

Golfing injury: He was a topnotch football player at Canisius High and College and Fordham University. The doctor now walks with a limp from an injury he suffered on a golf course 6 years ago. He was riding in a cart when it was hit by another cart. He was dumped hard on the ground.

"I came down on one leg and twisted my hip and I've had a lot of pain from it since," he said.

He is a spry, rugged looking 75. He has all but two of his own teeth; his hearing and eyesight are fine and his 5-foot-9-inch, 160-pound frame is solid looking. He has a full head of gray hair and a ruddy complexion.

Cites smoke peril: Dr. Brady has been a pipe and cigar smoker for more than 50 years but believes there is definitely a connection between chain smoking and cancer.

He was born in Buffalo and he and his wife, the former Leila McGuire, had a son and four daughters. One daughter died several years ago.

Dr. Brady received his medical degree from Fordham University and completed his training at Bellevue and Allied Hospitals. During World War I, he served in an Army medical unit in Franch.

Chief surgeon: He was chief surgeon at Sisters Hospital for 25 years and during World War II was director of surgery at Meyer Memorial Hospital. He retired as chief consultant at Meyer Memorial 10 years ago at the same time he retired as an assistant professor at the State University at Buffalo.

Dr. Brady said it is impossible for him to estimate how many thousands of people he has treated over the years and how many thousands of operations he has performed.

"I would just have to say thousands," he said. "But there has been a tremendous change in medicine since I started practice. In the old days if you couldn't perform an operation in a hour, it was no good. Now an operation may last 9 hours or more."

Notes advances: We had lots of real trouble with typhoid, measles, and scarlet fever." Dr. Brady said. "That's just about gone now. And too, 40 to 80 percent of the cases in which an appendix ruptured were fatal. You almost never hear of that anymore. Brain surgery wasn't much in the early days and chest and heart surgery have just come into their own in recent years."

In 1942, the Pope made Dr. Brady a Knight of St. Gregory. The doctor accepted that not only as a great honor but also as a great obligation and it was then that he began his practice of attending Mass every day.

On Monday, Dr. Brady was honored at the 160th annual convention of the State Medical Society in New York City for completing 50 years of medical practice. He was given a certificate citing his dedication to his community and his profession.

Implied, of course, was recognition of the fact that he preserved "the purity of his life and his art."

Ashburnham Bicentennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, February 22 has a special significance for the town of Ashburnham, Mass., in my district. Not only does the day mark the birthday of George Washington—a day when the people of this great Nation pay homage to the memory of the man who most fully personifies our most cherished traditions of strength, wisdom, and independence—but it also marks the day of the founding of this thriving community, which I have the honor and privilege of representing in this House.

And with the coming of February 22 this year, there will have come to an end in Ashburnham a year that will long be remembered by the town as the year of celebration marking the 200th anniversary of this proud, outstanding community.

It is a year ago this month, Mr. Speaker, that the Ashburnham Historical Society opened Ashburnham's yearlong bicentennial with a silver tea in the Ashburnham Community Church with members and guests dressed in colonial costumes. Later on in April, the gala bicentennial ball was held in the Oakmont Regional School cafeteria. The highlight of the anniversary celebration came in October with a huge parade, one of the finest ever held in northern Worcester County, which attracted over 30,000 people and several thousand marchers.

There were more than 100 units from Massachusetts and New Hampshire which thrilled the crowds along the 3-mile parade route through the center of the town. It was particularly pleasing for me to arrange for the participation of Federal units in the parade at the request of my friend, W. Irving Taylor, chairman of the bicentennial parade committee, and I am happy to report to my colleagues in the House that the various branches of the service were well represented in the parade.

With the opening of Ashburnham's bicentennial, I was happy and proud to send a special message of greeting to the Ashburnham community and under unanimous consent the text of my letter will be printed in the Congressional Record.

The letter follows:

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1965.

Board of Selectmen,
Ashburnham, Mass.

My Dear Friends: I have been informed that you will celebrate the 200th anniverary of the incorporation of Ashburnham on February 22, and I am very proud and pleased indeed, to send you and the loyal patriotic people of your outstanding community, my heartiest congratulations upon this great event and all best wishes for the future.

Your great own of Ashburnham is rich in history, strong in patriotism and loyalty to the Nation, vigorous in its progress and advancement. For the magnificent contributions of your people throughout the years since the early origins of our Government, I express my deep gratitude; for your magnificent achievements, my unbounded admiration; for your inspiring loyalty to the Nation, my pride and appreciation for your noble, forward-looking public spirit and your high purpose for the future, my prayers, my pledge of wholehearted cooperation, and my complete confidence in your ability to reach your high goals.

This day will go down in the history of our State and our country. It is another proud marker of your progress, your vitality, and your determination to go forward.

Warm regards and best wishes to all.

Sincerely yours,

Philip J. Philbin.

In these troubled times, Mr. Speaker, it is well to recall, as we pay homage to the memory of George Washington, that the early settlers of Ashburnham were of the same intrepid breed of pioneers which helped to build this great land. Like George Washington, they chose liberty as their standard and rejected tyranny at all costs.

It was on February 22, 1765—that same year that George Washington was supporting Patrick Henry's revolutionary Stamp Act in the Virginia House of Burgesses—that the little settlement of Dorchester Canada in the rocky wilderness came into existence as the incorporated town of Ashburnham.

Located in the easternmost part of Worcester County on the New Hampshire line, Ashburnham was established from seven early land grants, notably the Dorchester Canada or Township grant of 1735, which was divided among the descendant's of the stalwart men who fought in the Canadian expedition of 1690.

The names of Starr, Converse, and Rolfe also figure prominently among these early grants which were given by a grateful Massachusetts Bay colony in recognition of the gallantry and great contributions of these families in the building of a new land.

It was in 1650 that young Dr. Thomas Starr gave his life in a struggle with the fearsome Pequot Indians, leaving behind a young wife and eight small children. It is the later descendants of this family who benefited from Dr. Starr's heroism when they were given 400 acres of land in his memory.

A similar grant is named after Maj. James Converse whose heirs benefited from his distinguished service to the colony. The son and two daughters of the Reverend Benjamin Rolfe were given 600 acres after escaping an Indian raid in 1708, in which the parents and another sister lost their lives.

It is from these heroic deeds and sacrifices of the pioneer settlers that Ashburnham got its start, and it is from the spiritual strength, resourcefulness and determination of these early forebears that our Nation got its strength and purpose to become the great country it is today—truly a giant among the nations of the world, the most powerful, richest, and most advanced with the highest standards of living the world has ever known.

Among the great names still echoing from that rugged and glorious period of growth and progress in golden history of Ashburnham is that of Cushing, which is with us today in the living memorial of Cushing Academy, named after the Reverend Thomas Cushing, and one of the great secondary schools of the Nation.

It was my great privilege to participate last year in the 100th anniversary celebration of Cushing Academy, which is today, more than ever, a model of academic excellence.

The Reverend Thomas Cushing was the first minister for the Ashburnham settlement. On the occasion of his half-century sermon, delivered on November 3, 1818, he reflected on past events in the history of the town, describing the perilous days when "soldiers were stationed in these parts to range the wilderness and protect the scattered inhabitants which numbered under 50."

After recounting the births, deaths, illnesses, and marriages which took place during his years of ministry, he concluded with this description of the Revolutionary War, which is particularly noteworthy at this time of homage to the memory of George Washington:

> The opposition to the acts of the British Parliament, the war that ensued, * * * cannot be fully conceived of by the present generation. It cost the States immense blood and treasure.
>
> What people have been more highly favoured? God raised up Washington to lead our armies to victory and independence; and when the new Constitution was established, he was, by a unanimous vote of the people, placed twice at the head of the Government, where he shone with as distinguished lustre as at the head of our armies. What is the man in all history to be set in competition with him?

If Washington could have visited Ashburnham any time last year he would not have been surprised by the looks of some residents of the town because the bicentennial celebration prompted many to wear the wigs and garments of colonial America. Even the parades would have seemed familiar to him, featuring as they did, oxen, horse-drawn carriages and wagons, various fife and drum corps, and bagpipe units. He certainly would have been impressed with the October 10 fireworks display, one of the largest ever presented in the area, and the cannon firing, and the "Gentlemen of the Brush" would not have surprised him.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that on the whole George Washington would have been well pleased with the birthday year of Ashburnham and all the wonderful events which went into making it the great memorable celebration that it was—the Boy and Girl Scout participation, the helicopters and antique automobiles, the lovely and gracious bicentennial queen, the time capsule with its ballpoint pen and modern razor among its contents, the parties and balls.

I think also that George Washington would have been convinced that Ashburnham has not stood still, but has kept pace with the times and the demands of the age in which we live. He would draw inspiration, as we all can, from the great and glorious history of our past, as reflected all over America by the growth and prosperity of hundreds upon hundreds of thriving communities like Ashburnham.

Let us all be thankful, with hearts overflowing with everlasting gratitude, for the blessings of the Creator and the epochal work and achievements of those who have preceded us and whose blessed memory we honor on days of remembrance.

Let me again express the hope and the prayer that the next 200 years will bring to Ashburnham and all its loyal people that greatness in the spirit and the ways of independence, liberty, and peace which will insure prosperity and happiness, not only in the material sense, but in the spiritual graces that have always been so much a part of this splendid American community.

The Supreme Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, too often we hear the voices of defeat and despair from those who know little of the trials and tribulations of the battles being waged in Vietnam.

The views and feelings of the soldier in the thick of battle may be interesting and enlightening to those safely at home.

I request unanimous consent to insert a letter which I received recently from Army Sgt. Thomas E. Wilcox. He says several important things in a simple but poignant way.

TNY HOA, VIETNAM,
February 13, 1966.

DEAR SIR: My name is Thomas E. Wilcox. I reside at 1817 Lincoln Avenue in Seaside, Calif.

I have been in this country since the 2d of January, 1966. Thus far I have seen many of my buddies killed and wounded.

This is a dirty, stinking war. I am willing to pay the supreme sacrifice for freedom here in Vietnam to stop Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

I trust you are a backer of the administration's Vietnam policies. This country and its people must not be betrayed and abandoned into Communist hands. In South Vietnam the United States must stand firm.

If you must deal with people who insist that the Vietcong are our brothers and only want peace, you can ask them to come to South Vietnam and take note of the Vietcong's "brotherly, peaceful" politics. I guarantee these Vietniks would change their tune after taking note of the Vietcong's ritual of murder and violence in South Vietnam.

I hope that peace will come to this land before too long.

Yours with respect,
TOM WILCOX.

Sergeant Wilcox is a patriot, convinced by firsthand experience of the meaning of our national commitment and our grave responsibility in South Vietnam. We all join in his hope for that foreign land which is nevertheless inhabitated by human beings who would cherish liberty and freedom above physical peace.

School Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not in the habit of inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters from constitutents in my district; in fact, I have never done so until now. However, when I received a letter from Mr. John C. Friese, director of food services at Kent State University, I was thoroughly impressed with his eminent knowledge of the school lunch program. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Friese's letter into the RECORD.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY,
Kent, Ohio, February 16, 1966.

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON,
1625 Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STANTON: May I also add my thanks for your help in procuring the excellent colored film on the astronaut flights that we showed to two local Boy Scout troop last month. It was amazing to me to listen to the intelligent comments of these 12- and 13-year-old boys after watching the pictures.

My prime reason for writing to you is because part of my responsibility here at Kent State University is that of directing the school lunch program in our university school for grades kindergarden through the 12th grade. For over 15 years I have had connections with this very successful Federal program in Ohio and Pennsylvania. For the past 6 years, our department has pioneered cook-manager workshops for Ohio school lunch personnel in conjuntion with Mr. Wade Bash, director of the State school lunch program. It is with this background and interest that I wish to present several thoughts for your consideration about the proposed drastic cuts in Federal subsidy to the school lunch milk program.

Unfortunately, my information regarding the reasons for this budget decision are based on newspaper and trade magazine articles, which at best, may be incomplete. For 25 years I have favored the various Federal programs such as the WPA and NRA through to the present ones that compose the Great Society. Many of them have been excellent but for the first time, I am now concerned about the seemingly extravagant waste of Federal money for vocational retraining, Head Start, and other of the recent poverty programs. If the needy and untrained people were reaping benefits in proportion to the amount spent, I would never question these programs. Government bureaucracy is inevitable and you know better than I what is happening in these emerging programs.

This leads to my second point, which in question form might be as such: Why does the Federal Government drastically cut the very successful program of milk subsidy for schoolchildren with known results and instigate new programs of unknown value? Food is probably the greatest world problem that now exists. Our housing may be substandard, our wages low, and education weak, but the good Lord help us if our children are hungry in this land of surpluses which the Government subsidizes such as wool, cotton, and unused farmlands such as the land bank program. The schoolchildren of Kent, Ohio, will not suffer with this proposed budget cut because of the economic level of the town, but the rural children of the surrounding townships will suffer from this penny-pinching idea. This false economy will not only effect Ohio children, but of greater importance, children of the entire United States.

Granted that food is my vocation, and please excuse any dramatic phrase that I may have used, but I hope that our Government will find better ways to economize for the war effort than to take away from growing schoolchildren and future leaders the most perfect food in the world—milk.

Yours very truly,

John C. Friese,
Director of Food Services.

Buffalo Is on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial in today's Buffalo Courier-Express, the growing dynamic spirit of Buffalo in recent years is reported.

In urban renewal, culture, sports, and average weekly income, Buffalo rates high in New York State and in the Nation.

According to the latest Labor Department bulletin on employment and earnings, Buffalo is reported to have the highest average weekly earnings for factory workers in the Eastern United States. In addition to high wages, employment is also soaring.

We in Buffalo are very proud of our progress, both physically and spiritually.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to add to the Record the editorial from the Courier-Express:

BUFFALO DEVELOPS A DYNAMIC SPIRIT

Buffalo is not the town it was a few years ago. It's much better now. And the change is not only in physical appearance, although the rejuvenation which the downtown area is undergoing is making a big improvement in that aspect. But it's more than that, much more.

Buffalo—and when we speak of Buffalo we mean the entire metropolitan area—has acquired a spirit, an elan it didn't have in the 1950's. And it is reflected in a pride which only a few years ago many people were talking about but few people had. What has brought it about? Many things.

Certainly the success of the Buffalo Bills has contributed, even if you're not much of a football fan. And the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, even if you can't stand pop or impressionistic art. And the Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra. And the Studio Arena Theater. And the general prosperity.

Maybe that prosperity is an underlying cause of the other factors. For prosperous we are. Just how prosperous was indicated in the Labor Department's latest bulletin on employment and earnings which showed that factory wages here are the highest in the eastern portion of the United States and higher than most other metropolitan areas in the Nation.

The average weekly earnings of production workers on factory payrolls here in mid-December amounted to $134.62. That's $4.14 more than the average a year earlier. It's $8.06 a week more than the average in Rochester, the second highest in the State, and it's 34 percent more than the weekly average in New York City where the cost of almost everything is greater than it is here.

Not only are wages high here but there are far more people working. The Labor Department reported that there were 458,700 workers on nonagricultural payrolls in mid-December, almost 41,000 more than there were a year earlier.

We don't know how much of this new Buffalo spirit and this new Buffalo prosperity has been due to the constant drumbeating: "Boost Buffalo, It's Good for You." But we have boosted Buffalo and it has been good for us. Let's stick with a winner.

The Odds Are on Dirksen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, even in a race against Lyndon Johnson, I would put my money on Everett McKinley Dirksen. Although AFL-CIO official, Peter McGavin, stated "if President Johnson had put as much emphasis on the repeal of 14(b) as he did on his wife's beautification bill, we would have gotten repeal," I feel Mr. McGavin has underrated the power of Senator Dirksen.

The following editorial from the February 17, 1966, issue of the Peoria Journal-Star, points out that Dirksen used the filibuster in his 14(b) victory, but broke the filibuster in order to move the civil rights bill. Perhaps he can do it again on reapportionment. Under unanimous consent, I include the aforementioned editorial:

DIRKSEN AND THE FILIBUSTERS

Senator Dirksen's "victory" on 14(b) will be matched, in all probability, by a defeat on his second most cherished battle of this session—that for a reapportionment amendment to overcome the "one-man, one-vote" ruling of the Supreme Court and reestablish State legislatures on the national model.

And the simple fact is that Dirksen's own tactics will be used to do it.

In short, the "liberals" who so recently condemned the "filibuster" not on the merits of the proposed labor legislation but with howls of outraged "principle" will soon be "outraging" the same "principle."

Those who inspired parades saying "Let the majority speak," "Let the Senate vote," and condemned Dirksen as if it were felonious to conduct a filibuster and was destroying democracy—will conduct a filibuster themselves.

Now, it is the "liberal" turn to switch from condemning filibusters to conducting one * * * and this time labor will conduct no antifilibuster campaigns.

And the chances of getting a cloture vote to stop them will be even more remote than getting one against Senator Dirksen.

What a good many people fail to recognize is that many Senators simply do not believe in cloture. They think that the filibuster is the last refuge and the last chance and the last defense of any minority to protect itself from being run over by a majority.

Indeed, without the filibuster technique, a majority could smash down opposition so efficiently and so promptly and so easily that the issue might never even be dramatized and the minority never even get its point across to the public.

A determined majority, with an important enough cause, can overcome a filibuster, and many Senators believe that those conditions should exist before some legislation is passed. So cloture is hard to get for either side.

Two things emerge from a study of the use of the filibuster:

One is the basic hypocrisy and political maneuvering involved by those who condemn the tactic, itself, when it stands in their way—but do not hesitate to use it when it serves their purpose.

The other is the truly unusual and remarkable accomplishment of Senator Everett Dirksen when he did succeed in breaking a filibuster in order to move the civil rights bill.

It isn't an easy thing to get done. He won't get it done again for reapportionment.

A footnote should be added. Dirksen, whatever agreement or disagreement one has with him on this issue or that, has never treated the filibuster when making or breaking them, as anything but part of the parliamentary procedure. He never played the demagogic game of condemning the instrument itself—even when breaking the most determined filibuster in modern history. His premise was simply that the time had come to vote.

A Tampa, Fla., Reporter Wins Broun Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM GIBBONS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last week, one of my constituents, Mr. John

Frasca, of Tampa, Fla., won the coveted 25th Annual Heywood Broun award of the American Newspaper Guild.

Mr. Frasca came to Washington last week to accept the award from the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Nicholas deB. Katzenbach. Mr. Frasca, a reporter for the Tampa Tribune received this outstanding journalism award for a series of articles which resulted in the release from prison of an innocent man who was serving a 10-year sentence for robbery. As a result of Mr. Frasca's persistence and excellent journalistic ability, that young man today is a free man.

We hear a great deal these days about the power of the press. And we are constantly reminded that the "pen is mightier than the sword." These are indeed true, and all of us should be thankful for the American system of government and free thoughts typiled by a man like John Frasca.

The New York Times of February 15 contained a story about John's winning the Heywood Broun award.

The article follows:

A TAMPA REPORTER WINS BROUN AWARD

WASHINGTON, February 14.—John Anthony Frasca of the Tampa, Fla., Tribune was named winner today of the 25th annual Heywood Broun Award by the American Newspaper Guild.

Mr. Frasca won the award, which includes $1,000, for a series of stories that resulted in the release from prison of an innocent 24-year-old man who had received a 10-year sentence for robbery. As a result of Mr. Frasca's series, another man confessed to the crime and a police chief and two policemen were charged with conspiracy in a robbery.

The Broun Award judges also gave special commendations to Steve Underwood and Harry Jones, Jr., reporters on the Kansas City Star, and honorable mention awards to Robert H. Collins of the St. Louis Post Dispatch and John Moore of the Houston Post.

Mr. Underwood and Mr. Jones wrote articles on nursing homes and care for the aged in private institutions that led to a number of reforms in nursing home care in Missouri and Kansas.

Mr. Collins was cited for a series of articles on the irregularities that led Gov. Otto E. Kerner, of Illinois, to dismiss a former State director of public safety. Mr. Moore was honored for exposing the use of Harris County, Tex., machinery and workmen to build roads on private property.

Judges of the awards were David Brinkley, NBC news commentator; Benjamin C. Bradlee, managing editor of the Washington Post, and Carl T. Rowan, former Director of the U.S. Information Agency and now a newspaper columnist.

Hon. Basil L. Whitener Addresses Statesville, N.C., Veterans Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER strongly supported the position of the United States in a speech made before a veterans group at Statesville, N.C., on February 18, 1966.

My distinguished colleague from North Carolina said that the greatest problem confronting our Nation at the present time is the Vietnamese war.

I feel that my colleagues will find his fine speech to be most interesting and informative, and I request that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY HON. BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM NORTH CAROLINA, AT ANNUAL BARBECUED RABBIT AND CHARITY BALL, HARMONY SCHOOL, STATESVILLE, N.C., FEBRUARY 18, 1966

It is a pleasure for me to be with you this evening on this unique occasion. I am happy to be here in Iredell County and to have the opportunity to visit with so many of my friends with whom I have been associated in various capacities and have had the pleasure to know personally down through the years.

My friends, there are a number of things I could discuss with you in the brief time I have been allotted this evening. I think I know, however, what is uppermost in your minds at the present time. As mature and responsible citizens, I know that you share my view that the greatest problem confronting our Nation at the present time is the war in which we are engaged in southeast Asia.

The erosion of constitutional liberty in the United States, the increase in our national debt with resulting inflationary pressures, the problems that we have with respect to crime and juvenile delinquency, and the great effort we are making to improve the standard of living for every segment of our population all recede into the background whenever we consider the full impact and significance of the commitment we have made to keep the light of freedom from going out in southeast Asia.

During the past several weeks I have referred to the Vietnamese war in a number of speeches I have made in North Carolina. I plan to speak to the Midwinter Conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars tomorrow night in Charlotte. In the course of my remarks I will discuss the Vietnamese war. I feel it is imperative that our people come to know why we are in Vietnam and by so doing muster that moral and material support which our Government must have if we are to halt the spread of communism.

It is necessary for us to understand our involvement in southeast Asia. It is necessary for us to realize that the battle in Vietnam is another incident in the struggle which has been going on for the past two decades to prevent the entire free world coming under the Communist yoke.

We are familiar with our successful economic and military efforts to contain Russian communism in Europe, Africa, and the Middle East. The Marshall and Truman plans saved the Western European nations and Greece and Turkey from communism.

Our military forces in West Germany and our commitment through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has held the Russian military machine at bay in Europe and the Middle East. Our stand in Berlin, our intervention in Lebanon, and our refusal to be intimidated diplomatically and militarily at other strategic points in Europe have given Europeans the opportunity to reach the highest standard of living in their history.

On the other side of the world communism has been just as virulent, insidious, and cancerous. When the history of the 20th century is written, the fall of China to communism will be listed as one of the, if not the, greatest catastrophe for the free world.

The late Gen. Joseph Sstilwell said that two American divisions in 1946 could have prevented the yoke of communism from being placed over the necks of over 700 million Chinese. The magnitude of the Communist take-over in China staggers the imagination.

Communist China poses not only a threat to the liberation of Southeast Asians, but to Japan, the Philippines, and Australia. The 226,000,000 Russians have cause to view with great alarm the threats to world peace emanating from Peiping.

My friends, there would be no problem in South Vietnam today were it not for the fanatical support that the Chinese Communists are giving to North Vietnam. The President said on February 17, 1965, that "Our purpose in Vietnam is to join in the defense and protection of freedom of a brave people who are under attack that is controlled and that is directed from outside their country."

For the past 10 years North Vietnam, with Chinese help, has been trying to subjugate South Vietnam. Few people realize the terrorism, sabotage, assassination, and kidnaping to which the South Vietnamese people have been subjected during the last decade. Only in 1961 did the South Vietnamese call upon the United States to furnish greater military assistance. As late as January 1, 1965, total U.S. forces committed to South Vietnam amounted to only 23,000 persons.

During 1965, however, American determination to bring the Communists in Vietnam to the conference table by diplomatic means or to bring about a military decision has caused a buildup in our forces to approximately 181,000 at the end of 1965. At the present time over 200,000 American troops are in Vietnam, and the number is rapidly increasing. Our forces have joined the 679,000 South Vietnamese citizens under arms.

The war in Vietnam is unlike any other struggle in which our Nation has been engaged. Our troops are fighting in the most difficult terrain in the world and under climatic and environmental conditions without parallel in our history.

A look at the magnitude of our military operations during 1965 should dispel any doubt that our enemies might have as to our intentions in South Vietnam. The Communist forces lost over 34,000 men killed in Vietnam in 1965. The United States and Vietnamese air forces flew 12,000 strike sorties into North Vietnam and over 60,000 within South Vietnam. The U.S. Navy and Marine Corps flew more than 6,600 sorties into North Vietnam. Over 39,000 sorties were flown in South Vietnam.

In the third quarter of 1965 alone more than 500 highway bridges were destroyed. The U.S. Air Force carried over 265,000 tons of cargo into South Vietnam and more than 660,000 passengers. In addition to our purely military operation in South Vietnam, the United States distributed to the South Vietnamese people over 106,000 tons of foodstuffs.

We built over 2,400 military and civilian type buildings in South Vietnam. Imports by ships into the country rose more than 800 percent during 1965. More than 20,000 American civilians were employed in the country at the close of the war.

The tragic part of our effort to destroy Communist aggression in Vietnam has been the casualties we have suffered. Over 1,300 American troops lost their lives, and many thousands were wounded in 1965. In our operations we lost more than 240 aircraft.

Unless there is a dramatic change in the attitude of the Communists, however, we can expect a drastic increase in our commitment of men and material to South Vietnam during 1966. We must be prepared to face the grim fact of additional casualties.

In our past wars we have had the support of our major allies. In South Vietnam, instead of enjoying the support of our allies, we are suffering by reason of their trade with North Vietnam and China and their constant criticism of our efforts to preserve freedom in southeast Asia. It is ironic that those nations we have helped the most to preserve their freedom in Europe from military and economic aggression are the countries which are interfering with our military and diplomatic efforts in Vietnam.

I admire many of the fine qualities inherent in the character of our oldest ally, the Republic of France. I cannot admire, however, the French attitude toward Vietnam, or for that matter, France's attitude toward American efforts to maintain a free Europe.

France lost the war against communism in Indochina. Instead of supporting the United States in the valiant effort our country is making to undo some of the damage of the French debacle, France openly advocates our withdrawal from her former colonial empire.

Our Government is greatly disturbed over the extent of trade on the part of the free world with Communist China and North Vietnam. I am greatly concerned over the matter. I feel that it is a grave problem which calls for stern measures on the part of our Government.

I know you will find it hard to understand why free world nations in 1964 sold to Communist China and North Vietnam $989.4 million worth of material while at the same time buying from these nations $1 billion 204.4 million. Much of the material sold to Communist China finds its way into North Vietnam and down the Ho Chi Minh trail into South Vietnam.

It is a bitter, but tragic, fact that American boys are dying in Vietnam as the result of material brought into Communist ports in China and North Vietnam by ships flying the flags of our allies.

I feel that the United States should remind our allies that the prosperity they are enjoying and the peace they are experiencing is due to a great extent to the presence of American dollars in their economies and American soldiers on the ramparts of freedom in Europe. I do not believe that we should be expected to support and defend governments which embarrass and harass us diplomatically and which trade with the common enemy of all mankind.

President Eisenhower stated that the nations of southeast Asia are like so many dominoes. If one nation falls before communism, the other nations, in turn, will topple. It is for that reason, therefore, that our efforts in Vietnam must not be permitted to fail.

Many of our people have vigorously opposed our policy in southeast Asia. That is their right and privilege as American citizens. It would be wise for all of us, however, to seriously weigh any statement we might make or any action we might take which could give aid and comfort to our enemies.

In exercising our freedom of speech and press, those great freedoms guaranteed to us in the Constitution, we should be sure that we are not strengthening the hand of the tyrant whose objective is the destruction of our Constitution.

The United States has made a sincere effort to resolve the Vietnamese war through diplomatic means at the conference table. Our efforts to negotiate the war, and our offers of vigorous economic assistance to both friend and enemy alike, have been scornfully rejected by the North Vietnamese and with hysterical invective by the Chinese Communists.

We must continue to keep all avenues of a negotiated settlement open while pressing for a military solution. A withdrawal from Vietnam under existing circumstances in that country would be equivalent to the defeat of the United States. Such a defeat would spark a renewed effort on the part of the Communists in every part of the world. Abandonment of our commitment to stand by South Vietnam would be disastrous to American prestige throughout the world.

My friends, I am aware of the concern felt by the American people over the war we did not seek in southeast Asia. As a veteran of the Second World War with over 3 years of combat service, and as the father of a son of military age, I know something of the anguish, the worry, and the apprehension that is felt by the fathers and mothers throughout the land.

As the richest and most powerful nation in the world destiny has given us the task of preserving freedom. In our support of free institutions throughout the world we must not overlook the preservation of constitutional government and the health of our economy at home.

A bankrupt America which has forsaken its constitutional heritage cannot long hold back the tide of communism. While vigorously making every effort to hold atheistic communism in check we should reaffirm our devotion and dedication to the great constitutional principles which have led us to our place of world leadership.

A Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, in his message on international education and health, President Johnson reminded us of that declaration of William James a half century ago that mankind must seek "a moral equivalent to war."

The world in which we live today is no longer just our own backyards—our own city or even our own Nation. It is the very globe itself. The enemies of disease and ignorance are such that men everywhere must unite to make a global attack on them.

> The same rewards we count at home will flow from sharing in a worldwide effort to rid mankind of the slavery of ignorance and the scourge of disease—

President Johnson has reminded us.

Such a crusade is termed "an admirable and inspiring one" by the New York Times, which editorially said:

> The desirability of the President's objectives—and the moral obligation of this country to try to fulfill them—are beyond dispute.

This editorial, entitled "Call for a Crusade," is submitted for inclusion in the RECORD, with the belief that it sheds light on a subject which challenges and inspires us all:

CALL FOR A CRUSADE

President Johnson yesterday called on the American people to begin a major crusade against the ignorance and illness that are the lot of countless millions abroad. His message to Congress on international education and health presented an omnibus collection of measures he considers vital in this area. In effect, the hitherto largely domestic objectives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are extended far beyond this Nation's shores, and a major international element is added to that Department's already homeric assignment.

The desirability of the President's objectives—and the moral obligation of this country to try to fulfill them—are beyond dispute. The practical problem is how to realize them. Here the President's program comes up against the same difficulty that has impeded earlier efforts in this direction. The United States is itself suffering from shortages of highly trained educational and medical personnel, and those possessing the skills needed abroad are under strong economic and other pressure to use their energies here.

Evidence abounds in Mr. Johnson's message that he understands how difficult the skilled manpower problem is. He gives careful attention to measures intended to increase the supply of needed educators and medical personnel for service abroad. But much of this program is likely to yield fruit only in the long run, while the needs of the developing countries are urgent now. The imaginative idea of the Exchange Peace Corps may serve as a modest offsetting factor, but its overall contribution is likely to be small.

The short-run problem of providing personnel for realizing the President's goals will be especially acute in the medical field. The country's existing shortage of doctors, nurses and other technicians is being aggravated by the demands of the war in Vietnam. That deficit may rise much further when medicare begins in midyear. The course Mr. Johnson has charted is an admirable and inspiring one; the great question is the adequacy of the means to travel it.

Crooks Always Get Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Bridgeport, Conn., Sunday Herald of February 6, 1966, by William Loeb, the publisher of that fine newspaper, entitled, "Crooks Always Get Guns."

This fine editorial points out very well that crooks will always get guns despite restrictive firearms laws.

One outstanding case in point is Philadelphia, which has practically eliminated sales of firearms within the city and honest sportsmen being able to carry firearms through that city.

Since that outrageous legislation was passed there were more than 21,095 major crimes committed, 96 more than in the same period of 1964. What is more significant this excellent editorial points out is that homicide increased from 122 to 132 in 1965, and armed robberies in the same period rose from 1,779 to 1,832.

Perhaps some of those who devote themselves to seeking to disarm honest and law-abiding citizens would do well to spend more time attacking criminals, the roots of crime, and dedicating themselves to more forceful and vigorous use of existing laws.

The editorial follows:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Sunday Herald, Feb. 6, 1966]

CROOKS ALWAYS GET GUNS

(By William Loeb)

Senator TOM DODD notwithstanding, the proposals to restrict citizens of the United

States in the purchase or possession of firearms—and this goes for handguns and concealed weapons, also—are absolutely ridiculous. All these gun laws ever do is to disarm the honest people. The crooks will always get guns one way or another. You can bet on that.

Gun laws which prevent the average citizen from owning or carrying a gun only make it easier for the crooks. With such gun laws in effect, the crooks know they can step up to the average citizen, stick a gun in his ribs and rob him, beat him up, or murder him with impunity because the chances of the citizen whom they are assaulting having a gun are one in a thousand, all because of the gun laws.

Take New York State and New York City, which probably have the most stringent gun law in the whole Nation. Do you know of a more crime-ridden place anywhere on the face of the globe than New York City?

Just take little Vermont. True, there are many differences in the amount of population, the size of the cities, and the fact that there isn't too much to rob up there, anyhow. Nevertheless it's interesting. In the State of Vermont, anyone can go into any store and buy a gun, put it in his pocket and walk out.

Yet hardly any armed robberies at all occur in the State of Vermont. One of the reasons obviously is that a gunman stops and thinks because the Vermonter whom he is going to rob is probably going to be armed and may be even a better shot than he is. So armed robbery in Vermont doesn't appeal very much to gunmen.

Take the case of Philadelphia. Down there they got really virtuous and passed a law which says: "No person shall acquire or transfer any firearm in the city, no person shall acquire a firearm outside of the city, which is brought into the city, unless application has been made to and a license obtained from the department (police department)." The then Mayor Tate and Police Commissioner Leary were 100 percent for this. They blasted the sportsmen's groups and all the other people who appeared against the bill, on the grounds that these people were trying to hamper law enforcement and cause lawlessness.

Well, theory is one thing, and fact is another. What actually happened in Philadelphia? Here is what happened. During the first 8 months of 1965 there were 21,095 major crimes committed, 96 more than there were in the same period in 1964.

What is even more important is homicides (killing people with guns as the major instrument) were increased by 10 in the same period, from 122 in 1964 to 132 in 1965.

If the advocates of the gun restrictive laws were correct, how come more people were killed in Philadelphia in 1965 by guns than in the year before?

Next, armed robberies for the 8-month period in 1964 totaled 1,779; but in 1965, after the gun law was put into effect, they rose to 1,832, an increase of 53.

This situation is so completely obvious that it seems impossible that anyone like Senator DODD, who is supposed to have some brains, could possibly advocate such a silly law. Certainly President Kennedy was murdered by a man who bought a mail-order gun, and it is a terrible thing that he was murdered, but Oswald could just as well have bought a rifle right in Dallas without any trouble at all—or anywhere else in the United States.

If there was a gun law prohibiting the sale of rifles in Dallas, Oswald would have bought it somewhere else, because the man who wants to commit a crime always gets a gun.

About the only thing the absence of guns lying around will prevent is some kids shooting each other or some adults getting hotheaded and shooting each other, but that is a very minor part of the whole situation.

The American citizens, by our Constitution, are guaranteed the right to bear arms. There is nothing more the Communists or other would-be dictators in the United States would like to achieve than the disarming of the American populace. It is almost impossible to conquer an armed populace that knows how to handle guns and how to shoot straight.

So we wish Senator DODD would forget his publicity kick on the gun laws and devote himself to fighting the Communists, both in this country and abroad.

A Poverty Fighter's Struggle in Uptown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM GIBBONS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we continue to hear and read a great deal about how the war on poverty is worknig in Chicago.

I would like to recommend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives an article by Lois Willie in the February 7 edition of the Chicago Daily News which tells of the work of one poverty fighter in Chicago. He works in Uptown Chicago and his methods are rather unique:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Feb. 7, 1966]

A POVERTY FIGHTER'S STRUGGLE IN UPTOWN

(By Lois Willie)

(NOTE.—One year ago this week Chicago's $21 million war on poverty began with the opening of three urban progress centers—called "supermarkets of social service"—in poor neighborhoods. This is the second of a series examining what that money has meant in one neighborhood: Uptown.)

Jim Winstead's job may seem like the easiest one in town: finding people with troubles.

"When I started out," he says, "all I did was knock on doors and ask, 'You got problems?'

"Boy, did I ever get some wild answers. I mean, in a neighborhood like this—who hasn't?"

That was 2 months ago. Today Jim Winstead works his poverty territory like a brush salesman:

"Morning, Mrs. Evans. How's the kids? Everything going OK? Anything I can do for you?"

What Jim sells are the services of Chicago's war on poverty.

He's learned that getting people to accept help—even when it's free—can take a lot of wheedling and hard-sell talking.

A big, husky man of 39 with a round ruddy face and direct blue eyes, Jim looks like he should be pouring concrete or shingling roofs instead of acting like a social worker.

But that's part of the philosophy behind the job.

Last fall he was an out-of-work papercutter, one of about 25,000 Southern whites who have left their small hill towns and farms for Chicago's Mid-North Side since the end of World War II. He had 8 years of school and 10 children.

A neighborhood agency, the Council of the Southern Mountains, recommended Winstead to the antipoverty program's Uptown Urban Progress Center for a job as a community representative the so-called indigenous poor who are supposed to find customers for antipoverty projects.

As he sees it, a major part of his work is dispensing homespun advice and lots of comforting words. And the people on his rounds eat them up as though they were starving.

At one stop, the door opened only about 2 inches when he knocked, and a voice behind a mass of tumbling dark hair whispered, "Wait, wait, I got to clear the floor."

The door closed again and Jim Winstead murmured, "She's a mental case. I got her into the counseling program over at the center. She was so scared to death of going I practically had to pick her up and carry her there."

The door opened wide this time and a pale pretty, woman in a blue housecoat began a long string of apologies:

"You got to excuse this mess, these toys all over. You can't make kids pick things up. And the baby, she broke my alarm clock and I couldn't get up this morning and get the kids to school."

She glanced into the living room, littered with broken toys and torn magazines. A 9-year-old girl in pajamas was combing her younger sister's hair.

The woman clutched a green plastic coffee cup and continued:

"Besides, they got no boots. What can I do? Public aid gives me $225 a month, and I'm supposed to feed seven kids and pay the rent and get them boots?"

Jim interrupted. "Well, you should send them. You know they belong in school."

"Yes, but see—I'm not a firm person. I'm one way this day, the other way the next. It's just being here alone all day with seven kids."

She started to cry. "Sometimes I just can't face getting up. And I know it's hell for the kids.

"See, I'm from a broken home myself."

Jim asked about the oldest, a 14-year-old girl.

"That girl," the woman began. "She left here at 8 Saturday night and do you know what time she came in? Six o'clock Sunday night.

"Then she gave me this song-and-dance about how she fell asleep at a friend's house and was scared to call me."

Jim whistled through his teeth. "Oh boy. We've got to do something with her, fast."

"But she's a good kid," the mother said. "I mean, she would never do anything wrong." She looked at Jim, begging him to agree.

"Sure, sure. But, you know, the temptation."

By the time he left, Jim had secured a promise from the woman to bring the girl to the Urban Progress Center and "get her involved in those good things at Hull House."

At times, Jim Winstead can be tough.

In one typical, rundown Uptown six-flat, he wanted to tell the mothers to take their children to the infant welfare station to test for lead poisoning.

One woman, the mother of three, wasn't home.

"She just drove away, I guess with her husband," the landlady told him.

Jim was furious. "Husband? That's her boy friend. If that guy's around again."

The boy friend ran out when the woman got pregnant, Jim said, and he arranged for her to get aid to dependent children. He added: "Well, I know what to do if he's back."

What?

"Get her kicked off, that's what."

When his rounds end about 3:30 p.m., Jim Winstead reports to his supervisor at the Urban Progress Center for a professional opinion on how he's handled his people.

He's considered one of the best of the community representatives.

"We've got some that dog it," said a center official. "But we're weeding them out."

But one question could be asked about his job:

Most of his work involves families on public assistance. Shouldn't caseworkers from the Cook County Department of Public Aid have spotted the same problems he has spotted, and made the same referrals, and spoken similar words?

Why did it take the antipoverty program to get this done?

"Absolutely, they should have done this all along," Jim said. "The point is, they didn't. Maybe they're too busy.

"But I think the reason is they're not really interested in people. You've got to know what people go through before you get the patience to deal with them."

Hon. Basil L. Whitener Addresses Midwinter Conference, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Hon. Basil L. Whitener, made a splendid speech on February 19, 1966, before the midwinter conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Charlotte, N.C.

In his speech he strongly supported the position of the President in the effort that our Nation is making to halt the spread of communism in southeast Asia.

I was greatly impressed with the remarks made by my fellow North Carolinian, and I request that the speech be inserted in the Appendix of the Record.

Address by Hon. Basil L. Whitener, Member of Congress From North Carolina, Before Midwinter Conference, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Charlotte, N.C., February 19, 1966

I am deeply grateful for the opportunity to be with you this evening and to have a part on your fine program. I am very proud of my membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is more than a patriotic organization. It is not just another organization of Americans who have worn the uniform in time of war. Ours is an organization of patriotic Americans dedicated to the very highest ideals and principles of patriotism and citizenship and devoted to constitutional principles of government.

This great organization is one of the oldest veterans groups in the Nation. Its history can be said to date from October 11, 1899, when a charter was granted to a group of Spanish-American War veterans by the State of Ohio under the name of American Veterans of Foreign Service. In 1913 the Colorado Society of the Army of the Philippines and an organization at Altoona, Pa., under the name of Veterans of Foreign Service joined with the American Veterans of Foreign Service to form our present Veterans of Foreign Wars. The stage was set, therefore, for a new and powerful patriotic force to be exerted in the future economic, social, and military life of the Nation.

The requirement that members of the VFW must have served in a foreign war, insurrection, or expedition has set the VFW aside as a unique organization. The official objectives of the VFW, as prescribed by Congress in the VFW constitution, are restatements of fundamental principles of Americanism.

VFW objectives are "fraternal, patriotic, and educational; to preserve and strengthen comradeship among its members; to assist worthy comrades; to perpetuate the memory and history of our dead and to assist their widows and orphans; to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to foster true patriotism; to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom; and to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies whomsoever."

My friends, these VFW objectives enunciated more than half a century ago are the bedrock upon which this great veterans organization flourishes. It is these objectives which have brought the American people to look upon the VFW with respect and admiration.

I am familiar with the wonderful work of the VFW. I have observed the assistance that VFW contact representatives have given veterans, regardless of whether they are VFW members, in connection with cases they have had pending with the Board of Veterans Appeals and the various discharge review and correction boards in the Pentagon.

The administration of veterans benefits is one of the most vital functions of the Federal Government. Although the Veterans' Administration is an independent agency without an official in the President's Cabinet, it has more employees than all the executive departments with the exception of two. With a budget averaging $5.9 billion annually the Veterans' Administration spends more money than all the executive departments with the exception of three.

The American people stand behind their Government's effort to provide for our veterans and their dependents. This tremendous effort utilizes 4 percent of all the doctors in the United States. Thousands of nurses, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, and clinical and counseling psychologists are employed in the service of our veterans.

Twenty-two million Americans living today have worn the uniform of their country. With their families they comprise 44 percent of our entire population. The Veterans of Foreign Wars in administering to the needs of this great veteran population is performing an essential service with a dynamic impact on the future of our Nation.

Since the time of formation of the VFW our Nation has been involved in a continuous struggle to preserve American freedom at home and to uphold the dignity of man and Christian civilization throughout the world. In this noble pursuit our country has been forced to fight despotic tyranny unleashed in Europe by imperial Germany during World War I, the pagan forces of nazism in World War II, and Communist aggression in Korea in 1950.

This organization supported the policies of our Nation in each of these struggles. In addition to the major wars, our country has been called upon to take part in numerous other campaigns and expeditions in the last half century. Each of these military actions has had the support of the VFW.

During the past 50 years the VFW has truly fulfilled its official objectives. It has fostered true patriotism and has fought to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom. And, above all, the VFW has steadfastly maintained its fidelity to the Constitution of the United States.

We meet tonight at a very critical period in the history of our Nation. We assemble at a time when our country is again engaged in a historic effort to destroy a threat to the liberties of free people at home and abroad.

As members of an organization dedicated to the security of our Nation and its institutions, we have more than an average interest in the events taking place today at home and abroad in our struggle with communism.

American participation in the Vietnam war is the greatest single event occupying the attention of the American people today.

The war in Vietnam is not an isolated instance of Communist aggression. It is an important phase of a Communist conspiracy to enslave the world, which had its origin in the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

The principles of democratic government and the liberties of free people have been the target of atheistic communism for the last half century. With the emergence of Russia after World War II as a great military and economic power, the tentacles of communism were rapidly extended throughout the world.

On more than one occasion during the past 20 years the United States has come face to face with communism, and we have stood firmly against all threats, militarily and politically. We can be proud of our record in opposition to communism. Communism does not respect the institutions of government and political principles of the free world.

Communism has a healthy respect only for military force. Our overwhelming military strength and the support of our people in the cause of freedom and justice have enabled the United States to prevent Communist enslavement in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa.

While our national leaders could see the Communist menace in other parts of the world, they failed to see it at our very doorstep in Cuba. Cuba went to the Communist side because of an unrealistic and misguided American foreign policy. Our leaders are determined, however, not to make the same mistake in Santo Domingo and the other nations of Latin and South America.

The struggle in Vietnam is a cruel and little understood war. Many of our people ask the question: Why are we in Vietnam?

I shall attempt to answer that question. We are in South Vietnam because the Communist effort to subjugate that country is another step along the road to Communist domination of southeast Asia.

We are in Vietnam to halt the spread of communism and to prevent the ultimate subjugation of Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, India, and Pakistan. The history of South Vietnam is a tragic example of the fate that befalls a country when a great power abandons a colonial empire and leaves a political vacuum. When the French pulled out of their former colonial possession of Indochina after suffering an ignoble defeat, the road lay open for the entire subjugation of that strategic part of the world by the Communists.

While negotiating an end to the Indochina war at Geneva in 1954, the Communists were making plans to take over all former French territory in southeast Asia. When pursuant to the Geneva agreement Vietnam was partitioned, North Vietnam immediately began to send guerrillas into South Vietnam. Arms and ammunition were stored in South Vietnam for future use. Many of the tunnels and other fortifications we have heard so much about recently were constructed during this period.

North Vietnam felt that South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia could be subjugated by infiltration, sabotage, and the aggravation of the war-torn conditions in that troubled area. South Vietnam resisted, however, and the story of that little nation's heroic effort unfortunately has been overlooked. The South Vietnamese were determined to have a peaceful and independent future, free of Communist domination.

Although harassed by North Vietnam with military attacks and terrorism, South Vietnam actually had, by 1960, exceeded prewar levels of food production and per capita income. Stepped-up Communist terrorism, sabotage, assassination, and kidnapping of civilians forced South Vietnam, however, to ask the United States in 1961 for increased military assistance.

This assistance has greatly increased during the past year. If anyone doubts the determination of the United States to halt communism in South Vietnam, he should examine our record in Vietnam for 1965. At the beginning of 1965 U.S. military strength in Vietnam was 23,000 men. At the end of 1965 approximately 190,000 Americans were in the country. At the present time we have over 200,000 troops in South Vietnam, and we can expect more military forces to be sent during the coming months.

While meeting Communist force with force in Vietnam, the United States has shown a sincere desire to settle the Vietnamese war by negotiation at the conference table. By indicating our willingness to negotiate, however, we have made it plain to the Communists that we are not going to surrender as some in our Nation apparently would have us do under the misguided view that it is possible to negotiate on an honorable basis with the Communists.

We have in the past several months demonstrated to the world that we will accept an honorable diplomatic solution to the Vietnamese war. Our efforts have been met with scorn on the part of North Vietnam. Communist China has gone to every length to vilify and attack the United States.

With China at her back North Vietnam has not indicated a willingness to negotiate. Instead, North Vietnam has increased military activity on all fronts. Our current military buildup in South Vietnam, therefore, is to meet this military challenge.

The United States has not had the support it deserves from the free nations of the world in the Vietnamese war. Countries that the United States has helped to preserve their independence economically and militarily during the past 20 years have openly criticized our efforts to preserve freedom in South Vietnam.

Several of these governments today stand protected behind the shield of American military might in Europe. Our resources and military power have enabled these nations to have the highest standard of living in their history. While urging the United States to abandon its commitment to help South Vietnam, they utterly fail to realize that if the United States were to abandon its commitment to preserve freedom in Europe they would fall victims to communism within a very short time.

Our Government has been disturbed over the attitude of many of these countries. I am concerned over not only their political policies which hamper our efforts to win the Vietnamese war, but I am gravely concerned over the persistent foreign trade between these countries and North Vietnam, and particularly with Communist China. It is no secret that much of the material reaching Communist China from the free world finds its ways into North Vietnam.

My friends, total free world trade to Communist China and North Vietnam in 1964 amounted to $989.4 million. At the same time the free world imported from Communist China and North Vietnam $1,204.4 million. This enormous trade between free world countries and Communist China and North Vietnam is enabling the Communist machine to destroy the liberties of free people in southeast Asia.

The ports of North Vietnam and Red China are clogged with ships flying the flags of England, France, the Scandinavian countries, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, Austria, and even our Latin American neighbors. I believe it is imperative that our Nation adopt a stern and realistic policy with our allies in the matter of trade with Communist China and North Vietnam.

We should make it plain to these nations that they cannot expect to enjoy our military protection and our foreign aid dollars while engaging in trade that results in death of our young men in southeast Asia and destruction of the liberties of free people.

There are those in our Nation who cringe from a possible confrontation with Red China. The United States has never deliberately attacked any nation. If war with Red China comes, it will come through direct intervention of that country in the Vietnamese war. In the event of such an occurrence the United States should not spare any of its material and military resources to destroy Chinese aggression.

It was my privilege last fall to visit Formosa and to talk with the great Chinese Nationalist leader, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. I also visited Thailand, Japan, the Philippines, and Hong Kong. I had a firsthand look at the vast and complex military and economic problems with which we are confronted in southeast Asia.

We have an awesome responsibility, and the task that lies ahead of us will demand great sacrifices on the part of our people. The President and our Government deserve the support of the American people in our effort in southeast Asia.

In our exercise of the right of freedom of the press, of the news media, of the pulpit, and of our educational institutions we should be very careful to avoid doing those things which will give aid and comfort to our enemies and prolong a conflict that will bring about the tragic loss of life.

As one who spent over 3 years in combat during World War II, and as the father of a son of military age, I know something of the anguish, apprehension, and worry that exists in the minds of the American people today.

Our country has not asked for the responsibilities and obligations which weigh so heavily upon us in the struggle for the preservation of Christian civilization. As the most powerful and most enlightened nation on earth the responsibilities and obligations have been thrust upon us. We must fulfill the demands that this period in history has placed upon us. If we fail, our prosperity will become the slaves of communism.

My friends, I want to say in conclusion that I am proud of the record that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has made in the cause of national security and the furtherance of our democratic institutions. It is a comforting thought to know that the VFW is growing year by year in membership.

While ever watchful over the welfare of our veterans, the VFW has strongly supported the broader aspects of our national life. As long as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other great patriotic organizations founded on similar principles exists, the United States will continue to hold high the torch of liberty.

Grand Old Man of Western New York Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the 88th birthday of the "grand old man of western New York politics," John W. Henry, of Amherst, N.Y.

John Henry's long political service combined with his dedicated and untiring contributions to Erie County and the Buffalo area have endeared him to many, both citizens and politicians, Republicans and Democrats.

On February 14, the model political figure and former county chairman of the Democratic Party, was honored by the First Friday Club of Buffalo.

With great respect and admiration, I would like to extend my remarks to include in the RECORD the following articles from two Buffalo newspapers praising Mr. Henry's integrity and many years of service.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Feb. 15, 1966]

JOHN HENRY HONORED

A Congressman Monday described John W. Henry, of 174 LeBrun Road, Amherst, as "the grand old man of western New York politics."

The tribute was made to Henry, a 70-year veteran in politics, by Representative RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, of the 39th Congressional District at a luncheon honoring Henry on his 88th birthday.

In a telegram read at the luncheon at Leonardo's restaurant, 386 Pearl Street, Represenatative MCCARTHY said:

"Henry could very well serve as the model for any young political figure. He is a man of energy, dedication, and integrity. He has served his community nobly and well for scores of years. Buffalo and Erie County are better today because of his high-minded and unselfish service."

Henry, a former Erie County sheriff and former county chairman of the Democratic Party, has been a Democratic committeeman for 68 years.

The luncheon was given by the officers and directors of the First Friday Club of Buffalo. Henry is chairman of the club's board and general manager-treasurer of its monthly newspaper, the First Friday Tribune.

Raymond J. Doney, a past president of the club, was luncheon chairman and toastmaster. He praised Henry for his dedication and service to the community, Catholic Church, the FFCB, and its newspaper, saying he "excels in integrity and is totally uncompromising on principle."

Among the guests was Peter McGlynn, president of the Northside First Friday Club.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Feb. 15, 1966]

OLD DREAM HAS NEW LEASE ON LIFE: HENRY TO HAVE HELP IN BID TO REOPEN CATHOLIC LIBRARY

Fourteen of John W. Henry's old buddies gave him a box of his favorite cigars on his 88th birthday Monday—and a promise to help in a 28-year-old dream.

At a birthday party in Leonardo's Restaurant, the possibility was discussed of reopening the Catholic Institute of Buffalo's 30,000-volume library. The library occupying the second floor at 828–836 Main Street, has been closed since 1938.

The luncheon party was limited to officers and past officers of the First Friday Club. Mr. Henry, chairman of the club's board of directors, also is general manager of its monthly First Friday Tribune.

"Reopening the library," Mr. Henry told his colleagues, "would be a wonderful way to observe the 100th anniversary this year of the founding of the Buffalo Catholic Institute.

"It was started, you know, by young German immigrants who wanted a place to meet and read and educate themselves.

"When they outgrew quarters at the northeast corner of Main and Chippewa in the 1880's, they bought the lot at Main and Virginia for a new building."

Mr. Henry was president of the Catholic Institute from 1914 to 1916. Its financial difficulties began during that period, when the Knights of Columbus built their own clubhouse and moved there. Much of the social activity also shifted there.

"The diocese took over the building in 1926 and began paying the Institute $5,000 a year to maintain the library, but during the depression they couldn't afford the money and the library had to be closed in 1938," he said.

Mr. Henry, who lives at 174 LeBrun Road, Amherst, was chairman of the Erie County Democratic Party from 1926 to 1931. He was Erie County sheriff in 1911, at the age of 33, serving for a year.

Raymond J. Doney, past president of the First Friday Club, was chairman of Monday's luncheon.

Food Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, The Baltimore Sun went to the heart of the President's food message when it said:

> Food supplies are the ultimate limit on population, that world population now presses beyond food supplies, and that willy-nilly, either voluntarily by food and population control, or involuntarily by famine and disease, men will, as ever, see food and population reach a balance.

The Sun continued that—

> It is just because he wants to stimulate food-population adjustment in the food-short areas that the President is swinging American food aid to a new system and rationale.

As the paper points out:

> While American food aid will certainly continue [the President] thinks a reasonable incentive to self-help in the deficit countries would be for them to bring their farm systems more into the market economy of buy and sell.

The editorial comments on a sensible answer to one of man's age-old problems, and I feel that others will want to peruse the thinking here. With this in mind, I offer the article for publication in the RECORD:

FOOD MESSAGE

It has been said that the secret joy of the thinker was his knowledge that millions would be marching to the cadence of his thought long after he was dead. Thomas Robert Malthus, born 200 years ago this (or perhaps tomorrow) morning didn't live to read President Johnson's message on the new American food aid program, but he would have approved every line. What the President was saying is that food supplies are the ultimate limit on population, that world population now presses beyond food supplies, and that willy-nilly, either voluntarily by food and population control, or involuntarily by famine and disease, men will, as ever, see food and population reach a balance. The Reverend Dr. Malthus could not have agreed more.

It is just because he wants to stimulate food-population adjustment in the food-short areas that the President is swinging American food aid to a new system and rationale. In the past decade the United States has shipped 140 million tons of food abroad—and the gap between food supply and population is wider than ever. The President fears one reason is that some aid recipients may have come to rely as much on American food aid as on gearing their own agriculture to their population growth—and vice versa. Yet, as he puts it, "the time is coming when even the fabulous abundance of America will not be enough to feed the world's hungry millions." And while American food aid will certainly continue, he thinks a reasonable incentive to self-help in the deficit countries would be for them to bring their farm systems more "into the market economy" of buy and sell.

That implies, of course, the other big shift in the President's food position—that our own farm programs must move toward the market economy and away from the confused, wasteful, and in some ways, fraudulent routine of subsidy-and-surplus which has characterized many of them up to now. After all, the crisis that Malthus foresaw 200 years ago was sidetracked only by the abruptly exuberant productivity of the market-economy industrial revolution, which Malthus did not foresee. Now the medical science which marched step by step with industrialism has abated the old brutal deciminations by disease, but population still has to balance out with food. The President announces an initial and urgent American contribution to that benign end.

Danny Fernandez: An American Hero Who Gave His Own Life for His Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply touched by the story which appeared in the press yesterday of the unselfish courage and supreme heroism of a young 21-year-old American soldier, Sp4c. Daniel Fernandez, who was killed in action last Friday near the village of Cuchi, South Vietnam, when he threw himself on top of a live grenade in order to save the lives of his fellow comrades in arms.

Danny Fernandez, whose home was the little Rio Grande town of Las Lunas, N. Mex., has been recommended by his military unit, the U.S. Army's 25th Infantry Division, to receive the Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest award, for the extraordinary personal bravery and outstanding devotion he showed in the service of his country—far above and beyond the call of duty.

Mr. Speaker, just to read the story of Danny Fernandez' heroism, and of what kind of a man he was, makes a person feel rather humble—and at the same time proud—to be an American.

But perhaps the most moving tribute came from a member of his own platoon, Pvt. David Masingale of Fresno, Calif., one of the men whose lives Danny saved at the cost of his own.

Private Masingale called Danny "the kind of person you want yourself to be. You know, we'd like to say to ourselves that we would do the same thing in the same situation. I wonder."

The following article appeared in the New York Times yesterday and recounted the heroism of Sp. Danny Fernandez:

BORN 1944, KILLED IN ACTION FEBRUARY 18, 1966

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

CUCHI, SOUTH VIETNAM, February 19.—Danny Fernandez was one of those rare young men who are looked up to by their contemporaries—quiet, competent, unselfish, cheerful, the type they choose as president of the senior class.

When he died yesterday a few months short of his 22d birthday, he was a rifleman in the U.S. 25th Infantry Division, and everyone who had known him mourned him.

They would have felt the loss in any case, but there was a special depth to their grief because Danny Fernandez chose death by throwing his body across a live Vietcong grenade to save five of his comrades.

On the report at brigade headquarters, the story was told in few words: "Daniel Fernandez, specialist 4. Born June 30, 1944. Next of kin, José Fernandez, Las Lunas, N. Mex., father. Killed in action, February 18, 1966."

The report might have added one fact—that Danny Fernandez has been recommended by his division for the Medal of Honor.

He was not a career soldier. He used to joke with his friends that he was in the Army for 3 years because he had flipped a coin with his draft board and lost. Actually, he had enlisted for 3 years.

His father is a rancher and Danny had hoped to settle in Texas to do the same thing. He had hoped to marry a girl named Backy some day. He had hoped to have a string of horses because he liked riding better than anything.

While he was in the Army, he wanted to be a good soldier. He spent hours at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii, where the 25th was stationed before coming to Cuchi, poring over infantry handbooks.

His platoon leader, 2d Lt. Joseph V. Dorso of Norfolk, Conn., called him "the type of guy I could always count on, no matter what the situation. S. Sgt. David M. Thompson of Bellmawr, N.J., who used to go sky diving with him in Hawaii, said simply, "Danny was my best man."

The members of his squad—a tight little group of 15 men, one sub-sub-subsection of a huge division—looked upon him as a father confessor. Even those who were older than he called him "Uncle Dan" and went to him with their troubles and complaints.

Sepecialist Fernandez had been in Vietnam once before, as a volunteer machinegunner on an Army helicopter. So it was not surprising that he was one of 16 men who volunteered for an ambush patrol sent out from Cuchi just after midnight yesterday.

All the men were from one unit—1st Platoon, Company C, 1st Battalion of our 5th Mechanized Infantry Regiment.

About 7 a.m., as the patrol lay in wait in a jungle clearing for the Vietcong, Sp4c. Joseph T. Benton, of Hertford, N.C. spotted seven guerrillas in the woods beyond a burned-out hut. He began firing his machinegun, and then reached for a hand grenade.

Before he could pull the pin, a sniper killed him with a single bullet through the jugular vein.

Specialist Fernandez crawled to one side of the hut to cover the right flank, and Sp4c. James P. McKeown of Willingsboro, N.J., moved into place on the other side. Behind the hut, Pvt. David R. Masingale of Fresno, Calif., the platoon's 18-year-old medic, bent over Specialist Benton.

RESCUE UNDER FIRE

A moment later the Vietcong opened up with machineguns, and a bullet hit Sgt. Ray E. Sue in the leg, knocking him to the ground. Sp4c. George E. Snodgrass of Pompton Lakes, N.J., who had come up with Sergeant Sue to try to pull Specialist Benton out, hit the dirt.

All five men were pinned down in an area no bigger than a living room—Private Masingale treating Sergeant Sue, the two flankmen riddling the bushes and Specialist Snodgrass firing from behind the body of Specialist Benton.

At that instant a grenade fired from a rifle by one of the guerrillas landed beside Specialist Fernandez' leg. He got up on all fours, trying to escape, but he hit the grenade with his ankle, knocking it to within a few feet of the group around Specialist Benton and Sergeant Sue.

Without hesitation—so quickly that Private Masingale is sure he did not have time to consider the consequences of his action—Specialist Fernandes shouted, "Move out." and threw himself onto the grenade.

It exploded under him, and a .50-caliber machinegun bullet hit him seconds later, but when the others reached him, he was still conscious.

"IT HURTS, I CAN'T BREATHE"

Specialist Snodgrass helped to make a litter from three shirts and bamboo poles and dragged Specialist Fernandez toward an open area where a helicopter could land.

"It hurts," the wounded man said. "I can't breathe."

Specialist Snodgrass, a Roman Catholic who often went to mass with Specialist Fernandez told him "to make a good act of contrition" because no priest was present.

"I will," the wounded man said.

When they got to a clearing, they found Specialist David N. Smeltz shouting into his radio, trying to direct an evacuation helicopter into the area. None of the men had a smoke grenade to mark the landing place.

"You got it coming in?" Specialist Fernandez asked.

"It'll be here in a minute," Specialist Smeltz said.

"Be sure you bring it in."

"I'll bring it in, you just hang on."

"I can't breathe."

"Hang on, you'll make it."

"Yeah, I'm going to make it."

But by the time the litter was carried through a cloud of dust and onto the copter, Danny Fernandez had apparently decided he wasn't going to make it.

The last man he talked with was Sgt. Ruben Perkins, of Nashville, Tenn., with whom he had shared a foxhole on the dreary plain of Cuchi since they came here January 27.

"I'm sorry," he said to Sergeant Perkins. "Someone else is going to have to take care of you, because old Dan has got to go now."

He died on the helicopter.

"He was the kind of person you want yourself to be," Private Masingale said today. "You know, we'd all like to say to ourselves that we would do the same thing in the same situation. I wonder."

The N. V. Nelson Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on a recent Saturday night in Boston, the famed Gridiron Club there once again conferred the National N. V. Nelson Football Award upon a most worthy recipient, this year's captain of Dartmouth's championship team, an outstanding young American, Tom Clarke.

This young man is not only a great football player. He is a strong, rugged, intelligent leader, a true inspiration to his teammates. As their captain, he served the team as a whole, with complete selflessness, a buoyant spirit of dedication, and with farsighted leadership that contributed to ultimate victory and the championship stature the great Dartmouth team achieved as the only major undefeated team in the Nation for 1965.

Most famous athletic awards are given for skill, proficiency, and outstanding performance. Some consider character and scholarship as well. The world-renowned Nelson Award is based on a somewhat different set of values, however, since it combines superior football performance with conduct stemming from the high character and ethical values of those who distinguish themselves in some notable way in keen football competition by demonstrating in a conspicuous degree lofty motivations toward others, superlative qualities of sportsmanship, or idealism in action toward their fellow competitors or their teammates.

In a word, the award evaluations are concerned with unusual reflections of personal conduct by athletic leaders and competitors evidencing laudable character traits of unselfishness and nobility of impulse.

After all, these are the qualities of idealism in action and conduct for which the great American, incomparable sports figure, and business leader, Swede Nelson, has been noted during his entire life—on the gridiron, in the world of sports, on the public platform, at the head table, in business, charitable and civic leadership, work for youth, and all his many constructive activities and warm human relationships. The real spirit of the Nelson Award springs from the life, works, and magnificent contributions of the great N. V. "Swede" Nelson himself—the high ideals he has always exemplified, the love of humanity, inspiration to others, and clean rivalry which has marked his entire career.

In the light of the personality and character of Swede Nelson himself, the example he has set in the encouragement of clean sportsmanship and in the development of a high honor code for athletic competition and human relations, the Nelson Award is uniquely adapted to represent, not only the highest ethical standards of organized collegiate sport, but the loftiest values of American life. They are the real values of our way of life because, if pursued faithfully and well, they foster and insure a sound mind in a sound body, fairness and fair dealing, self-discipline, loyalty, courage, determination, teamwork, and the will to win by fair and honorable means, and to give practical substance to the old adage—"let the best man win." Under these values, no petty discrimination can live on the field of play—men are judged on their merits, and not on their religion, the color of their skin, their birth or station in life. Thus, the playing field is a crucible of fierce, but fair, competition, where every man stands on an equal footing, artificial distinctions are never tolerated and honor, good faith, fairness, honesty and true sportsmanship are required of all.

In the Nelson code, sports and athletics are equated with personal ethical values, resolution to play the game to win, to play it with honor, mutual respect, fairness, thoughtfulness for others, and with the recognition of the time-honored truism that no man is greater than the cause, no man is greater than the team.

A book could be written about the Nelson Award because it sums up the basic ideas and ideals that underlie our great country, our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Sermon on the Mount.

As part of my remarks, I insert a very well written article from the Sunday, January 23, edition of the famed Boston Herald, which fully describes the award ceremonies and the admirable qualifications of Tom Clarke, this year's award winner. I also insert in the RECORD some other fine news articles about the award and remarks of Gridiron Club President John J. Carver, and N. V. "Swede" Nelson.

Everything about this young man, Tom Clarke, suggests class, caliber, quality, standout superiority. During the season just passed, he demonstrated that he was an outstanding football player, a great leader of men, and a young man who, notwithstanding his success and stature, intuitively reached out to think of his team, his teammates, and his college, and as he saw it, to subordinate his own personal status to a greater cause than self. There goes a real American boy of whom much more will be heard.

His loving family, friends, teammates, and college can well be proud of such an inspiring young leader. He is in the best traditions of his great Dartmouth College and his country. May we have more like him.

He does, in truth, represent the flower of American youth—strong, intelligent, enthusiastic, resolute of purpose, eager to win fairly, with first concern for the cause rather than for himself—the stuff great, human beings are made of.

I know that historic, illustrious, Dartmouth College and its alumni are very happy about Tom Clarke's sterling performance, and I am very proud of him, and I know that in honoring him, Swede Nelson feels that he himself has been honored.

The distinguished Gridiron Club of Boston and its wise leadership, composed of some of the greatest sports figures and greatest Americans in the Nation, in selecting this fine young man for this year's Nelson Award has in a real sense mirrored Swede Nelson's lifelong devotion to God and country, his unselfish, humane spirit, his courage and powerful will in the pursuit of tolerance, truth, justice and humaneness, not only in the world of athletic competition, where the finest examples of these virtues can be found, but in the everyday world in which we live.

I commend the Gridiron Club for its very wise, intelligent selection of Tom

Clarke, and I commend the gifted humanist and wit, my beloved friend and teammate, Swede Nelson, for doing so much to keep alive the invincible spirit of red-blooded, two-fisted, hard-hitting, but fair-minded, generous-hearted young American athletes, who not only have heart, but look beyond themselves to serve unselfishly in any and every cause to which they are committed. So long as our country can produce enough young men of this high posture, we need not be concerned about the future security and welfare of this Nation.

It is young leaders like Tom Clarke—well trained in their homes, their churches, and their schools, colleges, and universities, imbued with love of this great, free Nation, dedicated to its continued freedom, security, and progress, possessed of the brains and talents to cope with its challenging problems, the courage and idealism to stand up boldly and unswervingly for what is right and just, these are the ones who will preserve the rich heritage of our land in the days and generations that lie ahead.

The material referred to follows:

Introductory Remarks of Gridiron Club President John J. Carver, Executive of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.

As president of the Gridiron Club of Boston, I bid you welcome to this 20th annual "Swede" Nelson Sportsman Award with special attention to your wives and sweethearts whose beauty and grace lend dignity to this occasion. Nor can I overlook the presence of so many Dartmouth alumni whose loyalty to their alma mater, to their athletic teams, and to their great college traditions are legendary.

Each year that this dinner is held is a happy and auspicious occasion. This affair, however, is significant since it is the 20th year that we have honored a football player on a national scale for outstanding sportsmanship. Moreover, the fact that the ever-loving "Swede" has been spared to us is heart warming and refreshing, for here is an evangelist of fun, the harbinger of good news, always and forever building up sports and sportsmen and sharing them with us and making them our heroes too. He has made sports not only respectable, but a way of life, never by preaching or by propaganda, but by the sheer contagion of his joy of living. He illuminates a dark room, ignites a dull party, makes strangers into friends and has a way of merchandising instant gaiety. The generous gifts of his time and his talents have been enormous contributions not only to sports but to the civic life and to the educational and charitable well-being of this community and this entire Nation.

REMARKS OF "SWEDE" NELSON AT THE "SWEDE" NELSON SPORTSMANSHIP AWARD DINNER

My first official visit to wonderful Dartmouth was in 1920 with Phil Philbin, Eddie Casey—Billy Murray and Jack Desmond of blessed memory—four Scandinavians. Where there are four Scandinavians there is always a fifth. We arrived at Hanover for the winter carnival and we were very pleased to find out that Dartmouth was coed.

I am proud to welcome you loyal Dartmouth sons—the incomparable Coach Blackman who is probably one of the finest coaches in the United States. Bob—you and your fine team were worthy winners of the Lambert Trophy. Bob, you have great imagination. You are a tremendously inspirational leader and you are a great molder of men.

Ernie Roberts, your publicity releases of the Big Green are read by everybody, including Wellesley, Wheaton, and Smith.

Tonight we happily honor Tom Clarke and in honoring him we honor one of the best. He is the 20th name to be added to this distinguished list of American athletes—great not alone for football ability but greater for their dedication and devotion to all that is decent and dignified in our system of sports. The fine Gridiron Club selection committee is very proud of their choice.

He is symbolic of service and sacrifice and tonight his unselfishness is rightfully recogniged and rewarded. His willingness to change from offensive glory to defensive drudgery—his wish that his substitute should finish the Princeton game because he thought it was Bill's opportunity—his leading the cheers for his opponents—all this is the progressive realization of the most worthy ideals.

Tom Clarke is more than a great athlete—he is a gifted student with a most pleasing personality—truly representative of his loving parents, and the inspiring example of his dedicated coaches, teachers, and fellow students.

The members of the 1965 Dartmouth football team were true champions and in electing him captain they proved to be all for one—and their captain in the distribution of the victory footballs also was a champion and likewise proved he was one for all.

When Tom noticed there were only nine game footballs, indicative of nine Dartmouth victories, he suggested, since he had received many honors as team captain, the nine game balls should be awarded to the other nine seniors, as a tribute of their contribution to the team's success.

Distinguished Dartmouth demands the best of her selected sons—this son in giving his best receives the deserving respect of this great college, her great alumni, entire student body and community as he now marches the long green line of Dartmouth's great men.

Tom Clarke—you are a credit to your wonderful family—your distinguished college—your great coach and your fine teammates. Your dedication is clearly told in these pages—and the paraphrase—from one of the greatest and most beloved Americans of all—the late President John Kennedy—it wasn't what Dartmouth could do for you—it is what you could do for Dartmouth.

I am proud to present to you the Gridiron Club trophy signifying that you are one of the greatest sportsmen of them all.

Ladies and gentlemen—Tom Clarke.

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Jan. 23, 1966]

Blackman Hails Clarke, Nelson Award Winner

(By Hy Hurwitz)

His Dartmouth team wound up as the Nation's only undefeated major football team in the country and Saturday night in the Sheraton Plaza, Capt. Tom Clarke had the frosting put on the cake when he was given the Swede Nelson Sportsmanship Award at the annual Gridiron Club dinner.

"I have never had a finer leader," said Coach Bob Blackman in describing his 1965 football captain. "He was singled out for the Nelson Award for one incident in our final game with Princeton.

"But I must say his deeds were sportsmanlike all the way through his college career. Tom broke his leg in the Yale game in 1964. When he came back to school last fall, he told me that he thought he might not have the same speed and agility he had a year earlier when he was an offensive end.

"Here was a boy who was a fine pro prospect. He was an ideal tight end for the professionals and almost every pro club in the country had made inquiries of me about his potential. He has the size and the weight. He is a great pass catcher.

"He told me that he'd be willing to play defensive football, even defensive left tackle, if I thought it would help the team. He is a boy who thought much more about the team and the other fellows on it than he did himself."

Blackman pointed out that the past football season had to be his finest and it was fitting that it was led by one of Clarke's character.

"We went through our season undefeated. We won the Ivy title. We won the Lambert Trophy. At the end of the regular season, there were four unbeaten teams in the country. Then, on New Year's Day, three of them—Michigan State, Arkansas, and Nebraska—were all beaten in bowl games and that left our team the only unbeaten major team in the country. When you think of the hundreds of teams that play football around the country, this is quite an honor and most befiting for our Capt. Tom Clarke."

There is little doubt about the idealism of Clarke, typifying the man (Nils V. "Swede" Nelson) in whose name the award is given. He has already been accepted at Dartmouth Medical School.

Speaking about the season, Tom related how he felt about the campaign and his fellow players. "No man is tougher than a tough gentleman," the Green leader said, "and we had a bunch of hard nosed gentlemen."

"The Harvard game was pivotal one of the season for us.

"The next week we went to New Haven and there we played the only game I thought we were going to lose. We were down 10 points going into the final period but we came back with two touchdowns to win it in the last period. The Princeton game was the hardest and the sweetest of 'em because we were both unbeaten and there was so much at stake."

[From the Boston Sunday Herald, Jan. 23, 1966]

Nelson Lauds Clarke's Dedication to Football—Gave Up Glory of Offense for Defense Drudgery

(By Jack Sheehan)

As a Dartmouth freshman, Tom Clarke once got lost in his hometown of Ridgewood, N.J. Since then, however, the captain and standout defensive end of the Ivy League champions and Lambert Trophy winners has known exactly where he was going—and he still does.

Last night as Thomas Eliasson Clarke, Dartmouth 1966, humbly accepted the 20th annual Nils V. "Swede" Nelson Sportsmanship Award before a gathering of 600 friends and members of the Gridiron Club of Boston at the Sheraton Plaza, that fact was obvious.

REFUSES GAME BALL

Actually the likable 6–3, 218-pounder could hardly be found at fault for not being able to find the Clarke homestead in Ridgewood. Dick Clarke, father of the Green's 73d football captain, is a telephone company executive and has shuttled his family from one end of the Northeast to the other.

Tom's trip to Ridgewood was his first. He was born in Ellsworth, Maine, played a year of football at Wellesley High and two seasons at Longmeadow before the move to New Jersey. Now the Clarkes are back in Wellesley.

Since that Ridgewood confusion, Tom has hardly been lost. He bounced back from a broken leg in his junior season, two chipped bones in his right hand and a shoulder injury to lead the Indians to a perfect 9–0 season. But it was, as Nelson himself said, Clarke's service, sacrifice and unselfishnees that earned him the award.

The leg fracture wrote finis to a promising career as an offensive end. "It made his dedication to the game clear," observed Swede. "He gave up the glory of offense for the drudgery of defense." Then in the Ivy League championship game against Princeton after reinjuring the leg, he elected to remain sidelined, explaining that his substitute, Bill Brandt was doing the job and should be allowed to continue for the good of the team.

Clarke had volunteered his services at the outset of last season as a defensive tackle when he realized he had lost speed and agility. And, according to Nelson, he led Dartmouth in cheers for the opposition following every game and even refused to accept a game ball, preferring it to go to "a more deserving senior."

TO STUDY MEDICINE

In accepting the award, Clarke said he was honored to accept a trophy named for a man of Swede's stature, a man who has achieved a pinnacle rare among men. "I view myself as a representative of many men who never overlooked sportsmanship while striving to win."

Clarke already has been accepted at Dartmouth's Medical School, and intends to further pursue his medical education at Harvard. His present aim calls for specialization in pediatrics.

"Incidentally," concluded Clarke, turning toward Swede, "both of my grandparents on my mother's side were born in Sweden."

"That explains it a bit," countered Nelson, another guy never at a loss.

Head table guests included John Kelleher, general chairman; Arthur Barr, selection committee chairman; Edward Costello, Boston Herald press representative; Edward Powers, Boston Garden president; Rabbi Zev Nelson, Temple Emeth; Esmond Crowley, Dartmouth Alumni president; Dr. William Ohrenberger, superintendent Boston schools; Mike Holovak, Boston Patriots; Rev. Edson Waterhouse, St. John's Methodist Church, Watertown; Robert Blackman, Dartmouth coach; Tom Clarke; Nils V. Nelson; Joe Zabilski, toastmaster; John Carver, Gridiron Club president; Senator Edward M. Kennedy; Dave Lucey; Dr. Alan Rozycki, 1960 award winner; Richard Clarke; Ernie Roberts, Dartmouth director of sports information; Harry Arlanson, Tufts director of athletics; Rev. Alfred Butler, St. Patrick's Church, Watertown; Joseph Blumsack, award committee; Johnny Pesky, Pittsburgh Pirates coach; John Cavanagh, Gridiron Club treasurer.

Enthusiastic Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, when recently in Taipei, Republic of China, attending the 12th annual Freedom Day rally, it was my honor to hear an outstanding address delivered by the Reverend Dries Van Coillie, of Belgium.

I commend Rev. Van Coillie's address to the Congress and to the people of the United States:

The last time I was in China was May 1954. As an enemy of the people and a mental wreck, I was expelled from China by a Communist Party that deprives people of their freedom except the freedom to be a slave of the party.

Today I am back in China; this time as a freeman and a friend of the people, among free citizens governed by a president and a government which respects human dignity and the fundamental rights of man, never flinching in their efforts to make this country prosperous and bring every happiness to the people.

I just can't find the words to tell you how happy and grateful I am to be with you today.

After losing my freedom for 5 long years, I returned to the West, and I was surprised to see how little this free world appreciates the freedom it still enjoys, how little they are aware of the dangers that threaten their freedom. Talking about communism, people carelessly say: "It won't be that bad, will it?" They are even convinced that reports warning them of slavery in Communist countries are exaggerated.

This makes me think of an interesting experience of mine.

In 1954 the Communist police brought me aboard an English ship that would take me from Tientsin to Hong Kong. I found a small library aboard the ship. You can imagine that after 3 years of reading and hearing nothing but communism—the speeches of Mao Tse-tung, Liy Shao-chi, Chou En-lai—I was very anxious to get something different. In this small library I accidentally came upon a book I had read before: "Darkness at Noon" by Artur Koestler. I had the recollection that this book described life in a Communist prison of the Soviet Union. I was eager to find out if this book really exaggerated. I read the book with a critical mind, comparing every page of it with my own experiences in the Communist prison of Peiping. I came to the conclusion that the book, far from exaggerating, falls way behind the reality I experienced myself.

There are some futurity novels, viewing the world of the future under Communist bondage. For instance, the bestseller "1984," by the English author George Orwell. I read the book and can only tell you that this novel is not a picture of the future, but simply relates the past. What you will find in this book will not happen in 1984, but did happen in Communist China in 1950. Today we are in 1966.

Two groups of people are seriously exposed to the danger of underestimating communism: youth and intellectuals.

It's a typical phenomenon in non-Communist countries to see youth, especially students, and intellectuals act as the outstanding promoters of communism. Once the Communists have taken over, though, it is typical to see the same youth and the same intelligentsia becoming the first enemies of the regime. Why does this happen?

In general, youth and intellectuals are idealistic minded. They possess the quality to be inspired and to put forth their efforts generously and with conviction for anything that looks like a good and noble cause. It is an excellent and positive attitude, a quality which we must admire and encourage. Nonetheless, experiences of young people are limited and intellectuals very often see things in a pure, theoretical way causing them to be bitterly disillusioned later when things go wrong.

Real communism is very different from a communism which is purely theoretical and has been deceivingly represented by tricky propaganda.

Victims of this false propaganda are the openminded visitors spending a few weeks in Communist China. They are fascinated by the warm reception. They are influenced by the same guided tours to the some old factories and people's communes. They have nothing but praise for all they have seen and heard. They have not been able to detect the bitter reality behind the masque of propaganda.

For this very reason I have written a book entitled "Enthusiastic Suicide." In my humble opinion these are the two typical aspects of each Communist country, and especially Communist China.

The outer aspect: Enthusiasm.

The inner aspect: Suicide.

Enthusiasm stands for the parades of hundreds of thousands of people praising the party and strewing flowers at the feet of their leaders.

Enthusiasm is to be found in the speeches, in the assemblies and even at the horrible and painful meetings for brainwashing.

Enthusiasm is to be found on posters and in magazines, showing nothing but healthy looking, beaming, smiling people.

People are enthusiastic on the outside because they have to be. Whoever is not enthusiastic is reactionary; and every reactionary must be punished.

The other aspect is quite different. It is the inner, invisible, but real aspect murder of freedom, murder of personal thought, feelings and actions; murder of personality, individuality—enthusiastic suicide.

Physical torture at one time broke down my whole body. Moral torture ruined me mentally. In prison I had become an enthused robot. I expressed my gratitude to the Communist Party for not granting me any sleep or rest for 21 consecutive days and night. I thanked the party for my handcuffs and fetters. I was grateful to my fellow prisoners for hitting me and spitting upon me. I used to shout, to sing, and to laugh but every moment I could have burst into tears: enthusiastic suicide.

Communist China is a country of fear, of mutual distrust, terror, slavery, and lies.

People have to spy on each other, to impeach, attack, and accuse each other. Parents can find no way to talk to their children. Husbands and wives can't trust each other. There is no friendship. There is only one safe thing to do: To do and say whatever the party wants you to. For this reason people use the official language or else they shut up.

A leftist French author went to Communist China in 1965 so he could write a book to boost the Communist regime. A few months ago he returned and wrote some of his impressions: "I arrived in China with great love and admiration, but I returned a bitter and terrorized man."

A European economist made two trips through Communist China, one in 1957, the other in 1963. He reported had not had a conversation with one single person. Everywhere witnesses showed up, party leaders and Communist agents. Only once he was able to interview one single person for a split second somewhere in one of the big cities of Communist China while visiting the Catholic church. Everyone was using the official language. At the end of his visit the pastor asked him: "Would you be interested to visit the tower?" "I really would," was the answer. As they were climbing the winding stairs, the pastor was just a little ahead and used the occasion to whisper: "Don't believe a word of what I have said downstairs. I am obliged to speak this way."

All people in Communist China must talk that way for they are terrorized by the party. What they are thinking deep down inside is entirely different. They want to break away from slavery and are longing for freedom, justice, friendship, and peace.

The tens of millions who were murdered under the Mao regime or who were locked up in prison and concentration camps are living proof of this.

Another proof is the 7 million refugees, among them the recently escaped pilot Li Hsien-ping all facing the greatest dangers to get away from the Red paradise.

This phenomenon has been very wittily called by an author: "Le plebiscite par les pieds."

What about the "Campaign of the Hundred Flowers."

What about the statistics of the Communist government in which the Department of Public Welfare had to admit that in 1961, 7,300 local revolts were booked.

A living proof is today's celebration. Twenty-two thousand so-called enthusiastic volunteers for Korea from Communist China, have come to Formosa freely and spontaneously.

Human nature can't bear lies and despises slavery. People want truth and freedom. Whoever does not respect these laws will perish by them.

Happy are the people who enjoy real democracy, inspired by the "Three Principles of the People" of Dr. Sun, glorious founder of the Republic of China: "government of the people, for the people and by the people," a democracy that shows respect for order. It is the order from the famous encyclical "Pacem in Terris" by Pope John XXIII, an order founded on truth, limited according to justice, impied and integrated by charity and put into practice in freedom.

It is my most earnest wish to see the order restored in a free and united China.

Nixon Chided on Poverty Cost Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party apparently intends to make the Johnson administration's war on poverty one of its prime 1966 congressional election campaign issues.

Recently, the defeated 1960 Republican presidential candidate, Mr. Richard Nixon, made a speech in which he tore into the war on poverty and stated that 70 percent of the Federal war on poverty funds in the Baltimore, Md., program went to its administrators rather than to the poor who need the financial help. The mayor of Baltimore, the Honorable Theodore McKeldin, a former Governor of the State, replied to Mr. Nixon's remarks by pointing out that Mr. Nixon apparently did not understand the basic philosophy underlying the war on poverty.

Mayor McKeldin is a Republican as is Mr. Nixon. It is encouraging to me to see a responsible spokesman of the Grand Old Party rebuke another member of his party who apparently wishes to make political capital from a worthy program designed to help the Nation's poor raise themselves out of the muck of poverty. It is to be hoped that more Republicans of the persuasion of the mayor of Baltimore will speak out against the shrill cries of opponents of the antipoverty program in their midst. I commend the article in the February 2 edition of the Baltimore Sun telling of this action on the part of Mayor McKeldin. He is to be commended for his steadfast dedication to the efforts of the Economic Opportunity Act.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 2, 1966]

NIXON CHIDED ON POVERTY COST SPEECH—MCKELDIN IS "PUZZLED" OVER HIGH ADMINISTRATION ESTIMATE

(By Scott Sullivan)

Mayor McKeldin yesterday chided his fellow Republican, Richard M. Nixon, for criticizing the war on poverty "out of a lack of understanding of the fundamental nature of the program."

The mayor expressed "considerable puzzlement" over remarks delivered by the former Vice President last Saturday, in which he claimed that 70 percent of Federal antipoverty funds in Baltimore went to the program's administrators, and not to the poor.

In newspaper reports of the speech, Mr. Nixon was quoted as saying, "They [the administrators] have been making money out of the poor."

SEES "MISUNDERSTANDING"

In a letter addressed to Mr. Nixon's New York law office, the mayor argued that the reported remarks "indicate a misunderstanding of basic philosophy of the war on poverty."

He pointed out that the antipoverty effort "is neither a welfare program nor a charity, and it does not make financial grants to the poor."

Instead, the mayor continued, "it consists exclusively of services to the poor," such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the early admissions project, the elementary and secondary enrichment and remedial project and the educational work assignment project.

The mayor pointed out that these program consist entirely of services and that the people who perform the services must be paid a salary.

In that sense, he argued, the program is no more vulnerable to criticism than the schools, in which the bulk of expenses go to salaries.

Mr. McKeldin, who has long been a strong supporter of the program, described its chief strength as the fact that it "is not a handout. And," he continued, "I am disturbed to see it criticized because it is not."

Turning to the specific criticisms of Baltimore, Mr. McKeldin quoted figures produced by Parren J. Mitchell, the city's anti-poverty director, which indicate the city has spent only 2.2 percent of its antipoverty funds on general administration.

According to the Community Action Agency's figures, $80,814 out of a total budget of $3,715,968 for the first 6 months of this year has been allocated for general administration.

POINTS TO GOP SUPPORT

The mayor conceded that there are "obviously" other administrative costs outside the central office. Even so, he told Mr. Nixon, "the total does not bear any relationship to the figures you have been using."

Both the national party and the mayor himself have supported President Johnson's antipoverty program, Mr. McKeldin pointed out.

He said they had done so "out of a deep conviction that it is absolutely essential to the well-being of all people, particularly to those who have been luckless enough to date not to have been able to share in the extraordinary material benefits of our society and our way of life."

Hospitalization and Doctor: Medical Care Plans Go Into Effect July 1, 1966—You Must Sign Up Before March 31, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 31, 1966, is a very important date for most all people of our Nation nearing age 65 or over age 65. On March 31, 1966, to be eligible, all over 65 or those nearing 65 must register for medicare. If these people do not register by that date they would not be able to register until October of 1967. Folks over 65 or nearing 65 will lose 15 months of eligibility if they do not register by March 31, 1966.

This matter is so important that I am mailing a question-and-answer bulletin to all the homes in my district. This pamphlet answers the most frequently asked questions about the medicare plan. I strongly urge all the folks to read and study this pamphlet, and then help the elderly folks in every way possible. Some of our elderly folks have not had the advantages of an education as you and I had. These folks need your help. Please help them by explaining this pamphlet and urging them to register. If they have any questions not answered here take them to the nearest social security office listed in this pamphlet.

This medicare plan explained here will be a disappointment to many. It is a disappointment to me. I voted and worked for a better plan. I think it was a mistake to place it under social security. We could have gotten a much better plan if it had not been placed under social security. In the final vote I voted for this plan because it was this plan or nothing. I have been one of the original advocates of good, free medicare for our elderly more than 20 years ago. I introduced one of the original medicare plans many years ago.

Unfortunately, the administration plan was the only one that could get before the Congress. Confronted with this plan or nothing, I had no choice except to vote for the plan explained here. With all its faults and disappointments it is better than nothing, and I urge all of our elderly friends and neighbors to register before March 31, 1966.

There must be and there will be improvements from year to year. Experience with this plan will show us what is wrong and what is inadequate, and we can go on from there to make it a better plan. For one thing, I think medicare should be administered by an agency other than Social Security. Why do I say that? Because as long as medicare is under social security there will be little, if any, increases in social security payments to our elderly. Social security payment increases will be hard to get because the cost of medicare under social security will increase greatly as time goes on. This will stop any plans to increase social security benefits.

Already $3 per month will be deducted for medicare from social security checks. This amount will increase each year. Talk is that $5 will be deducted next year, and so on. I shall continue efforts to get medicare under a separate plan with broader benefits. Why should social security taxes alone be used to pay for medicare. There are many rich who inherited money who pay no social security taxes. There are millions of others who pay no social security taxes. They, too, should help pay for medicare. It is only right that they do so.

If we can get medicare under a plan other than social security, then social security payments can be made in amounts that will suffice the retired to live more comfortably. To deduct social security payments to pay for medicare lessens the benefits of the social security retirement system. This is wrong and I tried to get others to see it—but did not succeed.

But the important thing is that we finally have a medicare program. To me and many others is it not what we hoped for. But it is here and it is better than what we had. Because it is better than what we had, I urge all of our elderly who are eligible to register for it by March 31, 1966.

MEDICARE QUESTION-AND-ANSWER BULLETIN

Question. What is the medicare program?

Answer. It is a program of hospitalization and doctor-medical insurance plans to be operated under the Social Security Administration.

Question. Will only those people covered by social security be eligible for benefits?

Answer. No, all people, age 65 years and over, will qualify for participation in the program.

Question. I thought medicare was to be free. Why must I pay $3 a month?

Answer. Medicare is a two-part program. The first part, providing basic hospital care is free. The second part, providing doctor's services and other medical services, is a voluntary program that will cost $3 a month.

FREE

Question. If I do not want to pay the $3 per month, can I still be covered by the free hospitalization plan?

Answer. Yes, but only if you enroll in the program.

Question. When does the medicare program go into effect?

Answer. Both the hospitalization plan and the voluntary doctor-medical services plan will become effective on July 1, 1966.

Question. What must I do now to enroll for the free hospitalization portion?

Answer. If you now receive social security or railroad retirement, no further action on your part is necessary. Many other people receiving Federal or welfare benefits have received application forms in the mail. If you are not receiving social security or railroad retirement benefits and have not received an application form through the mail, you should immediately contact your nearest Social Security District Office.

Question. Who is eligible to be enrolled in the free hospitalization insurance program?

Answer. (1) All persons age 65 and over, eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits, whether they are actually receiving benefits or if benefits are not being paid them because they are working, and (2) all people who are not insured under social security or railroad retirement who are now 65 or who will reach age 65 before 1968. In a nutshell, anybody over 65 qualifies, regardless of income, even if still working for income.

Question. Who will not be eligible to enroll in the free hospitalization insurance program?

Answer. (1) Federal employees who are covered under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959, or who were covered on February 16, 1965, could have been covered under the program; (2) aliens, except those who have been admitted for permanent residence and have been residents of the United States for 5 consecutive years; and (3) persons who have been convicted of a subversive crime and certain other subversives.

Question. What benefits will be provided by the free hospital insurance?

Answer. 60 days in hospital (you pay $40); 30 days in hospital—you pay $10 a day and social security pays balance; after at least 3 days in hospital, 20 days in skilled nursing home or convalescent section of hospital; 80 additional days in nursing home—you pay $5 a day and social security pays balance.

(NOTE.—Nursing home care is not available until January 1, 1967); drugs furnished by the hospital during hospitalization; up to 100 home visits by nurse or other health worker in the 365 days following release from hospital or nursing home; outpatient diagnostic tests in hospital. You pay first $20 for each 20-day period of diagnostic testing and social security pays 80 percent of the balance.

THREE DOLLARS

Question. If I want to pay the $3 fee, can I be enrolled in the voluntary doctor-medical services plan?

Answer. Yes, but you must enroll before March 31, 1966, if you were 65 years of age or older on January 1, 1966.

Question. I am not yet 65 years old; when can I enroll?

Answer. Any time within three months before your 65th birthday.

Question. I am now 65 years old. If I decide not to enroll in the voluntary doctor-medical services plan, can I enroll in the future?

Answer. Yes, but not until October, November, and December of 1967.

Question. When does the doctor-medical services $3 voluntary plan go into effect?

Answer. July 1, 1966.

Question. What can I do now to enroll?

Answer. If you have not received an enrolling card in the mail, you should immediately contact your nearest Social Security District Office.

Question. I am 65 and married and I have filled out and signed my enrolling card. Does this qualify my wife, who is also 65, under the program?

Answer. No, your wife must also fill out and sign an enrolling card.

Question. How will the Government collect the $3 a month for the doctor-medical insurance plan?

Answer. If you receive social security or railroad retirement benefits, this amount will be automatically deducted from your benefit checks. People who are not receiving such benefits will be notified later by the Government how they are to pay.

Question. Who is eligible to be enrolled in the supplementary voluntary doctor-medical services insurance plan?

Answer. This insurance will be available to all people, age 65 and over (whether or not they are covered by social security or railroad retirement) who are residents of the United States and are either citizens or aliens admitted for permanent residence who have had 5 years of continuous residence. Any person eligible for the free hospital insurance benefit would be eligible. If you are eligible for one plan, you are eligible for both.

Question. What benefits will be provided by the $3 I pay for doctor-medical services insurance plan?

Answer. You must pay first $50 of medical expenses each year, plus 20 percent of everything above the first $50 on the following services:

Doctors' bills for treatment or diagnosis.

Surgeons' fees for operations.

Fees for up to 100 home visits by nurses or physical therapists.

No requirement for prior hospitalization, as under the free insurance.

Tests to diagnose an illness, such as a blood test or an electrocardiogram.

X-ray treatment and other radiation therapy.

Surgical dressings, splints and casts.

Devices, such as an artificial limb or a plastic heart valve.

Rentals of medical equipment, such as an iron lung, a wheelchair or crutches, if prescribed by a doctor.

Shots or other medication for a chronic ailment, such as arthritis or rheumatism, if administered by a physician.

MEDICARE IN GENERAL

Question. What medical bills will not be covered under either part of the medicare program?

Answer. Fees for a routine physical checkup; cost of a routine eye examination for glasses; cost of a hearing aid, eyeglasses, orthopedic shoes; cost of drugs prescribed for home use, such as antibiotic pills, insulin for a diabetic; immunization shots, such as those for smallpox, typhoid, malaria, dental care, unless bone surgery is involved.

Question. Should I cancel commercial hospitalization and health insurance policy that I now hold?

Answer. It is not recommended. Medicare is not effective until July, 1966. Until then, you will need the protection of your present insurance. Most major insurance companies are planning to issue new policies at a lower rate that will supplement or pay for costs and benefits not provided by the medicare programs.

Question. I now qualify for medical assistance under the Kerr-Mills Act in Wisconsin. Why should I pay $3 a month for added medical assistance under the medicare program?

Answer. The Kerr-Mills Act is a Federal law which provides funds to assist the individual 50 States in providing a program of medical assistance. The legislature of each State participating in the Kerr-Mills program has passed an implementing law providing certain medical benefits for the residents of their State. The program varies from State to State, depending upon the provisions of each State law.

In Wisconsin, the Kerr-Mills Act is implemented by the Health Assistance Payments Act of Wisconsin, as passed by the State legislature at the State capitol at Madison, Wis. It is this law that determines who may and who may not receive medical benefits and what benefits may be provided in Wisconsin by the Kerr-Mills Act.

The Kerr-Mills program, under the Wisconsin HAP Act, will obviously now duplicate some of the benefits provided under the medicare program. It can, therefore, be reasonably assumed that some changes will be made in the benefits, provided by the Wisconsin HAP Act under the Kerr-Mills program. Moreover, it is reasonable to assume some changes will be made in regard to the eligibility requirements and this would decide who may and may not qualify for Kerr-Mills benefits in the future in Wisconsin.

At this time, no one can predict what changes will be made by the State legislature at Madison on the Kerr-Mills HAP Act benefits. It is, therefore, advisable to elect the additional voluntary doctor-medical services benefits under medicare at the cost of $3 a month. The choice—and gamble—is yours to make.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISTRICT OFFICES SERVING THE 10TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

SOCIAL SECURITY DISTRICT OFFICE, 1810 BELKNAP STREET, SUPERIOR, WIS., TELEPHONE 394-7852

Serves: Ashland, Bayfield, Burnett, Douglas, Iron, Sawyer and Washburn Counties.

A representative from this office will be at: Ashland, U.S. Employment Service, 220 Sixth Avenue West, between 9 a.m. and noon on March 7, 14, 21, and 28, 1966.

Hurley, county courthouse, between 9 a.m. and noon on March 15.

Mellen, City Hall, 2 p.m. on March 21.

Hayward, National Guard armory, between 9 a.m. and noon on March 8 and 22.

Spooner, city hall, between 9 a.m. and noon on March 9 and 23.

Grantsburg, county courthouse, between 9 a.m. and noon on March 10 and 24.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISTRICT OFFICE, 513 SOUTH BARSTOW STREET, EAU CLAIRE, WIS., TELEPHONE 834-3436

Serves: Barron, Chippewa, Dunn, Eau Claire, Polk, Rusk, and St. Croix counties.

A representative from this office will be at:

Balsam Lake, County Center Building, 10:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. on March 14, 28.

Black River Falls, Courthouse, 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. on March 3, 17.

Hudson, Courthouse, 8:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. on March 9, 23.

Ladysmith, Courthouse, 8:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. on March 9, 23.

New Richmond, First National Bank Building, 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. on March 2.

Rice Lake, City Hall, 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. on March 7, 21.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISTRICT OFFICE, 119 SCOTT STREET, WAUSAU, WIS., TELEPHONE 845-2181

Serves: Oneida, Price and Vilas counties.

A representative from this office will be at:

Eagle River, City Hall, 8:30 a.m. to 12 noon on March 3, 17.

Minocqua, Community Building, 10 a.m. to 12 noon and 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. on March 23.

Park Falls, Post Office, 8:30 a.m. to 12 noon and 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. on March 9.

Phillips, Courthouse, 10 a.m. to 12 noon and 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. on March 8.

Rhinelander, Oneida Labor Temple, 9 a.m. to 12 noon and 1 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. on March 2, 16.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	2500 Virginia Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Tydings, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 113 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), for the rest of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ABERNETHY (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 15 minutes, February 23; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANNA and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. GRIFFIN in five instances.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. BUCHANAN in three instances.

Mr. CARTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. VIVIAN.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. MACKAY.

Mr. BANDSTRA in five instances.

Mr. RYAN in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

[*Omitted from the Record of February 21, 1966*]

2058. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for various agencies for fiscal year 1966 (H. Doc. No. 383); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2059. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of Farm Credit Administration, fiscal year 1965 (H. Doc. No. 384); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

2077. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting the third special report of the Commission, pursuant to section 107, Public Law 87-256 (H. Doc. No. 386); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2078. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed during January 1966, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2079. A letter from the Secretary, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, transmitting the annual audit report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 662, 83d Congress; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

2080. A letter from the Executive Vice President, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ended December 31, 1965, pursuant to section 14(b), Public Law 685, chapter 1036, 86th Congress; to the Committee on Judiciary.

2081. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report of cost ascertainment for the fiscal year 1965, as authorized by 39 U.S.C. 2331; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1294. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 12169. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 12958. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 12959. A bill to provide that the value of annuities and pensions payable under the Civil Service Retirement Act or any other Federal law shall not be taken into account for State inheritance tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 12960. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows who are now ineligible for such a pension; and to increase the rates of pension payable with respect to widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 12961. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax to offset losses of retired pay sustained by certain individuals who retired from the Armed Forces before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 12962. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 12963. A bill to amend section 709(f) of title 32, United States Code, relating to contributions to retirement systems in the case of caretakers and clerks employed by the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 12964. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12965. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12966. A bill to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12967. A bill to amend the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for certain members of the police force of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 12968. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 739. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct certain investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

400. Mr. MOORE presented a memorial of the West Virginia Legislature relating to the importation of glassware from the Republic of Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R 12969. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vivona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 12970. A bill for the relief of Aristide G. Coletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12971. A bill for the relief of Teresina Mancini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12972. A bill for the relief of Adolf L. Vandendorpe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

331. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ralph Boryszewski, Rochester, N.Y., relative to the impeachment of the Honorable Stephen S. Chandler, U.S. district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, which was referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

Appendix

Illinois School Lunch and Special Milk Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the Members attention to a communication received today from the director of the school lunch division of the office of the superintendent of public instruction for the State of Illinois, which points up difficulties which have arisen as a result of the administration's decision to cut back on the amount being expended for the special milk and national school lunch programs.

I had been among those who had earlier questioned the advisability of this determination in the belief that it was poor policy to initiate new programs costing many millions of dollars while curtailing such tried and true programs as the special milk program and the school lunch program. This letter, prepared by those responsible for the administration of these programs in my State, further serves to substantiate our fears and doubts.

Text of the letter follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, SCHOOL LUNCH DIVISION,
Springfield, Ill., February 18, 1966.

Hon. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter received in this office December 29, 1965, which we feel would be of interest to you.

We, of the State of Illinois school lunch and special milk programs, appeal to you as a Representative of the people in our State, to consider what is happening to funds which are appropriated to furnish assistance in serving milk and nutritious lunches to the children in our State as well as all other States of the Union.

It would seem that when money is appropriated by an act of Congress it should be put to the use for which it was intended. We find it very difficult to administer a program which is dedicated to the benefit of all the children of the State, with no discrimination, when funds available are so unpredictable.

In the special milk program the lack of funds necessitated reductions of reimbursement payments by higher percentages each year for the past 3 years. Starting with the month of February 1966, a 10 percent reduction will be made. This large reduction will bring chaos to many school budgets and consternation to school administrators and in turn will reduce the benefits to the children.

In the school lunch program for the past several years, there has not been adequate Federal money allocated to Illinois to pay the 5-cent type A plate subsidy for the complete year. Not receiving the 5-cent reimbursement the last 2 or 3 months of the school year places a burden upon the already overtaxed school lunch program. Many will have to raise the price of the lunch to students or entirely eliminate the school lunch program.

Several schools have already indicated this year that student prices will have to be raised in order to make up for the Federal reimbursement which will not be received. Some have dropped out of the program due to increased cost and diminishing income. Every price raise in the school lunch program causes some students to leave the program simply because they cannot afford the additional charge.

The national school lunch and special milk programs have played an important part in eliminating the effects of poverty by feeding the needy children of the school districts regardless of race, color, or religion.

The National School Lunch Act and the special milk law were passed by the Congress for the benefit of all children. Over the years, the programs have been instrumental in improving the eating habits of all students participating, and we have become a State of "milk drinkers."

According to projected budget figures available, the school lunch program appropriation will be cut from $202 million appropriated in 1965–66 to $183 million for 1966–67, a difference of $19 million. The special milk program is to be cut from $103 to $21 million, a difference of $82 million.

These cuts are unbelievable and unrealistic, considering the amount of money appropriated for "give away" programs for foreign governments. The appropriation was inadequate for Illinois needs last year; what will happen now? Even in the rich farming area of central Illinois, schools would find it difficult, if not impossible, to operate their programs without an adequate subsidy.

If schools continue their programs after discontinuance of subsidies, the "health aspect" will, undoubtedly, be forgotten and snacks served merely as a convenience.

The national school lunch program is established in such an extensive pattern that much could be done to eliminate hunger of schoolchildren in the poverty pockets if adequate special assistance funds were directed to the school lunch program.

We ask for your help in supporting legislation to adequately finance the national school lunch program, the special milk program for children, and the commodity program, all of which are very essential to the health and future of our children.

We will be most happy to furnish information of any kind concerning our efforts in the administration of the programs in the State of Illinois.

Sincerely,

RAY SUDDARTH,
Director, School Lunch Division.

Making the Most of Kentucky's Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, much progress has been made in forestry in Kentucky during the past decade. No one could pass through our great State of Kentucky without being impressed by our forests. They are naturally beautiful. While certain problems, some of them old and familiar, will continue to demand the attention of our forest officials, yet with the progress they have made and the firm base they have established, I feel they can and will move ahead into a new phase.

One of the most pressing jobs seems to be to find ways to utilize our forest resources most effectively. At the recent Third Annual Governors' Conference on Forestry, held in Lexington, Ky., on February 16, 1966, Mr. Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, delivered what I consider a most timely and interesting address on this subject, which I would like to have inserted in the RECORD so that all people interested in forestry and its problems might have an opportunity to read his fine address:

MAKING THE MOST OF KENTUCKY'S FORESTS

(By Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the third annual Governors' Conference on Forestry, Lexington, Ky., February 16, 1966)

I am very pleased to participate in this third annual Governors' Conference on Forestry. These past few years have been especially exciting for everyone interested in the resources and people of your great State. As a forester, and as a friend of Kentucky, I am personally delighted with the outstanding progress in forestry that is taking place here.

This series of Governors' conferences is just one indication of the high-level, well-planned new emphasis on forestry in Kentucky. Governor Breathitt, Commissioner Jack Matlick, State Forester Gene Butcher, members of the State legislature, and all of the others responsible for this energetic leadership are to be congratulated. I am glad that the Forest Service is a participating member of your team.

The progress that your State forestry organization has made in the last 10 years or so is truly outstanding. In 1956 you had only 11 Service foresters; today you have 30 or more. Then your tree nursery output was 6.3 million; now you produce 12 million trees per year.

In 1956 about 6,700 acres were planted on State and private land; last year 16,400 acres were planted.

The average area burned each year is now 70,000 acres less than it was in 1957. An additional 2.5 million acres have been brought under fire protection through the Clarke-McNary cooperative forest fire control program. During the period 1957–64, only 1.2 percent of the protected land was burned over annually—twice as good as the average in the preceding 8-year period—but still not good enough. More recently, Kentucky was one of five States selected for the establishment of a rural fire defense training project. Noteworthy accomplishments have already been reported from the 23-county project.

Ten years ago only 450 woodland owners were assisted through your cooperative forest management program. In 1965 more than 3,000 owners were assisted in management of their woodlands—and the acreage involved had amlost tripled.

Ten years ago Kentucky had a whale of a job to do—not only in rehabilitating a forest that had been long abused, but in protecting a battered resource from further damage. It seems to me that you have turned the corner now. The downward trend has been reversed and your State now has built up one of the Nation's top forestry organizations. It has been a spectacular story of achievement—perhaps unsurpassed by any other State during this period.

Fires and pests and floods—insufficient resource management—these and other old familiar problems will continue to demand your attention. But with the progress you have made, and a firm base established, you have a good chance to move ahead into a new phase. Now one of your most pressing jobs seems to be to find ways to utilize your forest resources most effectively. That's really what this conference is all about.

I am impressed by the forests of your State. They are naturally beautiful. They also have great productive potential. Some of the finest timber ever grown has been logged from the slopes and coves of Kentucky, and much of the land is still capable of producing new hardwood crops of top quality.

The new forest survey data for Kentucky reveal an encouraging picture of timber as a basis for economic growth. Incidentally, the forest survey provides a good example of the close cooperation that exists between the Forest Service and your State agencies. Working together, we have collected a vast amount of reliable resource data. Reports are beginning to flow as the statistics and trends are analyzed. A substantial improvement in the statewide timber situation has occurred since our previous survey was completed in 1949.

About 46 percent of the land area in Kentucky—more than 11.7 million acres—is now classed as commercial forest land. This is a slight net increase from previous figures. However, in the eastern part of the State there is a stronger upward trend—for example, about 5 percent in the southern Cumberland unit and as much as 16 percent in some counties since 1949.

More than 90 percent of the timber producing land is in farmer and miscellaneous private ownership. The public forests and forest industry lands account for only a minor portion of the timber resources. Many thousands of people must become involved in improving resource utilization, marketing, and land management.

The forests still need a lot of improvement. About half of the commercial forest land is in seedlings and saplings or pole timber size trees—below sawlog size. Only 38 percent of the forest area is well stocked with desirable trees. Growing conditions are classed as poor and unfavorable on 6 out of 10 forest acres. Clearly much remains to be done before your resource potential is reached.

Kentucky forests are young—they are still rebounding from the heavy cuts of the past. Half of the timber stands are less than 40 years old. Forty percent of the volume is in trees less than 11 inches in diameter. Yet the volume of growing stock is already about 7.4 billion cubic feet—including 26 billion board feet of sawtimber. As you know, more than 90 percent of this volume is in hardwood species.

The survey shows a favorable balance between growth and cut on an overall basis. The net annual growth in 1963 was estimated to total about 362 million cubic feet. In 1962 the timber cut amounted to about one-third that volume. Thus, the forests are building up toward a more productive level of stocking. We estimate that it would be desirable to increase the 1962 level of cut by about 60 percent. Both growth and quality can be improved by thinning overstocked areas and removing more of the less desirable trees.

One of the most serious problems is the overcutting of high-grade, large sawtimber trees and trees of preferred species. There are fewer of those trees available now than there were in 1949. Reversal of this trend is a key factor in any long-term effort to improve utilization and marketing of timber in Kentucky and throughout Appalachia.

Making the most of Kentucky's forests involves stakes that are far greater than those encompassed by your borders. The progress you make here in the Bluegrass State has great significance throughout Appalachia and indeed wherever second-growth hardwood forests occur. Your approach to these problems and the solutions you hammer out will be of deep interest to many, many people.

An expanded wood industry will be possible only if increasing competition from nonwood materials is successfully met. This means, among other things, that production costs must be lowered and marketing effectiveness improved. Unless more wood products can be sold, your timber resources will continue to be underutilized—it is as simple as that.

I would like to tell you about some of the work that we in the Forest Service are doing to help find those solutions.

Our research scientists are concentrating their efforts on many items of direct concern to you. For one thing, they are analyzing trends in the use of hardwoods and competing materials. Specific knowledge of where wood products—those used in construction, manufacturing, and shipping, for example—are gaining or losing markets, is obviously a basic need.

Related studies are aimed at determining who makes the choice between wood or other materials and why. The architect, the builder, the homeowner, the writer of the building codes, and others are involved. Their choice is influenced by relative costs, esthetic values, durability, availability, and so forth. This happens whether it is kitchen cabinets, window frames, or the flooring in a huge apartment building that is involved. We need to know more about how this decisionmaking process actually works.

Exploring avenues of possible cost reduction along the way between the stump and the final product is a huge area of our research. If you ever had a lemonade stand when you were a child you know how vital it is to beat the competitor's prices. Unless you can produce what you want to sell at a price that will attract buyers you might as well close up shop. Wood-using industries are in a real price-cost squeeze and our scientists are working overtime to help ease the pinch. This involves developing improved harvesting techniques—including bucking logs for improved grade yield; more efficient processing equipment; better shipping and marketing methods; and a variety of related studies.

Development of new or improved wood products and markets is another very important area of research. You know the story about building a better mousetrap—our scientists at the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison and elsewhere have done this on a tremendous scale. In addition, they have opened up whole new horizons. The greatly expanded use of hardwoood species for pulp is one outstanding example.

Another research activity of special significance throughout Appalachia involves feasibility studies—that is, studies which evaluate opportunities for timberbased industrial expansion in specific locations. This work entails analyses of prospective markets; review of supplies of timber, labor, capital, power, transportation etc.; and an evaluation of costs, returns and other pertinent factors. They are a basic first step toward more effective use of timber resources.

The list of our research projects in this broad field of utilization and marketing is a long one. Perhaps two examples may help to illustrate what I am talking about. One study is aimed at developing a low-cost, low-profile wood floor system—a type of construction that can compete with slab-on-the-ground design. This could be quite significant because, on the average, a wood frame house contains 4,400 more board feet of lumber and 800 more square feet of plywood than is the case when a house is built on a concrete slab. This can add up to a lot of timber.

In another project, we are working with industry and government leaders to develop ways and means of utilizing wood in a massive slum rehabilitation project in New York City. If competition with other materials is successful, this could mean orders for 580 million square feet of flooring among other items. And that project only scratches the surface in meeting urban renewal needs of this type throughout the country.

Similar work includes studies relating to lumber, furniture, flooring, pallets, veneer, plywood, pulp—indeed every major forest product that can be produced and marketed in Kentucky.

Our overall forestry research program includes many other areas of vital concern to Kentucky people, in addition to utilization and marketing. Scores of these projects can help you make the most of Kentucky's forests. Stripmine restoration is one of the dozens of examples that come to mind.

But our Forest Service responsibility does not end when results of a utilization or marketing research project are published. We need to make sure that the people who need this information and can use it are kept informed. In the past we have expected our research staff to do the whole job in putting these research findings to work.

We have now divided this responsibility. We expect research scientists to continue to assist in providing technical assistance and advice on especially difficult, nonroutine problems which occur in their area of responsibility. But we have recently assigned the primary task of keeping industry informed to our State and private forestry specialists. This change was necessary because of increasingly heavy demands on Forest Service scientists to do more research, and because of the pressing need to provide more technical help in applying research information.

The new approach involves a gradual phasing out of the research group in providing direct technical assistance to wood processing plants. Now, utilization and marketing personnel engaged in cooperative forestry work will give direct day-to-day service to loggers and wood processors.

The Forest Service and the State foresters will work together to do the job. Utilization and marketing personnel, both State and Federal, will use all suitable media to keep industry people informed about research findings. These men will cooperate closely with other agencies in this effort. In addition, they will supply scientists with feedback information to help identify problems and needs which require additional study.

The Forest Service is now preparing a training plan for utilization and marketing personnel. This plan will outline the type of skills needed by Forest Service specialists and by the State service forester working in this field. We plan to accomplish the initial training as quickly and as effectively as possible. Additional training will be provided for utilization and marketing personnel as needed. Developing a more effective system for assisting wood processors and for disseminating research information has high priority among our cooperative forestry programs.

We will be working closely with State forestry agencies to achieve this new emphasis—just as we are working with the Kentucky Division of Forestry in reforestation, pest control, fire protection, rural areas development, and so forth. Our specialists will work with Chauncey Lohr, for example, to make new information available when and where it is needed within the State.

As loggers and timber processors overcome their technical problems and gain economic strength, new job opportunities are created. And as we use timber more effectively and more completely, the earning potential of the land is increased. Eventually a combination of these factors can help alleviate poverty and raise the standard of living in timber-producing regions of the country. We are enthusiastic about this new emphasis on utilization and marketing—we see it as a program that is concerned with both people and wood.

Bringing timber and people together is part of the answer in making the most of Kentucky's forests. I think that cooperatives or assocations of forest landowners could help to assure supplies of timber for industry. They could improve timber markets for landowners, and make possible more efficient wood processing operations. Ready cash and prices that reflect log quality would provide new incentives to the landowner; a source of graded logs would attract the veneer or sawmill man; the pulpwood buyer could tap new supplies of timber; specialty mills would find additional supplies of certain species and sizes made available to them. All of these add up to greater incentives for improved forestry practices.

Much of what I have talked about this morning is closely related to the Appalachia program. Our utilization and marketing research program, for example, has been strengthened because of the impetus of the law enacted last March. We are working closely with the Commission in developing the timber development organization concept. Together with other agencies, we are deeply involved in the survey of strip-mined areas. Access road construction on the national forest has been stepped up—and, so the story goes. We are beefing up the full range of our activities in Appalachia to the fullest extent possible.

We are pleased about our progress to date in establishing the Redbird unit of the national forest system. Thanks to the top level leadership and support here in your State, and from your congressional delegation, we have made a good start in acquiring the headwater areas that should be protected and managed as public lands. By the first of July we hope to have a district ranger on the scene—probably working out of Manchester.

Although the theme of your meeting this year is timber oriented, let's not lose sight of the nontimber values and opportunities to be found in the forests of Kentucky. This alone could be the subject of an entire conference.

As I said earlier, your State is naturally a beautiful one. As forests continue to cover up the scars remaining from the darker years of the past, it will become even more beautiful. Flood control, soil stabilization, stripmine restoration and so forth, will pay handsomely, just as your efforts of the last 10 years are paying off now. Tourism, recreation, wildlife, stable watersheds, and other benefits will flow from the multiple uses of managed and protected forests. Timber harvesting is an important part of making the most of Kentucky's forests—but it is only a part.

Thank you for this opportunity to address the opening session of your conference. On behalf of your many friends in the Forest Service I commend you for what you have accomplished already. We wish you every success in the years ahead.

Goldberg Impressive as Person and Ambassador, Says Max Freedman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article by Max Freedman in the Chicago Daily News of February 19, 1966:

GOLDBERG IS IMPRESSIVE AS PERSON AND AMBASSADOR

(By Max Freedman)

UNITED NATIONS.—The first thing one notices about Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, with a sense of pleasure, is that he still likes to be called "Mr. Justice." He does not think of his 3 years on the Supreme Court as a mere interlude in his life. He speaks of the Court with admiration and of all his former colleagues with affection.

During his brief service on the Court he wrote 100 opinions. He is generally regarded as an exponent of a judicial philosophy with which Justice John M. Harlan, for example, is in conspicuous disagreement. Yet a careful student will find that in a wide range of cases Harlan and Goldberg were on the same side, or else their differences were within a larger framework of general agreement.

This led to a discussion of the strange but persistent myths about the Supreme Court that take root in the public mind and then can never be dislodged. He took it for granted that no man appointed to the Supreme Court in our time would ever think that he had to carry out the President's wishes in deciding a case. He said quite simply, as if he were announcing an inevitable fact that should surprise no one, that he had handed down several important decisions of which both President Kennedy and President Johnson had disapproved. Yet his personal relations with the two Presidents had never suffered the slightest impairment.

He thought we had forever passed the stage in our history when any President would put a man on the Supreme Court in the expectation that he would be a creature and agent of the presidential will. He believed that public respect for Federal judges rests on their independence and impartiality even more than on their learning and power.

By a rather abrupt transition, Goldberg then said that he had agreed to speak at the memorial service for Mike Quill, the labor leader who had dominated New York's transit strike. He knew this decision would surprise some people and irritate others. But he had been Quill's friend for many years. In the past he had worked with him and for him in labor negotiations.

He knew how Ireland's tragedies and ideals had given Quill his passion for social justice and for eccentric controversy. Without approving of everything Quill had said or done, he would be ashamed of himself for shrinking from a friend's part at the memorial service merely because Quill had become a very controversial figure.

Nothing can be more futile or more offensive than to attempt a comparison between Goldberg and Adlai Stevenson. The two men were friends, they worked together in support of many causes in Chicago, they were colleagues in the Kennedy administration and they shared the same devotion to the United Nations as an indispensable guardian of peace, despite its faults and imperfections.

For our present purposes only one of these differences is really important and the advantage is entirely with Goldberg. He has established better working relations with the White House and the State Department, has come much closer to the substance of power in Washington, than Stevenson did.

The results can be seen in Goldberg's great personal prestige throughout the United Nations and the sense of power that he invariably conveys. Goldberg does not pretend that every one of his speeches and statements has been beyond criticism but he does think it is only fair to judge him on his entire record in a period of almost unexampled difficulties.

Wyoming TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in my experience on Capitol Hill—as a Senate employee for Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney years ago, and now as an incumbent Congressman, no item has ever brought such an abundance of mail to an office as I have seen in these last few weeks generated by the promulgation of rules for cable antenna television companies by the Federal Communications Commission.

This has not only caused a restudy of rules governing the use of the airwaves which belong to all, but it has also afforded a study of the future of television, particularly as it affects the lives of people in a thinly populated State of great land mass area such as Wyoming.

Wyoming has often been described as a "land of high altitudes and low multitudes." Problems of statewide cultural integrity, of keeping the large television stations from Montana, Utah, and Colorado from economically fracturing our Wyoming people has always been an acute problem to the public servants of the State.

This has also affected the education potential of TV to Wyoming homes. I noticed that in the February 1966 issue of Diplomat, Mr. Pete Benchley wrote what I believe to be a great article. It is entitled "The Television Nobody Watches," and in my opinion it is the first thorough analysis posing a possibility of a major oasis in the vast wasteland TV brings in our home. As reading and writing suffer, as the classics go neglected, as each new generation relives the mish-mash of horrible movies of old, I think it is well that all of us reexamine the future of television in America.

I have taken this opportunity to ask that this article be printed in full as a part of my remarks on this subject. I am sure that every Wyoming citizen who has written to me regarding his television selectivity and service certainly has high regard for the education of his children. He may well find much to be of interest to him in this fascinating article which follows:

THE TELEVISION NOBODY WATCHES

(By Peter Benchley)

Look at your television set. If it's a portable of recent manufacture, there's a ridiculous-looking circle of wire sticking up to the right of the rabbit ears. You have probably bumped into it, and possibly cracked it off, sometime in the past year. If your set isn't a portable, you'll still see what seems to be a superfluous dial with strange numbers like 37 and 68 above the channel selector. If perchance you have turned it, you noticed that it feels sticky to move—not like the sharp click of the lower knob. What these extra appurtenances represent is not simply a new way to rid the screen of ghosts. It goes by a three-letter title: UHF.

Technically, UHF is a broadcasting range, the ultra-high-frequency band between 300 megacycles and 3,000. More practically, though, UHF represents the opening of a whole new area of growth in television. It means that there will be slots on the dial for some 2,500 new television stations across the country; that broadcasters will have opportunities for almost unlimited expansion in cultural and public affairs programing; and, most important, that America's 60 million television families will have an alternative to "Petticoat Junction" and "Shindig." But careless optimism is premature. For the time being, partly because of FCC decisions made more than 10 years ago, UHF is the television nobody watches.

Before World War II, experimentation in television began in the VHF range (30 megacycles to 300) for the simple reason that transmitters of the period couldn't handle the higher frequencies. The VHF band was and is hemmed in on both sides by military frequencies, so it would have been logical after the war to develop UHF equipment. But while broadcasters and engineers alike realized that TV had no room to expand in VHF, the FCC was harassed by eager set manufacturers and decided to begin commercial operations in VHF. UHF was relegated to experimental status.

In 1952, the FCC decided to issue UHF and VHF permits indiscriminately, which was like asking Mr. Peepers into the ring with Joe Louis. VHF was established and supported by three major networks. Practically nobody had sets equipped to receive the UHF signal. More than 100 UHF stations took the plunge and drowned.

Finally, in 1962, at the urging of President Kennedy, Congress passed a law declaring that all television sets made must receive UHF. The FCC set the final date for the turnover at April 30, 1964. For the first time, viewers would be able to receive not only channels 2 to 13, but 70 new positions up to channel 83. Everyone who had ever seen "Captain Video" grabbed for a UHF station—from a coal millionaire in Atlanta to the Boston Catholic Television Center—hoping for a cut of what had developed into a $1 billion-a-year business. All the FCC demanded of applicants for licenses was that they prove themselves financially able to operate a station for 1 year despite losses.

Of the 689 TV stations on the air last November, 546 were VHF, 143 were UHF. But 138 UHF application were pending before the FCC, while only 32 potential VHF operators were applying. By the time all TV sets are capable of receiving the UHF signal (somewhere around 1970), the FCC estimates that 300 UHF stations will be operating at a profit.

Whether net profit will mean new programing is a different matter. At the moment, UHF stations program mostly for minority viewers, ethnic as well as aesthetic, on the grounds that they can't compete with network programs and must supply "what the networks can't or won't provide."

Basically, UHF programs fall into three categories: educational, ethnic, and commercial. "Educational" is usually a synonym for nonprofit, which means that the programs are cheaply produced and of value only to the eclectic viewer who is interested in "Parlons Français" and an occasional police training program. WYNC, New York's municipally owned station, has rebroadcast the superb BBC series, "The Age of Kings," but its schedule is larded with "Teenage Book Talk," "Investors' Roundtable," and "Industry on Parade."

Strangely enough, ethnic programs are one of the few big moneymakers in UHF. Operating on the theory that the Mexican and Puerto Rican communities from New York to Atlanta to San Antonio to Los Angeles are still unsettled enough to respond to an "old country" approach, stations have programed shows directed entirely at the Spanish-speaking community. WNJU in New York, which is largely a Spanish-language station, broadcasts an hour of folk singing with Pete Seeger every Saturday night and follows it with bullfights from Mexico. KMEX in Los Angeles attracts more than 75 percent of the 1.5 million Spanish-speaking residents of the city with its bullfights and novellas, which translates into soap operas, and which go on for 100 or so episodes. "La Mentira" ("The Lie") was very big recently.

In San Antonio, KWEX–TV has attracted more national advertisers than any of the English-language stations in the area by programing entirely toward the Mexican immigrants. Novellas, bullfights, wrestling, and soccer are bought from Telesistema of Mexico and broadcast over KWEX. Commercials are translated into Spanish, which causes some confusion, especially with well-known slogans. "Winston tastes good, like a cigarette should," for instance, translates into "Smoke one, smoke a hundred, Winston tastes good." And Salem doesn't refresh your taste, it "refresca su sabor." Some ethnically oriented stations can draw over $1 million a year in ad revenue, which more than supports an overhead of $300,000.

Commercial stations are the high rollers with the bad return. Few UHF stations have network affiliations, so they are unable to program the most popular shows. Therefore, they have to rely on buying network reruns or producing their own shows. A station like WNJU can only get away with charging advertisers $800 an hour, as opposed to $7,500 on a VHF independent station, and thus can hardly afford the $150,000 necessary for an hour spectacular. The result is that most commercial UHF stations have picked out one area uncovered by the networks and deluged the public with it. WKBD in Detroit, for instance, chose sports, and for the first few months of its operation showed sports five nights a week—professional hockey and basketball, college events, films of roller derbies, karate matches, and auto racing. It now tries to balance its schedule with placebos like Soupy Sales, Lloyd Thaxton, and Superman, but still plans to show 150 major sports events in the first 3 months of 1966.

One encouraging sign, a sign that money plus ambition can produce worthwhile UHF television, came with the opening of Chicago's WFLD on January 4. The station is owned by the gargantuan Field Enterprises, Inc., and began with an initial investment of $3 million. An imaginative former ABC vice president named Sterling C. Quinlan is running WFLD, and he shows promise of being the first to drag UHF up to proving its potential.

Quinlan may well be the first to reinstate the so-called golden age of live television. He negotiated a contract with AFTRA, the performers' union, whereby actors can appear for less than scale in return for which they will get increased fees depending on the success of the shows. Every evening he wants to show an amorphous 90 minutes called "The Special Show." One day the show may be a rerun of "Profiles In Courage." The next, it may be one of several early Chaplin films he has purchased. The next may be a gaggle of folk singers hosted by anyone from Newton Minow to Bob Dylan. And the next may be—oh rarest of commodities—a live television play.

UHF has a long way to go. Its product so far has been cheap, its appeal local, its imagination sporadic. And the public has responded in kind. Most UHF stations have so few viewers that rating services can't even determine the size of their audiences. But the future of this new band can be as bright as if it were a whole new medium. Each community could have its own local station. Local theater groups could experiment with new plays before two kinds of live audience—at home and in the studio. Performers would have a real off-Broadway in television, an arena in which to try new tricks without the live-or-die tension of "The Ed Sullivan Show."

The idea that UHF is good only for teaching in classrooms and broadcasting open-heart operations to medical students will disappear, just as it did with FM, which was first thought of as an esoteric frequency for deafening dogs. If enough money, drive, and imagination can be poured into the medium, UHF stands a good chance of being the first major oasis in the vast wasteland.

Citizens Support Mandatory Retirement Age for Federal Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Gallup poll recently reported that 76 percent of those American citizens polled on the question of a mandatory retirement for Federal judges thought this would be a good idea.

In the last several Congresses I have introduced a constitutional amendment which would require retirement for U.S. Supreme Court Justices and other Federal judges to retire at age 70. This resolution is now pending in the House Judiciary Committee.

It is vital for this Nation to have men of the very greatest physical and mental ability sit on our benches in the Federal courts of the United States. Under present conditions this is not always the case, and I am hopeful early action on my proposed amendment, House Joint Resolution 34, will take place. I include articles from the Jacksonville Journal, Jacksonville, Fla., on this needed change in our Government:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, Feb. 15, 1966]

A NEEDED CHANGE

Regardless of how much importance most people outwardly attach to the results of opinion polls, most of them are still interested in their findings and certainly this is true of most elected officials.

President Johnson reportedly never forgets a published opinion poll. He assumes probably that this is one way, even if not all conclusive, of holding the pulse of a nation and finding out a bit of how they feel toward various subjects.

One national poll reported the other day in the journal that a vast majority of citizens asked favored the retirement of all Supreme Court Justices and other Federal judges at the age of 72. As a matter of fact, the ratio was 76 percent as opposed to 17 percent.

The advocation of mandatory retirement for Supreme Court Justices is not exactly new, but despite previous urgings no effort has been made in Congress as far as we know to start the ball rolling for a constitutional amendment.

There is more at stake here than the mere philosophy that a man after 70 should move over and make room for a younger and more energetic replacement.

In government, and certainly in the courts, a man after 70 is usually quite capable of rendering superior service and judgment. It depends upon the individual.

In Federal positions, however, notably the Supreme Court, the acquisitions of those high honors are through Presidential appointment and are for life according to the Constitution. This was meant to offset the burden of political pressures and to insure a more thorough and honest approach to all decisions coming before the Supreme Court and the Federal benches.

Former President Dwight Eisenhower points out, though, that whereas life expectancy in this Nation has been lengthened by many years since the Constitution was written in 1787, it is now possible for the same group to function on the Supreme Court Bench unchanged for three or four decades.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt was severely chastised for trying to "pack the Court" in 1937 by pushing for the number of justices to be increased. The theory was that he, as President, could then appoint to those new positions justices who were more in sympathy with his political philosophy and the New Deal. The efforts failed and his critics were appalled that any President would tamper with such a sacred institution as the Supreme Court.

But times change and with those changes new problems arise. Even the Supreme Court is not sacrosanct in the United States. It might be healthy for those who occupy its positions and enjoy its privileges to know that mandatory retirement faces them at a given age.

At least it might be encouraging for the country to know it.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal Feb. 11, 1966]

FAVOR U.S. JUDGES RETIRING AT 72

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N.J.—Former President Dwight Eisenhower's suggestion that all Supreme Court Justices and other Federal judges retire at the age of 72 meets with the approval of 3 out of every 4 Americans.

Eisenhower, in his new book, "Waging Peace," said, "Life expectancy has been lengthened by many years since the Constitution was written in 1787. It could now become possible for the same Supreme Court, because of life tenure for its members, to function as an almost unchanged group for three or four decades.

If then, most of the members of the court were definitely inclined toward a single political philosophy, the court could, by a long series of decisions and orders, gradually but radically change our system—even against the majority convictions of the electorate. Moreover, the dangers of senility cannot be overlooked.

"A simple constitutional amendment would certainly have the effect of bringing fresh blood and fresh thinking to our courts."

To find out how the public reacts to Eisenhower's suggestion, this question was asked in the latest Gallup survey:

"It has been suggested that justices of the Supreme Court and other Federal judges be required to retire at the age of 72. Do you think this is a good idea or a poor idea?"

Here are the results for the Nation:

	Percent
Good idea	76
Poor idea	17
No opinion	7

Little difference is noted on this question by any of the major population groups, such as sex, age, education, and politics.

If such a retirement program were applied to the present members of the U.S. Supreme Court, three members would be removed from active service: Chief Justice Earl Warren, appointed by Eisenhower, and Associate Justice Hugo L. Black and William O. Douglas, both appointees of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Taft Broadcasting Co. Series Wins Major Freedoms Foundation Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the five-part television series, "Rights and Responsibilities," produced and conceived by Mr. Robert T. Schlinkert, vice president and general manager of WBRC–TV, the Taft television station in Birmingham, Ala., is today receiving one of the highest awards in the General Americana category from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., an Encased George Washington Honor Medal for "outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life."

WBRC–TV is also receiving for the fifth time, a regional award from the Freedoms Foundation for its annual Fourth of July celebration television broadcast, a patriotic program broadcast each Independence Day. This presentation is to be made at a later date to WBRC–TV.

Mr. Schlinkert, WBRC–TV in Birmingham, and the Taft Broadcasting Co., are to be congratulated for their outstanding presentation and achievement, and I take great pride in presenting to the Members of the House the following review of the Freedoms Foundation award to be made today at Valley Forge.

TAFT BROADCASTING CO. SERIES WINS MAJOR FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD

LOS ANGELES, February 21.—The Taft Broadcasting Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, will receive at the Patriots' Ball tomorrow from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., an Encased George Washington Honor Medal for "outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life."

The encased medal, one of the highest awards in the General Americana category, is being presented for the five part television series, "Rights and Responsibilities," conceived by Robert T. Schlinkert, vice president and general manager of WBRC–TV, the Taft television station in Birmingham, Ala.

The award also cities the contributions of Dr. Billy Graham, Bob Considine, Pat Boone, and Art Linkletter who appeared in the series. The award is the only Freedoms Foundation presentation to be made at the Patriots' Ball in the Beverly Hilton Hotel here.

It will be received by Lawrence H. Rogers, II, president of the Taft firm, and presented by Don Belding, cofounder and chairman of the Freedoms Foundation executive committee.

WBRC–TV is also receiving, for the fifth time, a regional award for its annual Fourth of July celebration television broadcast, a patriotic program aired each Independence Day. This presentation will be made at a later date.

In the "Rights and Responsibilities" series, Dr. Graham discusses "Freedom of Religion"; Mr. Boone, "Background to the First Amendment" and "The Rights of Assembly and Petition"; Mr. Considine covers the communications media in "Freedom of the Press" and Mr. Linkletter addresses himself to "Freedom of Speech."

The five programs are based on the first amendment. In addition to being carried on the Taft stations, "Rights and Responsibilities" was made available at no cost to all radio and television stations in the country, both commercial and educational as well as civic, educational, religious and patriotic organizations.

The Freedoms Foundation Awards Jury was composed of 36 persons, one third of them chief justices or associate justices from individual State supreme courts, and national heads of patriotic, veterans, and service organizations.

With Mr. Rogers at the presentation here will be Mr. Schlinkert and Roger B. Read, administrative vice president of Taft Broadcasting, and Charles R. Vanda, Beverly Hills, producer of the series.

Messrs. Boone, Considine, and Linkletter are expected to be present. Dr. Graham is unable to attend.

In addition to Birmingham, the Taft Broadcasting stations are located in Cincinnati, Columbus, Ohio; Kansas City, Mo.; Buffalo, N.Y.; Lexington, Ky.; and Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Confrontation With China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, probably many of my colleagues and fellow Americans have already seen Walter Lippmann's column "Confrontation With China" which appeared in the February 15 Washington Post. I believe that his comments on our present Vietnam policy—and the public debate concerning it—are too solid to be digested with a morning's coffee and toast.

I commend these thoughts to your serious reflection.

CONFRONTATION WITH CHINA

(By Walter Lippmann)

The televised hearings, at which General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, have done an inestimable service to our people. For they broke through the official screen and made visible the nature of the war and where our present policy is leading us. On the rule that if you cannot beat them, join them, which in its modern form is that if you cannot debate with them, say you agree with them, the President takes the position that there is not much difference between the Gavin-Kennan thesis and the Rusk-McNamara policy.

There is in fact a radical difference, the difference between a limited and an unlimited war. The President may not want to fight an unlimited war. I have no doubt myself that he does not want to do so. But the promises he made in Honolulu which the Vice President is now broadcasting so lavishly in Saigon and Bangkok, are—if they are to be taken seriously—an unlimited commitment of American soldiers and American money. It is this unlimited commitment which those of us who belong to the Gavin-Kennan school oppose. For we see that as the numbers of our troops and the range of our bombing are escalated, and as the theater of the war becomes widened, it is highly probable, indeed it is well nigh inevitable that the United States will find itself confronting China in a land war on the mainland of Asia.

Last week's hearings made visible that this is where the course we are taking leads. Congress and the people would be frivolous if they did not examine with the utmost seriousness how real, how valid, how significant is the hypothesis that the kind of war the Johnson administration is conducting is leading to a confrontation with China.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, who since 1961 has played a leading part in our military intervention in South Vietnam, has recognized that the prospect of a land war with China is today our greatest worry. In an interview published in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, General Taylor is asked about the danger of "a military confrontation with Communist China." He replies that "one can never rule out the possibility. But I would list the probability quite low in terms of percentage."

This has an ominous resemblance to the colloquy in 1950 between President Truman and General MacArthur. (cf. Lawson, the United States in the Korean War," p. 79.)

"In your opinion," President Truman asked General MacArthur, "is there any chance that the Chinese might enter the war on the side of North Korea?"

MacArthur shook his head. "I'd say there's very little chance of that happening. They have several hundred thousand men north of the Yalu, but they haven't any air force. If they tried to cross the river our Air Force would slaughter them. At the most perhaps 60,000 troops would make it. Our infantry could easily contain them. I expect the actual fighting in North Korea to end by Thanksgiving. We should have our men home, or at least in Japan, by Christmas."

At the very moment that President Truman and General MacArthur were talking there were already more than a hundred thousand Chinese Communist troops in North Korea, and another 200,000 were ready to cross the Yalu. By mid-November at least 300,000 Chinese would be poised to strike—and the ROK, the American, and other U.N. forces would not even be aware of their presence. Before the war was over the Chinese Communist armies in Korea would reach a peak strength of more than a million men.

On the question of the need to contain the military expansion of Red China, there is virtually universal agreement in this country. The containment of Red China today, like the containment of Stalinist Russia after the World War, is necessary to the peace of the world and is a vital interest of the United States. What is debatable is the diplomatic policy we are pursuing in order to contain Red China. If we compare what Mr. Rusk and Mr. William Bundy are doing with the diplomatic policy by which some 15 years ago Stalin was contained, the differences are very striking.

The cardinal difference is that our Chinese containment policy is a unilateral American policy whereas our Stalinist containment policy was shared with and participated in by all the Western allies. It is often said officially that in the Far East today we are repeating what was done so successfully in Europe. If this were what we are doing, there would be an alliance to contain China in which Japan, Russia, India, Pakistan, the United States, Great Britain, and France were alined in a Far Eastern Marshall plan and NATO. Instead, owing to the miscalculations and blundering of the Vietnamese war, we have alienated and indeed neutralized all the great powers of the Asian mainland.

The difference between the two containment policies in Europe and in the Far East is the difference between realism and verbalism, between professionalism and amateurism. Our present policy is as if we had set out to contain Stalinist Russia by ignoring the British, the French, the Italians, and the Germans, and had decided to make our stand against communism by the defense of—let us say—Bucharest.

The Old Market Town: Operation Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. MACKAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, clearly, the function of the U.S. Department of Commerce's Area Redevelopment Administration was to revitalize our rural areas which, for years, have been losing their talented young men and women to the city.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues, an article that was written before the Area Redevelopment Administration was replaced by the Economic Development Administration, an agency with broader powers and authority.

The article, which appeared in the Atlanta Economic Review, November 1965, was written by my constituent, Dr. Philip Weltner, a prominent leader, active in community affairs, and who has had the roles of lawyer, educator, and management consultant.

Dr. Weltner is the father of our esteemed colleague, Congressman CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER.

THE OLD MARKET TOWN: OPERATION COMEBACK

(By Philip Weltner)

"Sweet Auburn, loveliest village of the plain." Methinks Goldsmith penned that line. Since then, how many Auburns have vanished? The old Cotton South had many such, and some still linger uncertainly on.

Strange that an age, bemused as is ours by economics and psychology, neither notes the loss in tangible values incident to the stagnation of our rural market towns nor ponders why so few reverse their decline. For certain, the centers of wealth are totally indifferent to the dollar drain on them caused by the impoverishment of the hinterland. The steady migration from the latter into the cities is by no means all gain. The unskilled and ignorant sector of that migration has done much to create city slums and swelled welfare rolls and has added substantially to costs of tax-supported medical care. Furthermore, a great share of tax contributions to government from wealthier centers is diverted in subsidies to deficit communities in aid of local schools and other public services. And then there is the farmer.

"How long, O Lord." For years his plight has been of National and State concern. Untold millions have been expended in his behalf. Those millions have served ruralia as prop and stay. But the rural market towns of the old Cotton Belt, along with the surrounding countryside, have generally continued to regress. Millions more have gone to support rural and semirural schools, from both State and Federal funds. And yet the majority of high school diplomates and nearly all college graduates hotfoot to "Big Town" as fast as they can. Educational subsidies actually accelerate the flight from home of the brains and brawn the old rural market towns must retain to restore their languishing fortunes.

In 1961 the Federal Government started on a new track. Congress created within the U.S. Department of Commerce the Area Redevelopment Administration for the purpose of pumping new life into our decaying countryside. The hope was to move industry in and expand such industry as was there, stepping up local payrolls and infusing fresh blood into the local economy. Results to date have fallen short of anticipation. Fact is, brave new programs seldom fulfill the optimism of their sponsors. On the credit side, one can say that a three-quarter loaf is better than none. Nevertheless, an inquiry into why the loaf promised was not delivered could be highly instructive.

Quite symptomatic of our age is the fallacy shared in places high and low that "nothing is wrong that money won't cure." So if a billion won't do it, try 10. The money cure overlooks entirely the community as a social organism with a biology and psychology of its own. The rural market towns in the old Cotton Kingdom, barring rare exceptions, have steadily waned, not for lack of more money, but because their people for the last four decades failed to recognize and adjust to change. Instead of looking ahead, their people longed for the good old days to return. Well, they haven't and never will. Federal largess, distributed in whatsoever guise, is impotent to change the economies of such communities. Change, if ever it is to take effect, is first of all an inner process of discovery that a better future can be achieved through personal effort and how this effort can be directed so that once again the community may burgeon forth with opportunity.

But, even though this change of spirit and attitude takes place, too many of these communities by now are bereft of essential skills, in particular entrepreneurship, to create by themselves a new day. Nevertheless, all the essential helps are there in abundance, but alas in disjoined fractions. "East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet." "Water, water everywhere, but not a drop to drink." On the local scene we meet with a complex human organism, the community; and yonder on the State and Federal levels we encounter departments, agencies, bureaus, branches, and sections, administering different programs or different phases of the same programs, many of high importance to the renascence of our shrinking market towns—but, so far as the latter are concerned, no common strategy at State and Federal levels, no plan, no tactics, no coordination, no comprehension of existence of a task that they must share if ever the task is to get done.

The vital need for coordination may more readily be seen by a case in point. The scene is a rural market town, a county seat in the Cotton Belt of yesteryear. Population has steadily declined. Per capita income is among the lowest in its State. The town offers little by way of recreation and less of opportunity to the rising generation. Emigration has drained off the advantaged and more venturesome. Agriculture, once the mainstay of its commerce, now that cotton is a minor crop, follows patterns of land use, logging, cattle, and pasture, which leaves too much land idle and too many country folk grossly underemployed. Merchandising plods along as it did at the turn of the century; local schools administer statewide programs of slight relevance to community needs. Craftsmen and artisans are in short supply. A new home is a rare event. Property values are stagnant. Tax revenues are unequal to forward planning.

Despite these staggering handicaps, the situation, to the close observer, is not as bleak as it sounds. The industries there could rather soon almost double their payrolls; in one case, by aggressive marketing and extra plant capacity; in the other case, by a larger labor pool sufficiently trained. Each is capable of expanding into lines kindred to its present output. The immediate locality has natural resources now left to occasional exploitation by nonresident owners. Fine products, commanding ready markets, could be manufactured from these raw materials and sold, not by the ton but by the ounce, were the skills developed capable of turning out such wares. Farming could escape the doldrums by a new pattern of agriculture geared into the processing and packaging of foods for the gourmet trade.

The locality is rich in history, rich in its antebellum plantation homes, rich in a people honorable, hospitable, cultivated, and kind. Some wealth is there, too—wealth with little faith in the future of the community.

Manifestly a complete about-face could take place. As spirit is already aborning determined to leave past moorings and venture anew on the high seas of fresh endeavor. The community as it might become is coming vividly to view. But many of the skills are lacking for any such dream to mature into reality. The skills could be supplied through manpower training as administered by the U.S. Department of Labor. The U.S. Department of Agriculture is charged with the duty, indeed high privilege, of developing a pattern of agriculture befitting the present era. And so it goes with other departments of Government, State and Federal, each with some service that somewhere fits into the mosaic of this community's regeneration. But "some service" is not enough. There must be a total program, a consortium of agencies working with the community to impart deficit skills, to work out a new, viable pattern of agriculture, spark urban renewal, and bring to the local schools training in practical arts (for the love of heaven, not book ends and taborets). Much else, of course, is needed to complete the mosaic the community must supply for itself, particularly the enterprise to create new products out of raw materials right at hand.

Yes, the old market towns of the cotton kingdom can thrive anew once they face the last of the 20th century. As byproduct of such a transformation, the social problems of our big cities will assume more manageable dimensions. By a single nail driven at the right spot one salient in Big Town's war on poverty can be won. And it is the easiest nail to drive—the resuscitation of the sagging market towns of the old Cotton Belt. That nail, oddly missing now, is teamwork on the part of State and Federal agencies to bring them help suited to their opportunities. Such help would be trifling in cost compared with the values sure to accrue.

Should the Church Sponsor Federal Welfare Programs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, very few persons are fully aware of the extent the Federal Government is involving the churches of America in its housing programs.

This involvement raises serious questions of the traditional state-church relations and may insert our churches in Federal programs as agents of the Government.

Mr. Ross Hermann, the talented and energetic young editorial writer for the Indianapolis News, has explored the role of churches in Federal welfare programs in a detailed manner.

Some of the conclusions reached and questions raised by this new concept have been included in a perceptive column written by Mr. Hermann for his newspaper on February 1, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this article in its entirety for the Members of Congress to examine. The article follows:

SHOULD THE CHURCH SPONSOR FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS?

(By Ross Hermann)

Federal housing programs are bringing about some far-reaching changes in church-state relations.

Complete separation of church and state, supposedly favored by current doctrine in Washington, is in fact giving way to public embrace in which Government and churches cooperate on mutually approved social projects.

The subject came up locally at the Conference on Housing and Urban Development, sponsored last fall by Mayor John Barton and Representative ANDREW JACOBS, when a speaker told conferees that churches and other nonprofit organizations can qualify for Government-insured financing to build housing projects.

Churches, in this approach, are further envisioned as agents of Government policy under the proposed rent-supplement program, administration-backed legislation currently stopped in Congress by a revolt of House Members. The issue is now being pressed by Federal welfare-staters around the Nation.

Sidney Spector, a Federal Housing and Home Finance Administration official, explained the idea to local conferees as follows: "Let us say a church group here in Indianapolis wished to undertake a housing project, as one of its services to the community. It could form a nonprofit mortgagor corporation. It could go to a private lending institution for financing. The loan would be insured by the FHA with the maximum rate of interest I mentioned (5¼ percent) and for the term involved (40 years). And then it can go ahead, assuming all plans work out, and build the housing."

Rents, he said, could be set by Federal law in accordance with the nonprofit cost of operation and the cost of construction. Because the housing would be open to people of varying incomes in an attempt to promote social integration, he noted, some could afford the rent and some couldn't.

Those who could pay the rent, he said, would do so. Poverty-level families, however, would pay a maximum of 25 percent of their income. The difference between that payment and the regular rent would be made up to the church or other sponsoring organization by direct subsidies from the Federal Government.

Some churches are, at present, administrative arms of Government social policy under a program of long-term insured financing to build rental housing for the aged. Church and other nonprofit groups can qualify for Government-insured loans at 5¼ percent interest for 40 years, Spector said.

A prime example of church-state housing is San Francisco's Martin Luther Tower, built by St. Mark's Lutheran Church with Government backing. The 13-story apartment will house people over 62 who can afford rents between $100 and $220 a month. When complete, the tower with its adjoining social and recreational hall will be a self-contained community shepherded by Lutheran churchmen.

Institutions like the Martin Luther Tower are, to date, relatively rare and unobtrusive. As Federal officials travel around the country selling the idea to local congregations, however, a new national debate on church-state relations may be in the making.

Other churches, for example, could charge that the Government has, within the confines of the Martin Luther enclave, established a religion, contrary to constitutional prohibitions.

To back up the point, they could argue the Federal Government has given the favored churches in such programs a captive audience for their viewpoint and has established their dominion over the daily lives of a group of people, to the effective exclusion and disadvantage of other religions.

U.S. Combat Forces Spread Thin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's edition of the New York Times, the noted and widely respected military affairs correspondent for the Times, Hanson W. Baldwin, wrote an article that should cause concern to every Member of the House.

In his article, Mr. Baldwin cited chapter and verse about alleged shortages in experienced manpower, equipment, clothing, and ammunition, stating that "the Nation's armed services have almost exhausted their trained and ready military units, with all available forces spread dangerously thin in Vietnam and elsewhere."

Mr. Speaker, there are some extremely serious charges made in this article which, if true, will shake the confidence of the American people in those leaders in this administration who have been charged with the responsibility of insuring an adequate and prepared Military Establishment. For this reason, it is incumbent upon the administration to publicly answer the very serious charges contained in the Baldwin article

So that all of my colleagues will have an opportunity to read the very penetrating article written by Hanson Baldwin, I include it herewith in the Appendix of the Record:

U.S. COMBAT FORCES SPREAD THIN—READY UNITS AT HOME LARGELY COMMITTED TO VIETNAM WAR—SHORTAGE APPEARS IN ITEMS OF CLOTHING AND AMMUNITION

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Nation's armed services have almost exhausted their trained and ready military units, with all available forces spread dangerously thin in Vietnam and elsewhere.

This is the conclusion of a study of U.S. Regular and Reserves Forces by this correspondent.

Virtually all the combat-ready units in the United States have been committed to Vietnam and, except for a few Army and Marine battalions and a few squadrons of the Tactical Air Command, no more units will be fully trained and equipped for a number of months.

In addition to the shortages in trained military manpower and in field-grade officers, there are major existing shortages in uniforms and clothing, and actual or potential shortages of various types of ammunition and equipment that are causing the services increasing concern.

The commitment of more than 200,000 men to Vietnam, supported by strong air and naval forces, and the maintenance of two divisions in Korea, more than five in Europe and of smaller units elsewhere, including the Dominican Republic, have reduced the forces in the United States to a training establishment.

The experience level of the Atlantic Fleet and of all other commands has been reduced to provide the needs of Vietnam.

According to the services, the "squeeze" appears to be becoming worse instead of better. Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, is understood to have stated a requirement for some 200,000 more men in Vietnam during the 1966 calendar year, and a proportionate increase in air support.

High-level decisions about whether and how to meet these needs are expected shortly. The Joint Chiefs of Staff has recommended the limited mobilization of Reserve Forces ever since last spring, but President Johnson and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara ordered instead increased draft calls and voluntary enlistments to build up the Regular Forces.

In recent weeks, the services have been conducting studies at various command levels to determine how best to meet General Westmoreland's 1966 requirements. The alternatives considered were continuation of the present slow buildup of the Regular Forces by increased draft calls and voluntary enlistments; transfer of troops from Europe, Panama, Alaska, and anywhere else available; or a selected callup of the Nationary Guard and Reserves.

The studies, as far as could be learned, have not yet been completed. But preliminary indications were that the first course—continued dependence upon draft calls and enlistments—could fill only a fraction of General Westmoreland's requirements within the time he desired them and that the result would be what one officer called a very slow and disorderly buildup of the Regular Forces with a greater and greater lowering of the experience level and more and more bottlenecks.

Transfer of troops from Europe and elsewhere would supply a greater proportion of General Westmoreland's stated requirements, but not all of them. Even the mobilization of the Guard and Reserve might not supply all his stated needs, it was said, since various material shortages—as well as shortages in certain types of trained manpower—might develop by the end of the year.

A recently retired officer, whose last active duty assignment was concerned with the Army's mobilization base and Strategic Reserve, said that "whatever the course of action (in Vietnam)—continued, escalated, or modified downward—we are in a situation of perilous insufficiency," without much capability of "a graduated response to any serious challenge."

The actual and potential trained manpower and material shortages are affecting all the regular services—particularly the Army and the Marines—and the Army National Guard and Reserves. One National Guard general said, "there is not a Guard division in the United States today that could fight its way out of a paper bag." There are many reasons for the difficult situation in which the services now find themselves, officers say. Many of the officers in the services have long felt that many of Secretary McNamara's cost-effectiveness formulas were too rigidly applied and did not allow a sufficient cushion of supplies and equipment for emergencies.

Some of the centralized control procedures instituted in the Defense Department have proved to be too inflexible or too slow in response to the needs of the services.

For some years, even before Vietnam became acute, the services were tending to live off inventories, particularly in spare parts and ammunition, and full replacements were not provided.

EQUIPMENT WITHDRAWN

Equipment, particularly radios and automotive equipment, was withdrawn from National Guard and Reserve units to supply Regular Army units and this has not yet been replaced.

As the Vietnamese war became larger and larger the services were required until last year to fit the extraordinary expenses of the war into their regular budgets. The war was unfunded until last spring, and no special appropriation in any way commensurate with the war's expenditures was asked for until last month.

Service requests for reopening production lines of aircraft and other items were rejected or postponed until the emergency became acute. The letting of contracts was thus delayed and replacement of expended material was further delayed as available inventories became dangerously depleted. Officers point out that the administration's defense request for the fiscal year 1967, starting July 1, contains many items that were requested and rejected a year ago.

Other major reasons for today's squeeze are several. Expenditure rates—particularly for certain types of ammunition and ordnance and clothing—have been considerably higher in Vietnam than expected.

The administration's decision to depend upon the Regular services, without calling up the Guard and the Reserves, increased tremendously the strain upon the Regular Army and the Marines.

RESERVES IN PLAN

The Army's concept of mobilization had always been predicated upon the assumption that in case of any war as large as Vietnam the Reserves would be mobilized, and the supporting combat and supply units essential to supply and sustain Regular Army combat units would be furnished by the Reserves.

The concept also envisaged the replacement in the United States of Regular Army units transferred to the theater of war by mobilized Reserve units, thus maintaining the strategic reserve available for use in any emergency.

The Marines also depended upon a fourth (Marine Reserve) division, well trained and equipped, to supplement their three regular divisions, which are already almost fully committed to Vietnam, the western Pacific, the Caribbean, and the Mediterranean, said to training duties.

The Army's problems have been further complicated by the fact that ever since the Korean war, the main thrust of the Army's strategic planning had been based upon the assumption of a mechanized war in the European theater. A major war in an undeveloped country, like Vietnam, with inadequate ports, piers, airfields, roads, and warehouses, required considerably more specialized units, such as engineer construction battalions, terminal service companies, port construction companies, and, for the Navy, Seabee battalions, than were included in the peacetime force totals of the regular services.

CADRES TRANSFERRED

Without mobilization of the Reserves some of these specialized units had to be created from scratch, and the trained cadres for them had to be transferred from other units.

Thus, the policy now in effect, of gradually building up the strength of the regular forces by increased draft calls and voluntary enlistments, has resulted in very considerable reduction in overall experience levels and in constant squeezes, or as one officer put it, in "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

The trained manpower situation in the services today is as follows:

REGULAR ARMY

The last of the Army's trained major units—the 25th Division in Hawaii—has just sent two of its brigades to Vietnam; the third is expected there shortly. No other major units in this country are immediately ready for service, although part of the 4th Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Wash., is expected to be trained shortly. About a third of the 101st Airborne Division (Fort Campbell, Ky.) and a third of the 82d Airborne Division (Fort Bragg, N.C.) are in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, respectively.

The two other brigades of both divisions, which have been used to provide replacements for Vietnam and cadres for new units, will be filled up to strength soon, but except for a few battalions they cannot complete unit training for some weeks.

They could, however, be sent overseas—as was the 1st Cavalry Division (airmobile)—without completion of unit training. The 5th Infantry Division (mechanized) (Fort Carson, Colo.), like other Army units, has been attempting to ease the heavy burden on the Army's crowded replacement training centers by training its own recruits; it cannot be ready for some months.

TRAINING DIVISIONS

The two armored divisions at Fort Hood, Tex.—the 1st and 2d—are acting, in effect, as training divisions, they have almost completed the training of one cycle of recruits who will be used to fill out new units or as Vietnam replacements and will start on a new cycle shortly. The 3d Armored Corps staff at Fort Hood was transferred bodily to Vietnam last year, and now a new corps staff, re-formed and trained, has also been transferred there. The Army's new division, the 9th Infantry, at Fort Riley, Kans., and one of the three new brigades authorized last year, the 196th at Fort Devens, Mass., have just been activated and will not be ready for many months. Smaller combat and support units are being filled up with new manpower and trained as rapidly as possible.

In Europe, the combat strength of the 7th Army has been approximately maintained in numbers, but the experience level has dropped as specialists and individuals have been transferred to Vietnam. Supply and support units are at their lowest strength since before the Berlin crisis of 1961.

The dimensions of the Army's problem are illustrated by the fact that the Army took in almost 100,000 drafted men in November, December, and January, and 46,533 volunteers.

The training load for training centers, schools, etc., has climbed from 135,000 men in the month of January 1965 to 240,000 men in January 1966.

Scarcities in trained noncoms and in certain officer grades are becoming acute.

Officer candidate school graduates will climb from 2,319 in the fiscal year 1965 to 4,091 in fiscal 1966, and to about 11,000 in the next fiscal year, starting July 1.

In addition, Reserve Officer Training Corps graduates will provide almost 11,000 officers annually. However, these are all inexperienced second lieutenants; there is no immediate prospect of eliminating the shortages in major and lieutenant colonel ranks unless the Army is authorized to call up individual reservists.

The Army's manpower problem will become more acute late this spring and summer, as the 1-year tour of duty of troops sent to Vietnam last year expires and thousands of troops must be replaced by trained men from this country.

MARINES

The marines have been authorized another regular division, in addition to the three now in existence. The 3d Marine Division, and most of the 1st Division are now in Vietnam, and the 2d Division at Camp Lejeune, N.C., is responsible for maintaining one battalion afloat with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean and another in the Caribbean. The need for replacements for the marines in Vietnam and for training cadres for the increased training load will delay the activation of the new regular marine division until late spring or early summer, and it cannot be ready for many months thereafter.

NAVY

The Atlantic Fleet is about up to strength in numbers of men, but the experience level has been greatly reduced by the transfer of 5,000 trained men and specialists to the Pacific. Ships in the Mediterranean and Caribbean are kept as close as possible to full complement; the remainder of the ships in the Atlantic are, to a large extent, in a continuous training cycle. One antisubmarine warfare carrier, minecraft, and other ships have been in reduced commission or reduced complement.

Eight destroyers are periodically rotated to the Pacific from the Atlantic Fleet and some service ships have been transferred there. The Navy has relieved some of its worst personnel problems by extending enlistments for 4 months, but this authorization ends June 30.

AIR FORCE

The Tactical Air Command and Military Air Command are particularly affected. For a time, the Air Force rotated squadrons for temporary duty to Vietnam, but this system has been replaced by assigning pilots to 1 year's tour of duty in South Vietnam or, if flying over North Vietnam, to 100 missions.

Squadrons that have been rotated to southeast Asia from the Tactical Air Command in this country have now returned to the United States, or other home stations, leaving their equipment behind at the bases from which they operated.

The F-105 fighter-bomber, being used by the Air Force against North Vietnam, is not in production; losses are being replaced by transferring F-105's from Europe, and these in turn are being replaced by McDonnell F-4's. But there is delay in the process and some of the returning squadrons find themselves temporarily without planes.

Some of the few Tactical Air Command squadrons remaining in the United States have been charged with a refresher training mission, in addition to attempts to maintain combat readiness.

Pilots of B-47 medium bombers, phased out of the Strategic Air Command, are being trained in the F-105 as replacements for Vietnam. The Military Air Command, which has long been strained with the airlift to Veitnam, has been utilizing to an increasing degree planes and pilots of the Air National Guard on weekend flights or on missions of a few days duration.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

The Air National Guard, the Naval Air Reserve, and some units of the Naval Reserve are in relatively good condition, though few of them have really modern equipment. But the condition of readiness of the Army National Guard and of many units of the Army Reserve is lower than it has been in the past decade, according to many officers. Repeated withdrawal of equipment; the attempted merger by Secretary of Defense McNamara last year of the Reserves into the National Guard, a move opposed by Congress and still in abeyance; the inactivation of six Reserve divisions and the projected elimination of other Guard and Reserve units; the confusion resulting from the constant changes and reorganizations in the Reserve structure, and the saturation of the Army's replacement training centers with Regular Army inductees have all contributed to the low state of readiness.

Today, there are about 90,000 recruits of the National Guard and the Reserve waiting for 6-month training by the Army; some estimates are that this total will increase to 120,000 by the end of June.

When Mr. McNamara deactivated the 6 Reserve combat divisions last year, he announced the creation of a Select Reserve Force of about 150,000 men, composed of 8 National Guard divisions, each composed of units drawn from 3 different States, 6 independent brigades and hundreds of smaller combat and support units from the Guard and from the Reserves drawn from all 50 States.

This new high-priority force was to be built up to 100 percent strength and trained and equipped by this coming summer. The Pentagon hoped that about 15 percent or more of the 55,000 reservists in the 6 disestablished tactical divisions of the Reserve would voluntarily join the Guard.

But informed officials said last week that less than 350 reservists had actually joined the Guard and that out of the 55,000 some 3,600 had been assigned to Reserve units in the select force.

Nevertheless, by virtue of its priority the Select Reserve Force is almost up to strength numerically, though several thousand of its men have not yet completed 6 months' training. The force is supposed to have completed all basic training and unit training through battalion level by the end of June, but opinions differ about whether or not it will be able to do so. Some Guard officers say it will maintain its training schedule; others say that shortage of equipment and delay in training 6-month inductees will make it impossible.

New York State has only 1,600 National Guardsmen, plus reservists, assigned to the Select Reserve Force. Maj. Gen. A. C. O'Hara, chief of staff to Governor Rockefeller, said recently that "there is no Select Reserve Force unit in New York State at the moment prepared for intensive training."

Twenty other National Guard divisions, and other Guard and Reserve units, not included in the Select Reserve Force, are the "low men on the totem pole" in the military structure, and are many months away from readiness for deployment.

ARMS, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT

There are worldwide scarcities or shortages of many items. In Vietnam all the services have experienced temporary shortage or scarcities of many items, some of them due to the local shipping tie-up and logistical difficulties. These have not materially interferred, however, with combat operations.

Clothing: Shortages of winter and summer uniforms, overcoats, raincoats, fatigues, jungle boots, underwear, socks and other items are widely reported. The Army has reduced considerably the normal amount of clothing initially issued to recruits, and the Marines expect to issue only "half a bag" soon unless the shortages are relieved.

Some National Guard recruits have been temporarily drilling in civilian clothes until furnished with a suit of fatigues taken from the clothing allowance of other guardsmen. In some cases substitute items have been issued for standard ones.

The Defense Supply Agency, a centralized agency under the Secretary of Defense, which is responsible for procuring common-use end items for the services, said, through a spokesman, that there was a worldwide shortage of uniforms and clothing but that the United States had enough on hand and on order to meet its needs that all troops were "well clothed" and there had been no interference with training.

The Agency said it had initiated accelerated uniform and clothing orders last June, and that uniform and clothing contracts had increased from $55 million in the last quarter of the 1965 fiscal year to $200 million in the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

Officers pointed out, however, that increased clothing orders were not placed until after the start of the Vietnamese buildup and that inventories on hand were inadequate to supply needs until the contracts had been fulfilled.

Ammunition: Many different items of ground, air, and naval ordnance are in short supply. Reports that rifle ammunition shortages had interfered with the training of recruits are denied by the Army, but a spokesman said that at a few camps there had been temporary shortages, due apparently to maldistribution, which did not delay training more than 2 or 3 days.

Some units of the Air National Guard have reported shortages of certain types of bombs and other aircraft ordnance needed for training.

In Vietnam there has been no ammunition rationing as such, but many different items, including 5.56-millimeter ammunition for the M-16 rifle, 2.75-inch rockets, illuminating shells and 750-pound bombs have been issued on an "as available" basis, which means these items are not always available without limitation.

In part, these and other scarcities in Vietnam are due to Vietnam's inadequate port capacity and local supply problems. Worldwide, there has been a major reduction in ammunition stockpiles, not yet compensated for by new production.

Spare parts: Spare parts of every type for aircraft, helicopters, communication and electronic equipment, engineering equipment and motor transport are in short supply everywhere; it is not uncommon for a Navy destroyer to wait for months for spares for missiles, or generators.

The Military Air Command, which had stocked spare parts adequate to sustain a peacetime tempo of operations, is finding it difficult to keep its planes flying on the accelerated basis of the past year.

Arms and weapons: Except for some of the newest items the Army denies that it has any major weapons shortages. However, some of its weapons are old and the National Guard has severe shortages. In New York State, according to an assessment by General O'Hara, Guard units, even in the Select Reserve Force, are "still utilizing the M-1 rifle and have never been issued any quantity of M-14 or M-16 rifles."

"We do have," he said, "a few M-60 machineguns." Old quarter-ton trucks "are still being used with parts becoming almost impossible to procure; major weapons systems are old." Communications equipment is the most critical item in short supply, "and I foresee no immediate relief to this problem."

Many other items that are in short supply include generators of all types, batteries, tires for jeeps, trucks and aircraft, engineer and material handling equipment such as fork lifts, and, in Vietnam, barbed wire, sandbags and other field fortification material.

Aircraft: There is no actual shortage of aircraft and so far the United States has been able to replace its combat losses in Vietnam and its operational losses all over the world. But the margin of production over expenditure is small, aircraft production rates are still small and are limited chiefly, for combat aircraft, to the McDonnell F–4, the Douglas A–4, and the Northrop F–5. Increased losses and an increased air effort in Vietnam could greatly intensify the problem of aircraft replacement.

The scarcities or actual or potential shortages in trained manpower and equipment have caused considerable concern to the armed services, not only because of the increasing requirements of Vietnam and continued commitments elsewhere in the world, but because of the restrictive effect of these factors upon U.S. capability to meet other emergencies that might arise.

Blackmail in Home Rule Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, according to the press, a group calling itself the Free D.C. Movement was launched yesterday. It is apparently an offshoot of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. One Marion Barry, Jr., director of the Washington office of SNCC in speaking for the new organization announced plans for a consumer boycott against all Washington merchants who refuse to support District home rule. The support demanded from Washington merchants will be to sign petitions, wire the President and Members of Congress, display a "Free D.C." sticker in the window of his business establishment and contribute financially to the treasury of the "Free D.C. Movement." Those who refuse to meet these demands will be blacklisted and boycotted. It is further reported that one cleric who has pledged support to the new movement said he was "sorry that this kind of militancy is necessary" but all other methods have failed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not speak from the premise of one who is fundamentally opposed to home rule. However, I am shocked that the advocates of home rule are now going to resort to the unconscionable methods of blackmail recited above. This goes far beyond the legitimate pressures that should be applied to gain political ends. Steps such as those requiring people to sign petitions, to make financial contributions, and display window stickers are offensive to my sense of fair play. They violate freedom of conscience and the right to freely petition without duress. Indeed they are totally repugnant to the precepts of a free and open society. This kind of blackmail campaign is not going to win any friends for home rule among Members of Congress. It will be completely counterproductive and alienate support now existent.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that before we take up home rule legislation again perhaps we had better investigate the need for another type of legislation. Perhaps we should investigate the need to outlaw conspiracies to frighten, intimidate, and threaten under the guise of an economic boycott. This pernicious philosophy that the ends justify the means can be completely destructive of the fabric of a democratic society. Mr. Speaker, I do not like totalitarian and dictatorial methods even when practiced in defense of a good cause. And I repeat that I speak as one who is not opposed to home rule. The people who intend to resort to these tactics are a disgrace to the legitimate cause of home rule for the District of Columbia. They will fail as the forces which seek to employ tyrannical methods always fail when within the context of a democratic society they seek to substitute the weaponry of blackmail for the rule of reason.

Whither Foreign Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be engaged in this House in our annual debate over the budget funding for foreign assistance. The background against which these deliberations will take place will provide ample material for distorting our views and confusing our purpose. Included in that background will be the specter of the Vietnam war. The differing opinions on that conflict including both the international politics of the situation and the military conduct of hostilities will no doubt provide abundant confusion. The impact of the financial commitment which is a load factor on our balance of payments will unquestionably produce distortion.

The grave food shortage, the specter of famine is also adumbrated in the background tapestry. Humane as well as practical consideration will dictate that priority must be given to the food problem. As urgent as this need is, it does not take us to the central core of the problem. It is like giving aspirin for a headache which gives temporary relief, but does not treat the organic source which contributes to the recurring headache. Our views of the needs of underdeveloped countries will no doubt suffer distortion if we see our role as merely that of sustaining life without additional effort to make it tolerable and improvable. We would hope that immediate necessity would not be confused with long-term need.

Part of the background against which decision will be forged is the factor of time and our attitudes regarding time. We have been a long time at the business of foreign aid and enthusiasm has been seriously eroded. Our efforts over the past 20 years have not been without serious fault and some embarrassing and negative result. These continue to provide a growing irritation. Time also works in futuro. There is no end in sight. It is to most Americans wearisome to project into the future and find no place safely predictable as that point at which our outgoing efforts will terminate. This factor will distort our view and confuse our purpose.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, is an up-to-date articulation of what the problem is. We need to thoroughly understand why this problem commands a sizable portion of our resources over an interminable and rocky future. Aside from the good Samaritan aspects of the exercise, wherein does the national interest of the United States lie in helping the underdeveloped nations?

I do not claim to know or understand all the answers to these questions, but here are some that come to mind. Peace and security are indivisible. There can be no security where there exists such a tremendous gap between less than one-third of the earths people who are the haves and the over two-thirds of those who are the have-nots. Free enterprise and its profit system can only survive in a climate of expanding markets. An increasing reliance will of necessity be built upon international market or export trade. Unless the present underdeveloped countries of nonconsumers begin to move toward an awakening consumer market, the developed countries will begin to take in each others laundry.

The great expansion for the next 50 years or more lies in bringing the trailing two-thirds of the earth's people into the stream of modern technical development and modern consumptive demand.

We need further, Mr. Speaker, a clear-cut demonstration that we have learned from our past mistakes and that we are adjusting to the pragmatic requirements to make our assistance effective in serving our national purpose. The American public knows and rightly resents the fact that some of our aid effort in money and material have been diverted to private ends and other interests than our own. We should make it clear that we now have adopted a system of audit to trace the aid and report on its effectiveness. We should point out that financial institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank have been fostered by us as being the preferred banking controlled way to approve projects and supervise funding. We need to make clear that we are shifting emphasis to technical assistance. That our priority is toward industrial agriculture and to small industrial pursuits. A much more reasonable program than one which seeks to build large steel capability or other tremendously costly capital ventures.

We need, Mr. Speaker, to indicate our understanding and assistance for the foreign exchange problems of the underdeveloped nations. We should be firm in our insistence that a more liberal liquidity program for international monetary policy should reflect appropriate concern for and participation by the less developed nations.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we should have clearly in mind the ultimate cost of doing nothing or the loss of time and loss of advantage flowing from a course which does less than we are reasonably capable of doing. For myself, I am a pragmatic altruist. I firmly believe that the healthy future of my country lies in a prudent, continuing investment in nation building abroad. In doing so, carefully and critically, I see our country serving its security interests and its economic interests in the long pull. To insist on enjoying all of the benefits of today without wise concern and provision for the future is not in our country's best tradition or spirit.

Because it discusses some of these same aspects of aid, Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to insert in the Record, following my own remarks, an article from last week's Economist. I do not agree with all of the points made in this presentation. To the degree that it implies that some priority should not be given to food and education in our present aid efforts, I would take issue. To the main argument that aid cannot and should not be solely oriented to these present priorities, I am in hearty agreement.

The article follows:

Is Aid Out?—What Must Be Done To Stop the Next World Crisis

Have the rich parts of the world lost the will to haul the poor parts up toward equality? The annual total of the West's aid to the developing countries has stayed the same since 1961, though the rich are getting richer and money is losing its purchasing power. Only France provides anything near the Western Nation's supposed aid target of 1 percent of gross national product. President Johnson's foreign aid message to Congress this month put the accent on specific kinds of practical help—food production, education, health and, warily, birth control. All these are sensible, but they do not make a coherent whole. Clearly the old philosophy behind aid is going out of the window.

The old philosophy was that every excolony had a duty to industrialize, and that the ex-imperialists had a duty to help. Now Malthus has caught up with Marx. The fear of real famine once more grips the rural slums of India and even parts of Africa. India is short of nearly a quarter of the grain it needs this year to maintain even the average peasant's starvation diet. With population growing as fast as food supplies in most developing areas, and faster in much of Asia, famine is liable to haunt the world for years to come. Only the capitalist West, and chiefly North America, has surplus food to ship abroad—a political point that will be hammered at time and again.

More and more voices can be heard saying now that the poor must stop dreaming of industrial plenty and get down to plowing their modest furrow on the old home farm. There is a good deal of sense in this. There was a good deal of sense in Samuel Smiles. But one must be clear about what lies behind it. To tell poor countries that they must concentrate on agriculture, not industry, is more than a shift in technical priorities. It marks a sharp fall in the already precarious political position of the developing areas. They are, in a way, the casualties of the recent improvement in relations between Russia and the West.

In the 1950's Western attitudes to aid were generated partly by do-gooders, who were not a decisive minority, and by run-of-the-mill machiavellians, scared by the cold war, who were. Now that the West feels relatively secure, fewer and fewer allowances are made for the inevitable confusions and upheavals of the poor. Westerners are tired of Indian giganticism in planning; of Pakistanti obsessions with Kashmir that have wrecked a good start in development; of the Latin American pendulum swinging between reaction and revolution; of the lack of viable states in Africa. Hence the stern new emphasis on "practical" aid, which is a measure of the irritation of the rich rather than of any change in the needs of the poor.

No one expected the poor to become instantly rich and self-reliant at the mere touch of the Western Midas. Some people, indeed, still argue that it is not at all clear that the poor are really going from bad to worse. Mr. George Woods, the President of the World Bank, the only really successful firm in the aid business, did not think so when he wrote in Foreign Affairs last month that "despite some discouraging failures among them, the underdeveloped countries as a group are growing in their ability to carry out investment. Their development institutions are becoming more firmly established, education, and skills are spreading, administrative and managerial abilities are improving, and program and project planning is becoming more effective."

This is the hopeful case. But even if the poor countries must haul themselves up by their bootstraps by increasing food output and exports, it is hard to see how they can do it without substantially bigger injections of aid than they are getting now.

Take India, a third of the non-Communist developing world in point of numbers. Its main problem is not shortage of land, as one might think from talk of overpopulation. It is appallingly low yields from the land—half those of China, and a quarter those of Japan. But high agricultural yields almost always happen only in industrial societies where farmers work with modern techniques. Where these conditions do not exist, a country is not likely to get much return from lavishing its scarcest resources—capital and skilled leadership—on an obstinate medieval peasantry.

The same applies to the poor countries' attempt to expand their exports. To have meaningful access to rich export markets, poor countries must make things that buyers want in growing quantities, and that means manufactured goods. The emergency of famine must not be allowed to obscure these long-term needs. Larger food and trade programs are going to involve expanding, not contracting, aid programs. Mr. Woods claims that the poor countries could, in each of the next 5 years, usefully absorb $3 or $4 billion more than they get now.

The aim should not be to scale down the estimates of what the developing world needs, but to find a new way of stimulating the will of the rich to do enough. It is true, as Mr. Andrew Shonfield pointed out as long ago as 1960 in his book "The Attack on World Poverty," that aid schemes have generally been organized in a way that takes no account of the sensitivities of the rich, and this has boomeranged. Something must be done to avoid further damage. For instance, aid is going to be provided on the necessary scale only if it is more closely supervised. It goes against human nature to imagine that huge sums can change hands "without strings." This is why schemes organized on a regional basis—such as the newly created Asian Development Bank—are a sensible way of tackling the problem. They increase the potential bargaining power of the borrowers, and also give them a collective interest in seeing that none of their number kills the golden goose by sharp practices. The other thing that certainly has to be done is to find a way of linking international monetary reform with the business of helping the poor. This would loosen the stranglehold that balance-of-payments problems now impose on the aid policies of America and Britain.

But, unless a specifically political impulse is provided, mechanisms like these, however useful they are, will pretty certainly be set up with a sluggishness bordering on indifference. The one political event anywhere on the horizon that could put some zip into aid policies is British entry into the Common Market. It is to Mr. Heath's credit that he, more than any other British politician, is insisting on this point. For Britian's early entry into Europe could shake the European nations, including Britian itself, out of their growing conservatism and halt their retreat into parochialism. The worst disaster would be if the Britian that finally did get into Europe years hence were more introvert than it is today because it had lost its nerve through being out in the cold too long.

An extrovert common market, with Britain in, would be by far the world's biggest trader and could be a major provider of aid, especially if the European Development Fund were extended beyond French-speaking Africa. And it would almost certainly have an added impact on the Americans, who are highly sensitive to signs of Europe "playing its part" or, as now, "slacking" in the world. Europe's preoccupation with internal quarreling rather than with external action, and America's feeling that it is having to carry the can alone, has had a great deal to do with Congress's recent impatience on aid. A sign of more positive European purpose towards the poor would galvanize the Americans too.

Without a change of this order, the fascination with famine and emergency relief funds can easily become a cover for a retreat from really determined aid policies. It gives people the thrill of charity without making them get down to the root of the matter, which is the need to start closing the enormous and widening gap between the world's industrialized white north and the subsistence-level colored south. It is tempting to settle for programs that are designed merely to avert mass starvation, to "stop them going under altogether." It is easy to argue that the colored poor, weak and divided as they are, have no real influence on the balance of power. But it will not do, because prolonged poverty means constant crises in the developing areas, and constant crises will bedevil the efforts of the great powers to organize world peace. Vietnam, in its way, is a case in point. The awful threat of famine will be salutary if it awakens the West to the immensity of the problem. It will do harm if it makes it lose sight of the long-term aim of building modern industrial societies in such countries as are capable of them.

Right-To-Work Fight Misses the Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, of all the legislative issues which have confronted Congress, few have stirred as much controversy as the proposal to repeal section 14(b)—that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which leaves with the several States authority to outlaw union shop agreements.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am including the text of an article which appeared in the February 26, 1966, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. The article sets forth a position that I have consistently taken throughout the debates on this subject:

The Right-To-Work Fight Misses the Point

(By Congressman Robert P. Griffin)

Few political struggles have raged so long and so bitterly as the battle over the right-to-work provision of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Since its enactment in 1947, thousands of fiery speeches have been lavished on this issue; election campaigns for high office have hinged on it; literally tons of propaganda, pro and con, have inundated lawmakers. Within the last year alone it has caused jammed hearing rooms, angry shouting matches and even a Senate filibuster.

As ranking Republican member of the Education and Labor Subcommittee which handles this issue in the House, I have watched this emotional binge with growing dismay. In my view, right to work is a sham battle which too often ignores the issues. It is time we stopped tilting at windmills and faced facts.

The cause of the fuss, section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, is only 44 words long. Simply stated, it allows each State to decide whether labor-management contracts within its borders can require workers to join or pay dues to a union as a condition of employment. Today, 19 States exercise their authority to ban such agreements. Labor unions and their allies want to stop this by repealing 14(b) so that there would be no barrier to the union shop and many more companies could be organized with compulsory union membership. Most management groups are vehemently opposed.

The typical appeal for retaining 14(b) claims that compulsory unionism is somehow un-American—and therefore should not be sanctioned by Federal law. While many sincere people hold this opinion, I believe that they miss the point.

Obligatory membership is not necessarily so unusual or tragic. Many of the lawyers who urge on Congress the view that un-Americanism is somehow involved are themselves members of a compulsory union—the bar association. In 28 States, including my home State of Michigan, no attorney may practice in the courts without joining the bar association and paying dues. Like other attorneys, I have complied with this requirement since graduating from law school, and I have never felt that it corrupted my principles.

The vital question, I submit, is not whether I must join but whether and how my fundamental rights are affected when I do. An involuntary organization possesses extraordinary power since its members may not resign, or stop paying dues, without grave consequences. Thus, any such group should assume unusual responsibilities. As Justice William O. Douglas of the U.S. Supreme Court has written, "If an association is compelled, the individual should not be forced to surrender any matters of conscience, belief, or expression." A citizen should not be forced to choose between his job, the bread for his family—and his convictions.

My compulsory bar association would be un-American if it refused membership because of racial or religious bias, if it fined or expelled me for exercising the constitutional right to dissent, or if it used my dues money to support political candidates or political causes. In hard fact, these very practices are commonplace among labor unions. In my view, these are the central issues that have been sidestepped throughout the discussions about the right-to-work section. That is why I insist that repeal of section 14(b) is acceptable if—and only if—it is accompanied by legal safeguards against the abuses of power by the unions.

While many labor unions are free of such abuses, many others are not. This was amply demonstrated last summer at hearings before our committee. While I believe these hearings were often directed to the wrong issues, they did uncover some shocking instances of union abuse of constitutional rights, including freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and the right to equal employment opportunities.

C. F. Smith, a Texan, is a graduate engineer who passed his master electrician's examination in 1943 with an extremely high grade. For more than 20 years he has been a contractor, with a few other electricians in his employ. Many times over the years Smith and his employees have sought admission to the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, but the local union in Houston would never accept them as members. To Smith the reason is obvious—he and his workers are Negroes.

In spite of his unsuccessful attempts to join, Smith has suffered for being nonunion. "The unions have picketed our jobs," Smith testified, "and a number of our clients have been harassed because they elected to use our services in lieu of union electrical contractors." Texas is a State with a right-to-work law. Smith's problems would undoubtedly be even worse if Texas permitted compulsory-membership contracts, unless effective safeguards made racial discrimination impossible.

The fact is that every serious study of the Nation's unions shows racial discrimination by unions to be widespread. Despite the new Civil Rights Act, there are still many lily-white locals. A recent national study showed that less than 1 percent of the apprentices in the building and construction trades are Negroes. Even in supposedly liberal New York State, the figure was reported to be only 2 percent.

Velio Iacobucci, a movie projectionist from Upper Darby, Pa., was another witness before our committee. A veteran union member, he decided in 1962 to run against the president of his local on a reform platform. The election was held under conditions which Iacobucci claimed were fraudulent. In any event, he was defeated. He was then summarily expelled from the union. Without membership, he is unable to work in most Philadelphia theaters. To ply his trade, he has had to buy an interest in a theater—using borrowed money—and hire himself as a projectionist.

Our committee learned that a local of the United Steel Workers had expelled two of its members after they filed and supported a petition to decertify the union as the bargaining agent with their employer—although the privilege of filing such a petition is guaranteed by our labor laws. Because of the union's aetion against them, the men lost their jobs under the union-shop contract. Clearly the right to democratic dissent is meaningless if you lose your job for exercising it.

The spending of union dues to aid political candidates is another outrageous practice which dilutes the citizenship rights of those compelled to pay union dues in order to work. Federal law forbids unions to contribute dues funds directly to support candidates for Federal office. But dues money is directly, and liberally, employed in non-Federal elections. It is also used indirectly in Federal elections.

When I asked witness Sidney Zagri, legislative cousel for the Teamsters, if union funds were used to support candidates for State and local offices, he expressed an attitude that is typical of many union leaders: "I say we would be derelict in our duty to our membership if we didn't."

The records of a major union, the United Auto Workers, were included in the hearings and provided further evidence of the abuse of the political freedoms of workers for whom union membership is compulsory. The report shows, for example, that in 1960 the UAW contributed to many campaigns. Some of the funds went to help Orville L. Freeman run for Governor of Minnesota, some to help Otto Kerner in his campaign for the Illinois governership. Well over $100,000 went to the union's voluntary political arm, the Committee on Political Education—COPE—which operates in Federal elections.

Even more dramatic is the plight of workers whose religious beliefs prevent them from joining an organization such as a labor union. For example, among the Plymouth Brethren, a fundamentalist sect, some members have lost job after job because they refused affiliation with a union. In many parts of the country there are such groups which are opposed to union membership as a matter of conscience. Their members constantly have trouble finding—and keeping—jobs.

Countless stories of this kind cry out the need for reform within the American labor movement and, more specifically, for an overhauling of the union-shop provisions of the law. A simple repeal of section 14(b) would undoubtedly increase the violation of constitutional rights, for union shops would quickly be organized in the States that now forbid them. On the other hand, the mere retention of right-to-work laws will not cure many of the abuses either.

My proposal, embodied in a bill I have introduced, would eliminate the section 14 (b), thereby extending the privilege of negotiating union-shop contracts to unions in all 50 States—but at the same time safeguarding the rights of union members. This bill would make it unlawful for a union entering into an agreement requiring membership as a condition of employment (1) to discriminate on account of race, color, or creed; (2) to fine or penalize a member for exercising any legal or civil right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States; (3) to use dues or assessments for political or other nonunion purposes; (4) to cause the discharge of genuinely religious objectors to union membership.

Of course, it would be meaningless to recite fundamental individual rights without means for enforcement. Under my bill, a compulsory-membership clause in any collective-bargaining agreement would become void if the union involved should disregard any of the law's provisions.

Some of the problems of democratic rights in unions were faced in 1959 by the Landrum-Griffin labor-reform law, which I cosponsored in the Houe and which then-Senator John F. Kennedy sponsored in its Senate version. This was a valid first step, but experience since then proves that further steps are needed.

The basic safeguards I have outlined must be coupled with any repeal of section 14(b)—for the special privileges enjoyed by unions are linked both in fact and in the public view with special responsibilities. I am convinced that the American people would not long allow Federal sanction for compulsory membership in unions which abuse the rights of their members. This would amount to second-class citizenship for millions of workers. Before long the public would demand mouch stronger remedies—such as the application of antitrust laws to labor organizations.

It is high time to put aside the hollow clichés that permeate debate over this subject. It is time for all factions of industry to recognize that collective bargaining is a way of life in this country. And it is time for union leaders to recognize that special responsibilities must accompany union authority to require membership as a condition of employment. This, and not emotional arguments over the right to work, is the real issue in the right-to-work battle.

Russian Justice Defied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most naive and dangerous policies of the administration is the belief that the Soviet Union is mellowing and that a policy of coexistence with communism is possible.

I submit for the Record an editorial from the Chicago Daily News, of February 12, which ought to demonstrate the continued autocracy of the Soviet system:

RUSSIAN JUSTICE DEFIED

A strange thing happened in a Moscow court this week—the defendants pleaded not guilty. The accused in Soviet trials, especially those involving ideology, tend to plead guilty and publicly humiliate themselves with confessions. Their conduct can often be explained by long periods of imprisonment and questioning.

But this week the Russian writers, Yuri M. Daniel and Andrei D. Sinyavsky, who defied the Kremlin in critical novels, defied the Soviet masters again by refusing to grovel and say they were wrong.

The novelists' acts of bravery will probably go for naught as far as the trial is concerned. The Government-controlled press already refers to them as "guilty" and anticipates long sentences.

Yet, the day the trial opened, an act of defiance occurred outside the courthouse that was perhaps as daring as the ones that took place inside. A group of young students showed up to demonstrate against the trial. They also demonstrated a truth that censors of the human spirit refuse to learn. Attempts to suppress intellectual freedom are always too late. The torch has already been passed.

I Am an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include with these remarks a poem entitled "I Am an American," written by my constituent, Miss Mary Wieczorek, which reads as follows:

I AM AN AMERICAN

(By Mary A. Wieczorek)

I have, to my best, tried to set down in rhyme
What I think is me, for now and all time.

I am you and I and he and she.
I am dreams and hopes and memory.
I am young as the spring; old as the world;
Hard as the years; and soft as a curl.
I am born of great words and greater deeds.
I am all races, nationalities, and creeds.

There is nothing I haven't done once or twice.
I have known both glory and sacrifice.
I left the home my forefathers trod,
And built a new home with the help of God.

I have lived all over this wondrous world.
I have seen whole nations to destruction hurled.
I have tasted the life of every land.
I have searched for freedom and quiet peace.
From persecution I sought release.

I came because of circumstances.
I found a land of second chances:
Where everyone can do his best
And earn his own rewards and rest.
I built this country with blood, sweat and tears,
And I built it to last for innumerable years.
I build it for people, whose dreams like my own,
Were only to be happy, and left alone;
For people who could not be free in their homelands;
Who wanted their children to be better off than
They themselves were when they were as young.
Yes, these are the people I everyday welcome.

And there was a time I came in chains
But with others I stood the pain.
And when those chains were finally broken,
I found myself bound to a larger yoke, an'
I knew I must face with absolute pride
The responsibility no one could hide
Of making this land the best of all
Where every man could stand up tall
Feet planted firm and head erect,
Without the slightest thought to defect.

Based on my memory, and built with my dreams
I brought forth a nation the world now esteems.
Although it doesn't quite match my visions,
It's the nearest thing, and with some revisions,
One day, I'm sure, my children will see
This beautiful land as 'twas meant to be.

But although they'll enjoy every marvelous thrill
Their hearts will be empty unless they can fill
Them with love for all men, whoever they be,
Whatever their color, creed, nationality.

With so much behind me, and much more to come
To other's misfortunes I cannot be numb.
Wherever men die for liberty's sake;
Where women shed tears because their hearts break;
Where children are more familiar with war,
Than playing with toys on a living room floor;
Wherever these things occur, I declare,
You can bet your life that I'll be there
Trying to help to set things right;
Doing my best to win every fight;
For these are my people; these are my kin;
And it's surely my job to help them win—
Win for themselves what's already mine.
This is my background—and future design.

With victories and defeats; with smiles and tears;
With hopes and memory; with courage and fears;
With history behind me—today's and back when
I'll proudly say—I am an American.

Forward Look for Monroe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, in October of last year, public officials from throughout the Second District of Michigan met at my invitation for a community development conference which I was privileged to host here in Washington—the first such conference ever held for our district, I understand. Of those present a number were from the Monroe area of the district. The Federal officials present at the conference described a wide range of Federal programs, and the provisions of Federal law determining whether or not a community could be eligible for the various grants or loans available under each program. As they listened, the public officials from the Monroe area realized that they would not be eligible for assistance in their water pollution control efforts, which was one of their principal concerns, unless they could agree on some sensible areawide approach, rather than a township-by-township approach.

Later, working together to find an acceptable plan to follow, they began to find other situations in which cooperation between the many local governments would be advantageous—situations in which the Federal Government was not even involved.

In the months since, these efforts have begun to produce results. Last month, for example, funds were allocated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for two different Monroe County engineering projects. A week later representatives of the U.S. Economic Development Administration received the carefully prepared application of Ash Township, for Federal matching funds for the construction of a water supply and a sewage collection system.

On February 16, a delegation from the city of Monroe and surrounding townships joined me here in Washington to deliver to the Director of the Economic Development Administration, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Eugene P. Foley, a set of applications for extensive sewer and water improvements affecting the entire Monroe City area. Mr. Donald Burton, coordinator for these Federal applications for the county, has been widely credited, both by his colleagues and by the Federal officials with whom he has been working, as a real sparkplug in completing this effort.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial published in the Monroe Evening News on January 24 of this year points out the importance of the new "atmosphere of cooperation" engendered by this effort. By unanimous consent, I include this editorial at this point in the Record in testimony to the new Monroe spirit:

FORWARD LOOK FOR MONROE

The announcement of a large industrial complex planned on a 150-acre tract of land at the Detroit-Toledo Expressway and North Dixie Highway is, of course, a welcome piece of news for Monroe and Monroe County.

But of at least equal importance, on a long-range basis, is the atmosphere of cooperation between city and township officials which made such a development possible. Such an atmosphere presages orderly and consistent growth of the Greater Monroe area that was impossible under the jealousy-motivated policies of city and township boards in the past.

The absolute futility of such policies became dramatically clear in Washington, D.C., last November when city, county, and township officials heard reports from Federal representatives about U.S. aid programs available to local units of government. The common thread through all these programs was that cooperation, not rivalry, among local governments was essential to obtaining Federal aid in much-needed improvement projects.

The handwriting was on the wall. Monroe County, with a serious pollution problem in many communities, could not expect Federal help in solving the dilemma unless it was attacked on a widespread basis. Frenchtown and Monroe Townships, for instance, were working on plans for sewers. It became obvious that prospects for Federal aid for their construction were dim indeed unless they cooperated with the city of Monroe in an areawide sewer plan which would prevent expensive duplication of facilities.

As to the industrial complex itself, it's still too early for unrestrained joy. We well recall the enthusiasm that greeted an announcement of the Dow Chemical Co.'s taking of an option on property at the port of Monroe. Everyone—city and port officials alike—were sure Dow was all set to build a big plant. These plans now apparently have fallen through.

City and township officials are convinced the planned industrial complex is a certainty. They speak in terms of 1,500 jobs within 5 years. Such a development would be a boon to this region. We surely hope their optimism is borne out by later developments.

Regardless of the outcome of this industrial complex, however, firm steps have been taken to establish city-township relations on a cooperative and friendly basis. This is a major advance. Great credit should go to Mayor Cohn, Frenchtown Township Supervisor Curtis Yoas, and members of their respective boards for opening the way to what should be a tremendous future for Greater Monroe.

Newton Daily News Comments on Cold War GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members an editorial on the new cold war GI bill of rights from the Newton Daily News of Newton, Iowa, published on February 17, 1965.

The editorial makes the very valid point that cost of this new program eventually will be repaid to the Government in the form of higher income taxes paid by these benefiting from the cold war GI bill.

This is confirmed by the history of earlier programs enacted to provide benefits to veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

Veterans who participated in these earlier programs, which included educational benefits, are now making $1,000 to $1,500 more each year than veterans who did not take part.

This, in turn, has resulted in added income tax payments to the Government totaling about $20 billion over the last 20 years. The cost paid out for educational benefits under the earlier programs, it should be noted, was about $14.5 billion.

Of course, legislation such as the cold war GI bill of rights cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents alone. The program, by providing educational assistance to veterans, will raise the general standard of education and thus benefit the entire Nation.

Nonetheless, it is important to note, as the Newton Daily News has done, that this new legislation is fiscally sound.

The Newton Daily News editorial follows:

EARLIER GI'S WILL HELP PAY BILL

The new cold war GI bill passed unanimously by both Houses of Congress involves the outlay of a healthy chunk of money—some $2.8 billion over the next 6 years before it tapers off.

This is about twice as much as the administration asked for in its original request. But it is one of those things that cannot be categorized as inflationary or noninflationary, that eludes analysis in columns of profit and loss.

The fact is that a sumstantial share of the billions the program will cost will come from the incomes of citizens in the prime of their working lives who themselves received benefits—college educations, vocational training, home loans, etc.—under previous GI bills.

There were 8.4 million who participated in the first bill after World War II. Another 2.5 million were beneficiaries of the Korean GI bill.

How much more they have earned, how much more they have contributed to the Nation than they otherwise might have, is impossible to say. The monetary returns on these investments might perhaps be estimated; in any other terms it is incalculable.

While the heavy hand the veterans' lobbies exercise over Congress is open to question in some matters, the new GI bill is one fruit of their labors everyone can applaud. Theoretically, it could be of immediate benefit to some 3.5 million veterans who were discharged from the services after January 31, 1955, when the Korean bill expired.

Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, once again Walter Lippmann has written a column which crystallizes the problems which face this country. In assessing the recent statement by Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, he notes that, if the administration really is prepared to negotiate, then it must be prepared for the formation of a provisional, coalition government which would organize a general election. The report of the ad hoc congressional conference on Vietnam which eight of us sponsored recognized this in discussing the terms of settlement.

Mr. Lippmann also points out the contradiction between Dean Rusk's statement that our stance in Vietnam will increase our allies' confidence in our commitments and the article by military expert Hansen Baldwin in the New York Times on February 21 which shows that the war in Vietnam has almost exhausted our supply of trained and ready combat units.

I hope that all of my colleagues will take the time to read Walter Lippmann's column which appeared in today's Washington Post:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 22, 1966]

ROBERT KENNEDY'S POINT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The key question in the Senate hearings has been whether the administration, which says that it wants a negotiated settlement has in fact committed itself to a policy which requires the unconditional surrender of the enemy. This is the question which is at the root of the profound concern of the Senators. It is also, most certainly, the question which is worrying the country. The question was not answered definitively in the hearings. General Taylor and Secretary Rusk kept insisting that the administration was fighting a limited war, that its objectives and its targets were limited, and that it is earnestly seeking to engage Hanoi in discussions and negotiations.

It has remained for Senator ROBERT KENNEDY to raise the decisive question about a negotiated settlement, which is whether the administration is prepared to negotiate with its adversaries in the field. We have learned promptly from the immediate reactions of Messrs. Bundy, Ball and HUMPHREY that the administration is not prepared to negotiate with its adversaries in the field. It does want to negotiate with Hanoi but not with the Vietcong unless the Vietcong is acknowledged to be nothing more than the instrument of the Hanoi government. This position is in fact a demand for the unconditional surrender of the Vietcong, which constitutes at least three-quarters of the military forces arrayed against us in the field, and it is a demand for the unconditional recognition of General Ky's government as the only political power in South Vietnam.

No one is entitled to claim that he is in favor of a negotiated settlement of the war unless he is prepared to negotiate with all his important adversaries who are engaged in the fighting. Senator KENNEDY has gone to the heart of the matter in fixing public attention on the simple truth that if the administration wants to negotiate, it will have to negotiate with the enemy who is in fact arrayed against us.

This does not mean, it seems to me, that the United States itself should negotiate with the Vietcong for the purpose of forming a coalition government in South Vietnam. A negotiated settlement of the war in South Vietnam will have to be negotiated by the South Vietnamese, and our policy should be to refrain from vetoing it. We shall have to cease putting our whole influence and support behind General Ky, who refuses to negotiate. The makings of a South Vietnamese negotiated settlement have long been present just under the surface in South Vietnam.

The outcome would probably be some kind of coalition government formed for the purpose of organizing a general election. Such a government would of course be vulnerable to the machinations of the hard-line Communists in Hanoi and Peiping. Difficult and unattractive as this may be, it would be a great deal better than an unlimited war to achieve unconditional surrender. Moreover, there would still be open to us what in my own view is the only live option we have ever had in southeast Asia. It is to help provide the material means by which a united Vietnam—probably under the rule of Ho Chi Minh, who is the one national leader of that country—could be neutral and militarily independent as regards China.

The partisans of our present course will do well to study carefully Mr. Hanson Baldwin's article in Monday's New York Times. It deals with the present condition of our combat forces. Mr. Baldwin is not only the leading military correspondent in contemporary journalism, but has always been, and probably still is, a hawk in the Vietnamese debate. He tells us that "the Nation's armed services have almost exhausted their trained and ready military units, with all available forces spread dangerously thin in Vietnam and elsewhere. * * * The commitment of more than 200,000 men to Vietnam, supported by strong air and naval forces, and the maintenance of two divisions in Korea, more than five in Europe, and of smaller units elsewhere, including the Dominican Republic, have reduced the forces in the United States to a training establishment."

This report poses for the President the enormously difficult question of how much longer he can overrule the Joint Chiefs of Staff on a limited mobilization of Reserve forces. It also poses the question of whether Secretary Rusk realizes what he is saying when he tells us we have some 40 unilateral military commitments and that we must be prepared to fulfill them all. How can the American people have confidence in an administration which expands its commitments to the extent that Secretary Rusk expands them in the face of the condition of the military forces?

Mr. Baldwin's article raises the question, too, whether Secretary Rusk realizes what he is saying when he keeps telling us that the credibility of all our alliances all over the world is at stake in South Vietnam. Can he really believe that our value as an ally in Europe rises when we have to draw more and more trained men out of our Armed Forces in Europe and replace them with untrained men? Mr. Rusk has entangled himself in the error of failing to realize that it is not what the United States is willing to do but what in fact it is willing and able to do which determines the credibility of any one of its alliances.

Settled Policy

SPEECH

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker:

U.S. policy in the Vietnam war appears to be definitely settled for the time being—

The Times-Picayune of New Orleans declares.

It is one of building up military and economic strength in South Vietnam and, though it may take years, to exterminate or banish the Vietcong—

The newspaper states. And it adds:

President Johnson has now indicated the definitive shape of the policy by saying that he had the overwhelming backing of the country and of Congress for the course the administration is pursuing.

The editorial declared:

Why we are in Vietnam, it seems to us, is becoming better understood. The short reason: To stop aggression. But it is not merely to stop the attempted take-over of the Vietnamese. It is even more to raise a barrier to the almost limitless plans of the Peiping Reds to spread their wars of liberation as fast as they can find opportunities * * *. A long war in Vietnam carries with it some hazards. But the hazards of failing to meet the challenge now are probably much more grave.

Here is a thought-provoking article on an issue of national concern and I am making it available for the RECORD, where others can study it in depth:

[From New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Feb. 14, 1966]

U.S. VIET POLICY SEEMS SETTLED

U.S. policy in the Vietnam war appears to be definitely settled for the time being. It is one of building up military and economic strength in South Vietnam and, though it may take years, to exterminate or banish the Vietcong.

President Johnson has now indicated the definitive shape of the policy by saying that he had the overwhelming backing of the country and of Congress for the course the administration is pursuing. He avers that there is little or no difference between that policy and what main witnesses have said before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "No one wants to escalate the war * * * no one wants to surrender and pull out," he said.

As we read it at the moment the outlook is this: A long gruelling war with gradually rising pressure on the Communists but also restrictions on escalation that might result in a bigger war; intensified efforts to eliminate the guerrillas combined with economic improvement projects to lift the spirit of the Vietnamese in the villages and strengthen their will to thrust out the Vietcong infiltrators.

The economic-morale problem won't be solved in a month or a year but it has to be a part of a winning war (and after war) strategy. Experts believe that the job can be done if it is pursued with the determination that should mark all aspects of the war effort.

This country will pursue its drive for negotiations to end the hostilities. Nothing promising has yet developed. Until it does, there is no alternative to getting on with the war business.

The "quit Vietnam" element in the United States has been having its say. From here out it probably will be looked on with increasing disapproval wherever it is shown to interfere with the deadly serious war effort.

Why we are in Vietnam, it seems to us, is becoming better understood. The short reason: To stop aggression. But it is not merely to stop the attempted takeover of the Vietnamese. It is even more to raise a barrier to the almost limitless plans of the Peiping Reds to spread their wars of liberation as fast as they can find opportunities. There is nothing secret about these Chinese sponsored national liberation fronts as standing policy with the Mao regime and its satellites. Any success with it in Vietnam would probably open up a bag of troubles in areas outreaching southeast Asia.

A long war in Vietnam carries with it some hazards. But the hazards of failing to meet the challenge now are probably much more grave.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

A Proud Look Back—A Confident Look Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this year marks the 60th anniversary of the Chicago Motor Club, an organization with unmatched service to the motorists of Illinois. The Chicago Motor Club headed by its able president, Mr. Gerald W. Cavanagh, has been most helpful to me in my efforts to promote a midstate, north-south and east-west expressway through central Illinois. This aid has been most appreciated and I would add my congratulations to Mr. Gerald W. Cavanagh and the club members on its 60th anniversary and extend my best wishes for many years of future success and service to all the motorists of Illinois.

It is my pleasure to have the text of President Cavanagh's 60th anniversary message contained in the January 1966 issue of Motor News printed at this place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROUD LOOK BACK—A CONFIDENT LOOK AHEAD

This year, as you will note elsewhere in this edition of Motor News, marks the 60th anniversary of your Chicago Motor Club. The Chicago Motor Club tradition of unmatched personalized service to the motorist dates back to 1906 and all of us who serve you are indeed proud of this record of achievement.

Anniversaries, of course, are important events in the life of a corporation, just as they are meaningful to individuals. However, your employees at the Chicago Motor Club are aware that this year's 60th anniversary celebration—while representing a milestone for all of us—is important to you only for what it means in the way of continued service, protection, and progress.

While we hope that during the coming months you will permit us some fond reminiscing about the Chicago Motor Club's distinguished accomplishments since 1906, rest assured we are alert to the fact that it is the future which is most important and meaningful, not the past.

Your Chicago Motor Club and the American Automobile Association (to which you automatically belong as a member of the Chicago Motor Club) look forward to the years ahead with optimism and enthusiasm. Both the Chicago Motor Club and the American Automobile Association continue to grow at a record pace, thereby assuring you of the best motor club service available anywhere in the world.

Much has been written and spoken about the great American romance with the automobile. It has been the privilege of many of us here at the club to grow up and mature during the era when the United States became a nation on wheels.

Today there are more than 75 million passenger cars in the United States and more than 97 million licensed drivers. By 1980 these figures will become even more astronomical, as each year finds more and more cars and drivers on our streets and highways.

As the range of your motoring has widened, so has the range of our interest and responsibility to you. The problems of the motorist have become more complex each year—thereby making each year more challenging for us if we are to properly serve your every motoring need.

The Chicago Motor Club-American Automobile Association were pioneering and trailblazing the way for future generations of motorists when many of the problems now met and solved were not even in sight. More important, however, is the fact that although 60 years is a broad measure of time, the Chicago Motor Club and the American Automobile Association have preserved the spirit of youthful vigor and zeal so necessary to serve todays multiplicity of motoring requirements.

The history of your Chicago Motor Club-American Automobile Association is a colorful one, paralleling the growth of the automobile. Looking back, if you will permit me this bit of prideful nostalgia, your Chicago Motor Club can point to a record of "pulling Illinois and Indiana out of the mud" and speeding a modern road network for both States; of developing and maintaining the worlds best touring service for motorists; of pioneering and sponsoring the lifesaving school safety patrol movement; of my colleague Joseph H. Braun's remarkable achievement in eliminating speed traps and other unjust gouges of the motorist; of introducing sound, progressive legislation designed to make your driving safer and more economical; of opposing unjust legislation which would have placed unfair burdens upon the motorist; of leading the campaign for intensive behind-the-wheel driver education courses for our children; and of being the voice of the motorist wherever and whenever it was necessary for that voice to be heard loud and clear.

In recalling the Chicago Motor Club list of achievements through the years, it is also fitting that I pay tribute to some of the great names in motor club history—departed leaders like Charles M. Hayes, Joseph J. Cavanagh, and James E. Bulger—men without whom the Chicago Motor Club's 60th anniversary story could not have been written.

AND WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

From my vantage point, as president of the Chicago Motor Club, our motoring horizons appear unlimited, as do our opportunities of serving you, the member.

The crystal ball people predict that there will be 100 million passenger cars in America by 1980. That means we must make plans now for more superhighways, parking areas, and increased safety measures. There will be great changes in our highways and our cars. Naturally, your club's services will keep pace with all these developments.

Only one thing will remain constant in the years ahead. Human nature will not change. You will have much more leisure time, owing to automation and other advances, and you will spend that time on travel at home and abroad. Chicago Motor Club-American Automobile Association tour and travel services will be geared to blend with this accelerated pattern.

We can also assume that powerful blocs undoubtedly will continue to attempt to divert motorists' tax money to nonhighway purposes. The Chicago Motor Club-American Automobile Association will continue to vigorously speak out for the motorist when these issues arise. Unwarranted restrictive legislation will be introduced and will be opposed. The expanded motoring population in the years ahead will need representation even more than it does today—representation provided the car owner only by your Chicago Motor Club and the American Automobile Association.

Ten, twenty, another sixty years from now, your Chicago Motor Club—a corporation not for profit—will be as earnestly defending the rights of the motoring public as it does today. New services, undreamed of in our present economy, will be at your disposal. The enduring Chicago Motor Club and the American Automobile Association in the future as in the past, will continue in the front lines of civic work, traffic safety activities and legislative representation—all the while maintaining the unmatched personalized services which you have come to expect from us and which cannot be found anywhere else.

In the exciting years ahead, you will need the services that can be provided only by the Chicago Motor Club and the American Automobile Association even more than is the case today.

Your motor club (now approaching the 300,000 membership mark) and the American Automobile Association (with more than 9 million members on the rolls) look forward to the coming years with great anticipation, dedicated always to serving you, the member, the most indispensable individual in our business. We hope you will help us grow even faster by recommending friends and relatives for membership in the club. Remember, as your club's membership grows, the "voice of organized motordom" becomes stronger and more effective on both the National and State level.

On behalf of all of us at your club, I thank you for your unstinting loyalty and support, without which there could be no Chicago Motor Club-American Automobile Association and pledge our untiring efforts toward maintaining the Chicago Motor Club tradition of distinguished service.

Watershed Projects Benefit Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I consider the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, to be one of the most popular and helpful pieces of legislation enacted by Congress in recent years.

In my home State of Kentucky, 143 communities have requested assistance under the small watershed program authorized by the act. Thirty-five of these have been authorized for help in formulating a watershed project plan to improve resource use and prevent flooding of watershed lands.

Twenty-three projects have been approved for U.S. Department of Agriculture help in installing the measures called for in their work plans, and the measures are now being accomplished. Two projects, Twin Creek in Harrison County and Meadow Creek in Wayne County, have been completed. The 23 active projects involve a combined total of 1,862,700 acres. Only three other States in the Nation have a larger acreage of watershed projects in operation. I believe this record speaks well for my State, and it strengthens my longstanding support of the program.

I consider the record of accomplishments in the 23 projects to be unusually good. Of the 187 floodwater retarding structures planned, 70 have been completed. In addition, 14 multiple-purpose structures have been planned, and 8 of these have been completed. Conservation land treatment work is progressing well, too. In the Cypress Creek project in Union County, for example, more than 90 percent of the farms are operated under conservation plans developed with the aid of the Union County Soil Conservation District, and cooperating landowners have applied nearly all of the measures needed for land stabilization and watershed protection.

Total estimated cost of all the watershed projects in operation in Kentucky—both Public Law 566 and pilot—is $56,301,000. More than 53 percent of the total is non-Federal costs. This impressive record of local financial participation is conclusive evidence of the interest and willingness of local sponsors to use their resources to the fullest in developing and carrying out project programs.

Reduced flood damages and other direct benefits are plainly evident in the projects where some or all of the measures have been applied. In addition, there are some important benefits from these projects that extend far beyond the watershed boundaries. For example, watershed activity in Kentucky has created more than 2,300 surface acres of water. These bodies of water have provided more than 19,700 visitor-days of recreation since 1962. An estimated 349 man-years of employment have resulted from watershed construction since 1960. Fifteen new industries or businesses employing 774 people have sprung up because of the watershed work. Another 28 industries and businesses have expanded to give employment to more than 800 additional people.

These watershed project results are substantial contributions to the economy and general well being of Kentucky residents. I salute the local initiative and effort, and capable assistance from government at all levels, that made these results possible.

Multilateral Diplomacy in the Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Israel's distinguished Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Abba Eban, offered some thoughtful observations on the conduct of modern diplomacy in the Owen Roberts lecture which he delivered at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia on February 8. Especially interesting were Mr. Eban's comments on the capabilities and limitations of the United Nations as an instrument of diplomacy.

Unfortunately, the full text of Mr. Eban's lecture is not available. Instead, I ask unanimous consent that a synopsis of Mr. Eban's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the synopsis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYNOPSIS OF OWEN ROBERTS LECTURE DELIVERED BY MR. ABBA EBAN, ON MULTILATERAL DIPLOMACY IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

During the past two decades international relations have been dominated by public debate and conference diplomacy. The reticence and intimacy of the classic diplomacy have fallen into disuse. It is commonly believed that a special nobility attaches to international relations if they are conducted in the public view, and amongst more than two governments. The idealism of the postwar decades reacts with suspicion to secret, bilateral discourse. This concept was first expresed by Woodrow Wilson: "Open covenants openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view." The motive for the Wilsonian view had been formulated by its author some years before: "The great things remaining to be done can only be done with the whole world as a stage and in cooperation with the universal forces of mankind."

After 20 years of intensive practice, during a period of continuing crisis, a new classification of experience becomes possible. There is room for a more balanced and reserved judgment about the virtues of multilateral diplomacy; and the classic procedures need to be saved from the disrepute implicit in the Wilsonian definition.

It is true that the new parliamentary diplomacy responds to some of the realities of the nuclear world. For the first time in human history mankind is joined in a common destiny of danger and opportunity. For centuries events occurring in one part of the world had no repercussions in distant lands. Today the main problems affecting the human situation cannot be discussed, still less solved except on a planetary scale. These are the issues which are the responsibility of all nations and which therefore transcend the specific interests of each. During the next quarter of a century it is necessary to plan the affairs of the City of Man as a whole. The new technologies open up unprecedented horizons of danger and hope. This planet faces the problems of its relations to the world of space. The earth will double its population in the next three decades with no corresponding growth of resources in sight. More than 1½ billion people suffer from malnutrition in various degrees. In the golden age of science 700 million adults—a third of the world's adult population—are totally illiterate. The gap between the standard of life in the advanced and the developing states is too wide to permit the evolution of a harmonious and peaceful international order. The fabric of our planet—its soil, water, mineral, and air—face exhaustion or pollution or both. Our generation has no special right to hand the planet on to our children in a worse natural condition than that in which we found it. There is no effective machinery for peacekeeping, even in disputes not affecting the great powers.

The paradox is that these universal issues do not have the priority of discussion in the international forums. The summit meetings discuss local geographical conflicts without reference to larger global issues. It is probable that great powers which are divided on points of conflict in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the American Continent might find some common ground in a joint assault on the planetary problems which I have outlined.

There is a tendency to overestimate what the United Nations can do in the political and security field and to underestimate its unlimited opportunity in the field of accelerated development.

But while the United Nations and other supranational organizations express the new planetary spirit, this does not mean that they are endowed with perfection, or that there is no danger in their indiscriminate use. I suggest the following dangers for reflection and action:

The need to conduct all international relations in public view tends to sharpen differences and to discourage honorable compromise.

The parliamentary procedures of the United Nations encourage bargains and compacts which destroy relevance. A nation which seeks a result in one conflict will pursue support by committing its attitude irrelevant in another.

There is too much emphasis by the United Nations on public debate, too little on quiet negotiation. The question is whether the United Nations is an arena for the waging of conflicts or an instrument for resolving them.

There is a tendency toward constitutional disintegration in favor of excessive pragmatism. Two examples are relevant: A simple majority has ruled in the General Assembly on a substantive issue, and the right of access to the Security Council for discussion of an armed conflict has been challenged. Neither contingency was ever foreseen by the charter.

Self-appointed "international" conferences are debasing multilateral diplomacy by excluding states whose interests they attack, and by refusing to bind themselves to charter principles.

Praise for LULAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the praise already given to an organization which celebrated its 37th anniversary this past week, the League of United Latin American Citizens, commonly known as LULAC. I know, from personal experience, of the fine work they are doing in promoting the welfare of U.S. citizens of Latin American ancestry. In my district, there are several active LULAC chapters which are especially distinguished for their efforts to increase voter registration and participation among their members and in the community at large.

The members of LULAC in my district are also noteworthy for the strong social conscience which they manifest. They have often given voice to their concern about the general welfare at the local and State level, promoting not just the cause of their own members, but of all their fellow citizens. Their participation in Project Head Start in many communities is one example of their concern for all the members of our society.

I would not want to forget, Mr. Speaker, the fiestas which the LULAC's sponsor, which highlight the life of many communities and which not only entertain, but educate us all to the heritage which they possess. Such occasions serve a highly valuable function in promoting goodwill and respect among the peoples of differing ancestry who live together in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members of Congress in stating that the League of United Latin American Citizens is to be commended for the activities of the past 37 years and wished all possible success for their future efforts.

Aaron J. Racusin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks which I have prepared concerning the recent elevation of Mr. Aaron J. Racusin to the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS: AARON J. RACUSIN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE FOR PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT

Recently an appontment was made in the Department of the Air Force elevating Mr. Aaron J. Racusin to the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management. This appointment results from recognition of experience, dedication, and unusual ability as demonstrated by a most deserving public servant.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, Senate Committee on Small Business, I have been aware, for many years, of Mr. Racusin's contribution to the small business community. With Mr. Racusin in this new position, I am certain that the Air Force small business program will continue to grow and the small businessman's interests will be carefully safeguarded.

It is heartening to note that Mr. Racusin, a career civil servant who has worked at all steps of the procurement ladder and whose experience and knowledge have made him particularly accredited, has been elevated to this high post. I am equally pleased that the Air Force has shown unusual wisdom in selecting a man of Mr. Racusin's caliber to implement the congressional mandate in behalf of the small businessman.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, in these times when freedom is being tested throughout the world, our country continues to lead in the fight for liberty.

Miss Eva Harris, of Dayton, Tenn., recently won first place in a Jaycette sponsored Americanism essay contest at Rhea County High School. Her paper clearly links the future of our Nation with the historic past and points to patriotism as the cement that binds our country together.

I have unanimous consent that her essay on Americanism be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

AMERICANISM

(By Eva Harris)

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot, will, in this crisis, shrink away from the service of their country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly; it is dearness that gives everything its value." So were the thoughts that Thomas Paine expressed in his famous works, "The Crises." These were written during the Revolutionary War in which Americans were fighting for their freedom from England.

People came to America from England because they desired freedom—complete freedom that they were not getting at home. After settling here, the people were still controlled by the mother country and were not given the "rights as Englishmen" as had been promised in their charters.

The Americans declared their independence on July 4, 1776, in the formal petition sent to the King. This petition being refused, they then resorted to arms to prove to the mother country that they were determined to be free and have all political allegiance dissolved. Through hardships and toil, cold of winter, and unequipped soldiers was the Revolutionary War fought. But happy was the day and long to be remembered when King George finally had to yield and grant independence to our country.

A young nation developed, a constitution—the greatest document in history—was adopted, and a strong central government was established.

As time passed on and additional States were developed, there arose differences between the commercial North and the agricultural South. So great grew these differences that war resulted—another long, hard war to prove further the liberty on which America was founded.

Our Nation has been in other wars, civil and worldwide. All of these have been to prove that Americans love liberty so much they cannot let go of it.

The Englishman, Thomas Paine, who came to America to fight for the colonists in the Revolutionary War, said that God planned the war; that He intended for America to become a democratic country and an example to all the world. Truly it does seem that God has always led our country to victory, not only in the Revolutionary War, but in other wars as well. America has been blessed until today it is the richest Nation of the world, economically speaking.

Today almost 200 years later are we still in the "times that try men's souls"? Do we, as Americans of the present day, really love and appreciate our country as our great men of the past, such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and others have done? Are we the summer soldiers and the sunshine patriots shrinking away from service and esteeming it too lightly? Can we fully realize the price the early leaders of our country had to pay for the liberty we enjoy so much today?

Never will words be powerful enough to express the debt we as Americans today owe to the Americans of the past. This debt can never be paid, even in fraction, but it is the duty of every American to try every day of his life by showing his love and patriotism. Our motto should be the words of the familiar song "America": "My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing."

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on February 24, 1966, Estonians all over the world are recalling the re-creation of their free independent nation. Forty-eight years ago on this date the people of Estonia constituted the Republic of Estonia, and thus reestablished their national independence which they had lost in the course of imperialist Russian expansion toward the West.

But the Estonian people were able to enjoy their freedom for merely two decades. The new masters of Russia—the Communists—with their Red army overran and occupied the country during World War II. This flagrant assault against her peaceful neighbor initiated Soviet Union's westward march for world domination. Thus, in it the beginning of today's international tensions and threat to peace may be found.

Since this event, the Estonian people have been suffering under the oppressive yoke of their Communist taskmasters. Their lot under the Soviet neocolonialist rule has been of the vanquished; but they still have held fast to their confidence that Estonia will regain her freedom and independence. Their hope for that rests in the main on the United States as the acknowledged leader of the free Western World.

We recall Estonian Independence Day each year to reaffirm our friendship and support of the people in Estonia for whom freedom is still a memory and a dream. The Estonians who have come to the United States are a vital, contributing group of citizens. They know, as few can who have lived in freedom all their lives, the speed and ease with which liberty can be stolen and the suffering endured until it is regained.

Most of all, on this day we look to the future and resolve that we will never recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States and we will never forget the true Estonia which must one day again be free.

Section 14(b) Battle Just a Prelude?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in a recent issue of the Chicago Daily News on H.R. 8282, a bill which proposes sweeping changes in the unemployment compensation program, discusses some of the possible dangers of the legislation and cautions the Congress to examine the proposal with great care.

There is increasing concern among employers in the Chicago area about these suggested revisions, and I join in urging a thorough analysis of the proposed legislation by the Congress before action is taken.

The editorial follows:

SECTION 14(b) BATTLE JUST A PRELUDE?

We are glad to see the Senate kill the proposed repealer for section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—the section that enables States to make their own laws regarding compulsory unionism. Labor leaders' main interest in the repealer has been, we are convinced, to have the Federal Government relieve them of the need to persuade workers to join their unions, and to augment their own strength.

That strength has been amply demonstrated in the last few years, in strikes affecting the entire economy, as well as the survival of whole cities. As the New York transit strike made clear, the need is not to augment that power, but to bring it under some kind of discipline when it menaces the public welfare.

Now Charles Nicodemus of the Daily News Washington bureau reveals that the repeal of 14(b) was, in the eyes of at least some labor people, a secondary target at best, and perhaps only a smokescreen. What organized labor really wants from Congress this year, he concludes, is far-reaching changes in the structure of the Federal unemployment compensation program.

Changes already proposed would:

Broaden coverage and greatly extend unemployment benefits.

By setting up Federal standards and imposing tax penalties for noncompliance, whip into line those States whose own laws lagged behind the Federal norms.

Here is a framework for establishing a guaranteed annual income by indirection and opening doors to grave abuses. Ultimately such measures could produce a condition in which the employer had the responsibility for supporting the employee, whether he worked or not, until the Federal Government took the dependent off the company's hands with an old-age pension.

This involuntary largess would steeply increase taxes on employers while encouraging incompetents to ride free, and the unscrupulous to cheat.

Before this train of consequences is invited, we look to Congress to examine with utmost care each proposal and the whole package of proposals to be laid before it this year.

For the entire system of free, private enterprise depends upon the employer's ability to maintain a balance between efficiency and costs—a balance already sorely threatened in many cases by soaring taxes and wages. If a new set of laws is now to increase both ends of the burden—undermining efficiency while sharply raising the costs of production—the results could be ruinous.

On a Theme From Kennan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Alsop, when he is in the field, writes excellent articles from firsthand knowledge. I do not know of anyone who has put the issue in a more straightforward fashion than Mr. Alsop as he has in his February 23, 1966, column, "On a Theme From Kennan."

ON A THEME FROM KENNAN

(By Joseph Alsop)

BANGKOK.—Nearly 16 years ago, George F. Kennan, working at fever heat, dashed off his first draft of a famous policy paper. On the basis of the arguments therein set forth, President Truman made his magnificently courageous Korean decision, and a long chain reaction of Asian disasters was thus averted, albeit at heavy cost.

If one can trust the transmitted versions of Kennan's recent Senate testimony, he has by now forgotten just about all the arguments he assembled for presentation at the Korea meetings at Blair House. But with regard to this country, he is at least quoted as admitting that an American retreat and surrender in Vietnam would have an "unfortunate" effect.

"Unfortunate" is a pretty mild word for the reality. The Chinese Communist Foreign Minister, Chen Yi, has quite openly described Thailand as "next" on the agenda after Vietnam to at least one Western visitor in Peiping. And the preparations for an assault on Thailand's independence are quite plain for anyone to see.

In order to grasp the nature of these preparations, it is first of all necessary to grasp the basic facts of Thailand's geography. Briefly, the mountainous northeastern part of the country and the southern provinces on the Malay Peninsula are both fairly inaccessible from the center, and both regions have non-Thai populations.

The northeast, with its Lao and Vietnamese inhabitants, and the extreme south, with its Malays, have therefore been selected as the prime targets by the Communist planners in Peiping and Hanoi. In the southern provinces, a base was provided by the Communist guerrillas who fled into the Thai jungles after the failure of the assault on Malaya. In the northeast, the Vietnamese who fled to Thailand during the French war also offered useful human raw material.

A good deal has already been published about this Communist effort in Thailand. But its coldly calculated character has never been well conveyed. In the southern provinces, for instances, secret jungle camps were organized, where recruits from the villages were intensively trained by the refugees from the Malayan war.

Many scores of recruits from the northeastern provinces were also conveyed in secret into the parts of Laos controlled by the North Vietnamese army (from which solemn treaty obligations of course required the North Vietnamese troops to be totally withdrawn 4 years ago). A hundred or so of the most important agents were even taken by sea to Hong Kong, and thence into China, for advanced training.

In this manner, quite serious though still limited guerrilla movements have by now been organized in both the target areas. The ruthless terrorism that is such a characteristic feature of "liberation" movements, has begun on a considerable scale. In short, the pattern is clear, down to the last detail.

As of now, it is not an especially alarming pattern, since the Thai Government has organized energetic countermeasures. But let the United States take the advice of George Kennan and his friends. Let the Vietnamese war end in a retreat and a surrender. Then anyone with the smallest knowledge of Asian affairs can foresee that the effect in Thailand will be quite dramatically "unfortunate."

To be sure, Senator FULBRIGHT's antiadministration witnesses do not seem to have included many persons with any knowledge whatever of Asia. If one may judge from this distance, a good specimen witness was Prof. Hans Morgenthau, whose errors of basic historical fact concerning southeast Asia have been so crude and glaring that his pose as an expert is in the nature of a comic turn.

Yet the double standard that now prevails is still a bit bewildering. Think, for instance, of the outcry that would be heard from people of Morgenthau's stamp, if the CIA were discovered to be attempting in North Korea, or even in North Vietnam, anything comparable to what the Chinese and North Vietnamese Communists are quite openly attempting here in Thailand.

Even more bewildering, one must add, is the total carelessness of consequences and the flat refusal to face unpleasant facts. For these preparations for an attempted takeover in Thailand, please remember, are undoubted, well-established facts. And there can be no doubt that the shock of an American retreat and surrender in Vietnam would open the door wide for this attempted Communist takeover.

Hon. Fred E. Busbey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened to hear of the passing of our former colleague from Illinois, Fred E. Busbey. Mr. Busbey served with great distinction in the House for four terms and was recognized on both sides of the aisle as an extremely conscientious, knowledgeable legislator. He was also cherished for his warm personality and the genuine respect which he had for his colleagues here in the House.

During his service, Mr. Busbey represented portions of the district which I am now honored to serve. He was always respected and remembered in governmental circles and in the various communities he represented in south suburban Cook County, and his untimely passing was noted with great regret by his constituents who still considered him to be an outstanding gentleman and warm friend.

Johnson Inscrutability Sparks Flap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have wondered how the decisions at the White House are made in regard to Vietnam and perhaps the attached column by Charles Bartlett, which was published in the Evening Star of February 21, sheds some light on the methods used by this administration in arriving at their decisions, especially the operation followed by the President.

Johnson Inscrutability Sparks Flap

(By Charles Bartlett)

President Johnson would agree with Sophocles that "quick decisions are unsafe decisions" but the long uncertainty on his strategy for the next phase in Vietnam is responsible for generating the flap which has enlivened the Senate and unsettled the country.

The decisions have now been made and the flap will soon subside. But the uncertainty, stirred by the bombing pause, by the jet flights of the President's emissaries, and by signs that the war may be expanded if it cannot be negotiated, has somehow scarred and presumably weakened Johnson's leadership.

His rapport with the public, Congress, his own officials, and the press has been diminished by the inscrutable isolation in which he has labored to reach his conclusions. If his decisions prove to be sound, the damage done by his methods of reaching them will disappear.

Inscrutability is the earmark of this style. Summoning Robert McNamara, McGeorge Bundy, and Dean Rusk to Texas on November 11, the President asked each man to examine the usefulness of a bombing pause. When they met again on December 7, they thrashed through the pros and cons of the step. Johnson, by one count, asked 176 questions. As the meeting broke up, Bundy said to Bill Moyers, "I'll bet you $5 that he'll never go for it."

The President maintained his ambiguity down to the day on which the Pope gave him an opening to prolong the Christmas lull. He had special polls taken to learn where the public stood. He talked to friends outside the administration like Abe Fortas, Clark Clifford and Arthur Dean. But no one, even at close range, could be certain where he was headed.

This exercise is hard on officials. The President questions them severely, often unpleasantly, to shake their advocacy. He tries to get them off balance by misleading them on his own attitude. He is prone to call them late at night or when they are resting on weekends.

The relentless process is so informal that no one is certain where it begins or ends. Three weeks ago those at the top level of Government believed that Johnson was set to escalate his bombing to hit crucial targets near Hanoi and Haiphong and to increase his troop force in South Vietnam to 400,000 men. Today the more dramatic targets have apparently been eliminated from his bombing plans and the signs point to a lesser troop buildup, perhaps to no more than 300,000 men.

A terrible vacuum is created by the absolute isolation in which Johnson makes decisions like these. He doesn't bring his own people along except by the halter of official loyalty. Deprived of guidance from the President or his officials, Congress and the press are left to flounder in uncertainty, a state which leaves them little poise.

No President has found a way to satiate Congress' eagerness to be consulted on key decisions. John Kennedy stirred indignation by convening all the leaders in Washington before he announced the Cuban missile crisis. He asked for their judgments but he made the mistake of letting them realize that he had already decided what to do. Lyndon Johnson has briefed, wined, and flattere the Members of Congress but he still cannot share with them his right to decide.

Johnson's decisionmaking process would gain shape and dignity and even glamour if it were more formally tied to the National Security Council or to the Kennedy offshoot, the top-level informal grouping known as Ex-Comm. There is an aura about deliberations by these Olympian bodies which breeds confidence in the decisions that emerge from them.

Johnson is unlikely however to change his style. He does not like large meetings. He suspects that they foster hyprocisy and he knows that they breed leaks. The Kennedy-Johnson era has reduced the National Security Council apparatus to a highly fluid state, which seems likely to persist.

One change is in the offing. The President feels now that the war's course has been set and that the time has come to handle it as an affair that must be managed efficiently into the future and not as a crisis problem centered in the White House. This means a man to run it and a more formal approach to its conduct. This step could help to stabilize the atmosphere.

Social Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which would provide for social security increases based on factors combining increases in the cost of living and the gross national product.

I have long urged humanization of our social security system. The benefits we pay are just not enough. Sometimes the Congress just cannot keep up with changing needs.

My proposal is that we link social security benefits to both increases in the cost of living and increases in the gross national product. The link to increases in the cost of living is obviously important to insure that our senior citizens are not hurt by inflation and declining purchasing power. I don't believe it is enough just to guarantee senior citizens the status quo in purchasing power.

I want to go beyond a cost-of-living rise. I want to have social security annuitants share in the American boom. I want them to share in the soaring American economy of the space age. The work they did in the thirties, the forties, and the fifties is an inseparable part of the soaring sixties. We should not forget our senior citizens. They laid the foundations for our present economic level.

The best way to have senior citizens share in the prosperity they helped create above and beyond maintaining their purchasing power is to link social security pensions to the rise in the gross national product. The factor I would use is a 1-percent social security rise for every 2-percent increase in the gross national product. This is because not all of the GNP translates into purchasing power increases for our people.

I think that humanization of our social security structure along the lines of my legislation is an important aspect of creating a brave new tomorrow.

President Has the Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, in an excellent column appearing in the February 22, 1966, Washington Evening Star, pointed out clearly the difference between critics who appear to have missed the main point in Vietnam discussions and the President who has the responsibility for acting.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this reflective column by David Lawrence.

Critics Seem To Miss Main Point

(By David Lawrence)

Recent hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—particularly the comprehensive statements by the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk—produced questions and answers which undoubtedly clarified the thinking of many citizens about the Vietnam war. The critics, however, appear to have missed the main point, which is that a President has the responsibility for acting on the basis of information available to him at the moment of decision.

The President has at his side Cabinet officers and military men. Always at hand are up-to-the-minute reports from our representatives abroad—Ambassadors and intelligence personnel, civilian and military. It is easy enough for a Senator to come out, for example, with the advice that bombing shouldn't have been resumed after the recent truce. Such a critic cannot know all the facts, and, moreover, he doesn't have the responsibility for making the decision itself. If the critic is wrong, no serious harm is done. But the President is every minute responsible to the people and a mistake on his part could be fatal.

Johnson happens to be a master politician and knows very well that it's popular to call for an ending of the war, as some Senators are doing. But he knows also that to give the enemy what it wants would only lead to a larger war. Statesmen have been fooled by appeasement before. Johnson can't take chances. That's why reckless critics appear unwittingly to be giving comfort to the enemy and causing its resistance to be prolonged.

Criticism of domestic policy is one thing, but criticism of foreign policy is quite different. Almost everybody, for instance, knows the meaning of an internal policy, and the disputes are not likely to prove dangerous to the immediate life of the Nation. But foreign policy sometimes involves the risk of losing some lives in order to forestall a larger conflict in which sacrifices would be enormous.

No President would ever purposely or deliberately lead the American people into a large war. But misguided and careless critics can help to do it. They have a feeling that there's no harm in airing their views, sometimes to satisfy exhibitionist tendencies. They regard as a mere exercise in academic debate the discussion of ways and means of getting out of the war at any price. The enemy, however, construes this as a sign of weakness and irresoluteness.

The President has been firm, but cautious. In the main, he has upheld the principles for which America fought two world wars and the Korean war. The "peace offensive," for example, which he undertook has been sneered at by some of the critics as mere showmanship. Yet, it has had a good effect. The other nations of the world, large and small, are now slowly but surely veering toward the American viewpoint and are beginning to ask themselves what they can do to help, even though it might in some cases be token aid.

On the whole, the United States is making progress, both in the war and in the mobilization of world opinion. Captious criticism at home encourages the enemy to think the American people are not behind their President. Maybe it is time, after all, for a "vote of confidence." And Congress can do this by reaffirming the joint resolution passed in August 1964. This authorized the President to use whatever armed forces are necessary to safeguard the freedom and independence of a nation which is under the protection of the Southeast Asia Treaty. The resolution was overwhelmingly ratified by both houses of Congress with only two dissenting votes.

American foreign policy has had its setbacks. But it still stands for the concept of a universal alliance of peoples, based on the right of each nation to determine its own form of government and to be immune from aggression. If this principle is stanchly maintained in southeast Asia, the Americans who have been lost in the wars of the last half century will not have died in vain.

Commemorate Armenian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commemorate the 45th anniversary of the revolt of the Armenian people against the Soviet Union. In 1921, there was an uprising in Armenia against the Soviets who had a few months earlier taken the country into protective custody, so to speak. Unfortunately, the strength of the uprising was not sufficient to overcome Soviet power and it failed. Since then, Armenia has been subject to the rule of the U.S.S.R.

It is always unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, when the aspirations of any people for self-government are denied expression. Surely in a democracy, we must always salute the efforts of those who seek freedom and mourn any failures which occur. In that spirit, I join my fellow Congressmen in commemorating the 45th anniversary of the Armenian uprising and in looking forward to the day when self-determination will be a reality for all peoples.

Pushing Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Wyoming [Mr. Roncalio], has distinguished himself in his home State as a leader to provide recreation areas for the growing numbers of tourists. Such leadership is important not only from a standpoint of economic interest, but also as relief to the already overcrowded conditions which existing parks and recreation areas are experiencing. There is a growing awareness, I am sure, in Wyoming, as well as my home State of Wisconsin, of the desirability of preserving for future generations a small part of natural and historic areas.

Recently the Casper Star-Tribune commended Congressman Roncalio for his leadership in this field. To acquaint all Members of this body with that endorsement, under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial at this point in the Record.

Pushing Recreation

Representative Teno Roncalio hopes for favorable action at the coming session of Congress on four pieces of legislation which he has introduced with the objective of advancing Wyoming recreational interests.

Roncalio reports that the House Interior Committee is considering his bills to establish the Big Horn national recreation area, Flaming Gorge national recreation area and to make South Pass City a national historic site and Fossil Butte in Lincoln County a national monument.

Proposals for the two recreation areas should face no great obstacles, since they are tied in with water development and already have been considerably advanced. Efforts to establish the national historic site and national monument conceivably could run into some delay although they have much to recommend them.

"Wyoming has already garnered a good share of the recreation traffic," Roncalio says. "The 1964 statistics reveal 538,000 visits to camp grounds in Wyoming, 230,000 visits to hotels and resorts, 42,000 visits to recreational residences, including summer cabins and dude ranches, and 50,000 visits to wilderness areas, compared to 43,000 for Utah, 48,000 for Montana, and 53,000 for Colorado."

Persons who live in Wyoming may not require the statistics, since the importance of tourism and recreation is evident on every hand. Any steps which can be taken toward expansion of facilities will be welcomed.

The Other Side of the Coin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have been somewhat surprised at the statements that have been made either in press conferences or on the floor of the Senate with reference to Vietnam.

I attach herewith an excellent article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak dated Wednesday, February 23, 1966. This article probably should be entitled, "The Other Side of the Coin."

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The ironic aspect of Senator Robert F. Kennedy's stunning, self-damaging break with President Johnson on Vietnam is the fact it was precisely what he has been seeking to avoid.

Kennedy had not wanted a complete break with the administration on this key issue. Thus, it came as a shock to his own inner circle that he is now alined on the extreme edge of the Senate peace bloc for proposing a Saigon government with Communist participation—that is, a coalition government. The fine print on pledging guarantees to block a complete Communist takeover was lost in the shuffle.

Here then is one of those rarities of big league politics: A major miscalculation with long-range ramifications. For even if Kennedy did not intend to go into open opposition against the President, he has done so nonetheless. "This is something we'll have to live with for a long time," asserts a Kennedy intimate.

Barely 2 weeks ago, Kennedy was strenuously avoiding intimate identification with the peace Democrats. He toned down antiwar references proposed for his speeches by peace-oriented young staffers. He refused to condemn resumption of bombing in North Vietnam. His reasons were multiple.

Basically, Kennedy is not in tune with key precepts of the peace movement. He does not see the U.S. commitment in Vietnam as a blunder (and to do so would repudiate the foreign policy of John F. Kennedy). Nor does he view U.S. bombings as immoral.

Moreover, unlike many peace Democrats, Kennedy realizes that strident Washington opposition to the war encourages Communist belief that decadent Americans won't or can't stick it out. In a recent private interview, Kennedy disabused Soviet United Nations Ambassador Nikolai Federenko of any notion that the Democratic Party is divided into a Johnson wing (prowar) and a Kennedy wing (antiwar).

But watching last week's Foreign Relations Committee hearing as a spectator, Kennedy decided everybody was missing the point: That the Communist Vietcong, under growing pressure from Peiping, never would negotiate unless assured of participation in a new South Vietnam Government.

Still hoping to steer clear of the peace bloc, Kennedy made his statement at a press conference—not on the Senate floor, where peace Senators could heap encomiums on him.

Kennedy and his friends failed to realize that his procoalition stand was more extreme than the public position of peace Senators (even though many in the peace bloc, but not Kennedy, would like to bug out of Vietnam tomorrow.) "Bobby's out in front of all of us now," one delighted peace Democrat told us.

Another KENNEDY misconception was the belief that defining terms of negotiations might help the State Department by saying what they would like to say but couldn't.

On the contrary, State Department policymakers view a coalition government as the worst of all options in Vietnam and the sure highway to Communist control. Moreover, some officials now fear KENNEDY's statement has made the Communists even more insistent on a coalition as a minimum condition for negotiations.

This is why old colleagues from New Frontier days like White House aid McGeorge Bundy and Under Secretary of State George Ball flatly and immediately disavowed the KENNEDY statement—disavowals that stunned KENNEDY aids.

If KENNEDY has gained because of the incident, the gain seems marginal—among peace Democrats who were leaning toward him anyway.

On the debit side, bitter words are being said by old friends in Washington. He is privately accused of seeking headlines, undermining U.S. foreign policy, and dividing his party. How widespread or how lasting this immediate reaction will be outside Washington remains to be seen.

But it points up a political fact about KENNEDY: His need to play the role of critic, even when it serves no apparent political purpose. What he sometimes forgets is that his voice carries farther abroad than all the peace bloc put together and, as such, must be used with restraint.

Vets Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the appreciation of the public for the heroic service being performed by our men in uniform in Vietnam is an inspiring development. Under leave to insert in the RECORD, I offer an article by Mr. Joe Martin, an official of the Department of Illinois American Legion who contributes a weekly column to the Oak Lawn Independent of Oak Lawn, Ill.

VETS PRESS

(By Joe Martin)

Bitter fighting is only one side of the struggle in Vietnam. With inspiring selflessness, American soldiers are carrying on their own aid programs in countless hamlets and villages—practical hard-work projects to lessen the hardships of the Vietnamese people. Just as inspiring is the eagerness of Americans back home to support this spontaneous civic action work.

War is never fair. The war in Vietnam is no exception. Some soldiers will die while others will live. Some will spend a year of their lives in Vietnam—separated from their families and daily facing a treacherous enemy.

Other soldiers, serving far from the jungle war zones of that war-weary republic, will endure none of these hazards.

It is to these soldiers that the Army's Chief of Staff, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, spoke in his recent message to the Army. "We should show our pride in our comrades there," he said, "by doing our tasks with equal diligence and by standing ready to acquit ourselves as they do."

General Johnson called on the Army "to display the same sacrifice, sense of urgency, and responsiveness which are prevalent there. This is not the time for a 'business as usual approach.' "

The Chief of Staff's words would be applicable to any war. But they are more important than usual to the men behind the lines in the war in Vietnam. Unlike the Revolutionary War, our homes are not being burned. Unlike World War II, there are neither blackouts nor rationing to bring the hardship of war to the homefront. In our comfort it is easy to forget that our comrades are dying.

Although we are not on the frontlines, the job we do counts in the battle they are fighting. The life of a frontline soldier may depend directly on whether an officer in the Pentagon planned correctly or a civilian at a logistics installation quickly filled a requisition. It is no time for a do-it-tomorrow attitude.

Even if our job does not directly support the Army in Vietnam, it is important indirectly. For in doing a good job, we build a worldwide bulwark of strength against Communist aggression. With a strong Army in Korea, in Berlin, and wherever we face an implacable foe across a wall or a zone of truce, the Communists will not be lulled into the belief that Vietnam has lessened our guard at other crossings on freedom's frontier.

It is not a time for the long coffee break or the sloppy job. It is time to remember that the job we are doing—no matter where we are doing it—counts on the frontlines in Vietnam.

Prized letters in Vietnam are those addressed to "Any GI" or "A Soldier in Vietnam." It's good will mail from the United States and it numbers in the thousands of letters each day at the Army's 1st Infantry Division centered near Di An. The mail is divided evenly among the division's units and surprised troops have opened letters from their hometowns, even from their old schools. But no one has topped the coincidence by Sfc. Arthur E. Long of C Company, 26th Infantry. The Junction City, Kans., man was handed a letter addressed to "Our Fellow Dogface Soldier in Vietnam." The writer: Long's 11-year-old daughter, Sharon.

The Excise Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress considered the question of removing certain excise taxes, I offered my wholehearted support, having introduced a bill to eliminate Federal excise taxes on communication services that would have infused an estimated $4 billion into our economy in the first year of operation.

I supported this measure in the firm belief that Americans would rather see revenue made available by other means—by the resultant increased revenue from sales taxes or personal income taxes. This is especially true of the excise tax on telephone services and automobiles. The fact that these taxes require the greatest sacrifice from those lower income groups least able to meet this sacrifice made me most enthusiastic about seeing the telephone and automobile taxes removed. In the hope that savings would be passed on to consumers, giving a solid boost to the economy, I voted for the massive cuts in excise taxes.

Now this same Congress is being asked to restore the tax on automobiles and telephone services without taking any action on those taxes on furs, jewelry, cabarets and night clubs, television sets, sporting goods, and other more properly termed "luxury items."

If additional revenue is required, why do we not turn to the untouched tax cuts on these less essential items?

I cannot in good conscience vote against a measure I cosponsored a year ago when the same good reasons for eliminating communications taxes still exist.

At a time when our Nation is being asked to exert every effort to finance our commitment in South Vietnam—at a time when the school milk program for our Nation's youth is being reduced in the name of economy, it is inconceivable that the excise tax on mink coats will not be restored.

Because the Congress is being asked to undo what was the greatest service in the recent excise tax cut, without similar action on the least necessary of cuts, I must vote against this restoration.

If sacrifice is what is required, let us ask it of those who are best equipped to make that sacrifice.

Unless amended, therefore, to reflect what I believe to be just, I am opposed to this bill.

The Long View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, February is a month for recalling Abraham Lincoln and the unpopular war he had on his hands, Ralph McGill in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin reminded us recently.

He wrote:

> In our time President Johnson earnestly wishes peace. He is, among other things, a pragmatic man. War is not good for politics. It costs too much. It erodes domestic programs.
>
> But in the President's deliberations there also is present an invisible principle. Lincoln knew that in the long view the Union had to be preserved. President Johnson feels that in the long view the national security forbids that southeast Asia and India be turned over to Communist China.

The analogy will be of interest to many of my colleagues and with this in mind I am inserting the McGill article to which I have referred in the RECORD:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, Feb. 15, 1966]

MR. LINCOLN'S WAR

(By Ralph McGill)

ATLANTA.—February, the first half of it at any rate, belongs to Lincoln. We think of him and the massive burdens that rested on his stooped, bony shoulders. And, we think, also, of whatever man it is who happens to be in the White House each February 12.

Lincoln had, in 1865, an unpopular war on his hands. He, too, was subjected to demonstrations and protests, to hostile and critical churchmen, Senators, and Congressmen. Delegations came to see him. He was plagued by editors and columnists of that time. The "worst" of these was Horace Greeley, the leading and most influential voice.

Greeley and the protesting delegations wanted peace. The war was going badly. It had gone wrong almost from the start 3 years before. There were peace delegations in 1865. Georgia's Alexander Stephens, a shrunken, frail man who was Confederate Vice President, led such a delegation to Hampton Roads, Va. There, on a steamer moored in the river, they met with Lincoln and U. S. Grant. The day was February 3, 1865. The "peace movement" had long been harassing the President. Congress was wavering. The waters of public opinion were muddled.

DAVIS PREVAILED

Back in Richmond, Jefferson Davis, who looked like John C. Calhoun and had too much of that man's thinking in his mind, had misread northern public opinion. He believed there was such a demand for peace in the North that the Lincoln administration could not much longer stand against it.

Stephens, however, went to the meeting in a depressed state of mind, raging within himself at Jefferson Davis. Stephens knew Lincoln of old. They had served in the House together. Stephens and his peace commission were bound. They would agree to an armistice only if independence and slavery were assured of acceptance.

Lincoln and Grant listened. (Invisible, but present, sat the principle of "Union" and an end to human beings held as slaves.) There is a strong legend that Lincoln at one time held out a sheet of paper to his old friend Stephens, whom he trusted, and said in essence something like this:

"Alex, write 'Union' on here and sign it and I will sign it and you can fill in all other terms." (Stephens was bound by Davis. From that time on he was so harsh a critic of Jefferson Davis that some historians have sought to excuse his more violent conclusions as arising out of a deranged mind.)

PACED CORRIDORS

Lincoln went back to Washington. He did not realize the end of the war was so near. Peace delegations continued to arrive. The tall patient man, troubled by the casualties and the critics, paced the White House corridors at night in his flannel nightshirt and worn carpet slippers.

Sometimes he complained in a patient way of the demonstrators—laymen, ministers, petitions from churches, editorials from Greeley, "deputies and platoons" of protest committees. Once he said they all seemed to know what the will of God was save him. As for himself, he felt it most unlikely that, since he, the President, most earnestly wished to know the will of God, a merciful God would reveal it to everyone else—except him.

In our time President Johnson earnestly wishes peace. He is, among other things, a pragmatic man. War is not good for politics. It costs too much. It erodes domestic programs.

But in the President's deliberations there also is present an invisible principle. Lincoln knew that in the long view the Union had to be preserved. President Johnson feels that in the long view the national security forbids that southeast Asia and India be turned over to Communist China.

Who Flipped?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Springfield, Mo., Leader-Press carried an excellent editorial entitled "Who Flipped?"

The editorial very ably answers its own question. It seems to be typical of the President to lose interest and support for any program which does not bear the L.B.J. label, so that additional funds can be poured into such gigantic "give away" programs such as the "War on Poverty," which are truly "L.B.J. all the way."

The school milk programs have been an outstanding success. It has materially reduced milk surpluses, and has furnished nourishment for our most precious resource—our children—many of whom would have gone without, had it not been for this program.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

WHO FLIPPED?

President Johnson has demonstrated at times that he can wield a wicked ax when it comes to budget hacking. Yet—and it seems almost incredibly paradoxical to some Americans—he also can ladle lavishly from the public purse when it comes to promoting his Great Society.

Now in his recommended budget slashes for the school milk and school lunch programs, it appears the President has confused the ax and the ladle—or perhaps he confused the programs.

Both of these programs were instituted years ago, primarily with two ideas in mind: to help the price-oppressed farmer; and to provide milk and hot lunches to tens of thousands of children who otherwise would not get them.

The success of the programs was far greater even than anticipated. Surplus foods acquired by the Federal Government in farm price support programs were utilized; and some of the great milk surplus then suffered was drained away, helping dairymen who were producing at prices actually below production costs. But the greatest, farthest-reaching, most surprising benefits were to the children themselves.

Children, whose parents could afford it, paid for their lunches; those less fortunate were fed along with the others, and perhaps only a few persons were the wiser. There was no shame for the child, little stigma of charity, and tens of thousands received hot, attractive, well-balanced meals they otherwise would never have known. Surprisingly, even children from families of better means were, in the main, better fed, since their lunch money no longer went for sweets.

The milk program may have been even better, for children who had balked at milk at home learned to like and demand it, as did other children who seldom had milk at home because of the cost. Uncle Sam bore half the cost of the milk; the child, the rest. But if there were children who couldn't afford even that mite, schools usually provided funds to see that they weren't slighted.

Here were two related programs that drew no political fire; almost everybody liked them.

But the economy-minded Mr. Johnson has proposed that $19 million be trimmed from the school lunch program funds, and that the school milk appropriation be whacked from $103 million to $21 million—this is the face of tremendous gains in school populations.

Also, the President has recommended that the children receiving such help meet a "means test," that is, that they must be qualified as "poor" to receive milk and school lunches.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, said last week he could see no sense in seeking "new and unproven" social welfare programs at the expense of tried and true ones. The Republican indicated he would fight the budget slash for the programs.

And from his own party, the President has found other critics. Wisconsin's two Democratic Senators have been quite critical; Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE is waging almost daily warfare against the proposed cuts, both in speeches and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Senator GAYLORD NELSON slaps at the poor certification requirements and questions if any other program in welfare has been so popular and so cheap, relatively.

That is unquestionable, too, for about 17 million youngsters daily share in a program that means much to them, yet costs less than $100 million a year.

When Mr. Johnson viewed his proposals as sound economy, it must have been on a night he'd flipped one too many switches in the White House.

Blizzard Heroics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, in many areas of upstate New York we had a snow storm recently that will not be forgotten by those who experienced it. There were many episodes of exceptional public service, neighborly help, and outright heroism as citizens struggled to restore normal conditions to their communities.

A report of one of these episodes was recently made in the Upstate News of the New York Telephone Co., and a copy has been brought to my attention. It is a report of the efforts of telephone servicemen to restore service to a small community in the 37th Congressional District which was cut off from the other communities when a major connecting cable snapped in the high winds.

The report follows:

THEY HELPED KEEP BYRON ON THE MAP

BATAVIA.—One of the territory's outstanding service jobs during the recent record storm was carried out by a team of four Batavia plant men—Splicers George Johnson and Chick Majerus, Communications Serviceman Jim Laney and Switchman Bob Krantz.

During the brunt of the blizzard on the morning of January 31, the small community of Byron was cut off from the outside world when the storm broke an aerial cable between Byron and Batavia. Although they had no outside connections, the town's 1,200 residents were able to call one another and maintain contact with local police and fire departments.

Working out of the Batavia central office, Switchman Bob Krantz located the approximate source of trouble by testing lines and trunks.

Meanwhile, Splicers George Johnson and Chick Majerus, alerted to possible cable trouble, started their day about 6 a.m., trying to extricate a line truck from a snowbound company garage in Batavia. Once they got the truck rolling they were joined by two county snowplows and their crews, "riding range" along the aerial cable route to Byron. Both men were aware of several spots where high winds could have snapped the cable.

Testing cable as they fought shoulder-high drifts and howling winds, they came to a standstill when the plows broke down about 4 miles out of Batavia.

To carry on the fight, a rotary plow was dispatched from Batavia. The crew then managed to inch through the storm to the suspected point of trouble. There they found winds had snapped the aerial cable, severing trunk connections in and out of Byron.

Working as best they could in the blinding storm, the team made the necessary cable repairs. Communications Serviceman Jim Laney joined them at this point and they proceeded into Byron behind the plow to check on other possible trouble spots. Jim Laney went to work in the Byron office, testing with Bob Krantz in Batavia to make sure splices were paired correctly.

By 3:45 p.m. trunkline service was restored to Byron. The men continued, however, to check and strengthen other cable equipment that might be affected because of the severity of the storm.

Once service was back to normal, they left Byron about 2 a.m. for the return trip to Batavia. As the storm grew worse they were stalled on the road and took refuge in a nearby highway department garage. Here they waited until 6 a.m.—just short of 24 hours since they had left Batavia the day before—until highway crews came by and cleared a route for them back to town.

Other Batavia employees who gave a big hand during the cable failure were Jess Adams, Bob Kent, Dick Mazur, Dick Sheelar and Paul Southwell.

Hon. Fred Ernst Busbey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn of the sudden death of my very dear friend Fred Ernst Busbey, who represented the Third District of Illinois in the U.S. House of Representatives in the 78th, 80th, 82d, and 83d Congresses.

Fred Busbey was born in Tuscola, Douglas County, Ill., in 1895. He attended Armour Institute of Technology in Chicago, and Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill. He spent the majority of his life in Chicago where he was engaged in the investment brokerage business until his retirement in 1958 when he moved to Cocoa Beach in Florida.

Mr. Busbey was active in the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars programs, especially in Americanism and the fight against communism. As a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Congressman Busbey was labeled as a militant foe of communism.

Fred Busbey's dominant thought was the welfare of the Nation. He was always an eager and able participant in the legislative proceedings in the House of Representatives and was held in the highest esteem by his colleagues.

Mrs. Murphy, as well as the many friends in the Third Congressional District, joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Busbey and family in their great hour of grief.

The Typical American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, in the January 1966 issue of the Tennessee magazine, published monthly as an educational and informative service to members of the rural electric cooperatives in Tennessee, Editor John E. Stanford discussed the traits possessed by the "typical" American, in his column, "To the Point."

With wit and perception, Mr. Stanford notes some of the habits which mark us and our fellow Americans, and I believe that my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD will thoroughly enjoy this analysis.

TO THE POINT

(By John E. Stanford)

It isn't likely to be argued before the Supreme Court or debated in the United Nations, but we think that one of the reasons that our country has succeeded for almost 200 years as a nation lies in the fact that Americans, at one extreme, are as willing to point fun at themselves as they are, at the other extreme, to point guns at those who deprive us of our way of life.

It is with a view toward this first extreme—with no less fervent hope that the second extreme will diminish and crease in a true spirit of world peace—that we have accumulated a list of "traits" which are said to be identifiable with "typical" Americans.

A typical American is a fellow who has just driven home from an Italian movie in his German car, is sitting on Danish furniture, drinking Brazilian coffee out of an English china cup, writing a letter on Irish linen paper with a Japanese ball point pen—complaining to his Congressman about too much Amrican gold going overseas.

He yells for the Government to balance the budget, then takes the last dime he has to make the down payment on his car.

He whips the enemy nations, then gives them the shirt off his back.

He yells for speed laws that will stop fast driving and then won't buy a car if it won't make 100 miles an hour.

He gripes about the high prices of things he has to buy, but he gripes still more about the low prices of things he has to sell.

He knows the lineup of every baseball team in the American and National leagues but he doesn't know half the words in "The Star-Spangled Banner."

An American will get mad at his wife for not running their home with the efficiency of a hotel, and then he'll get mad at a hotel for not operating like a home.

He'll spend half a day looking for vitamin pills to make him live longer, then drive 90 miles an hour on slick pavement to make up for the time he has lost.

An American is a man who will fall out with his wife over her cooking and then go on a fishing trip and swallow half-fried potatoes, burned fish and gritty creek-water coffee made in a rusty gallon can and think it is good.

He will work hard on a farm so that he can move into town where he can make more money so that he can move back to the farm.

He is the only fellow in the world who will pay 50 cents to park his car while he eats a 25-cent sandwich.

When an American is in the office he talks about football, baseball, or fishing, and when he is out at the games or on the lake, he talks about business.

An American likes to cuss his government, but he gets fighting mad when a foreigner does it.

We're in the country that has more food to eat than any other country in the world, and more diets to keep us from eating it.

We're supposed to be the most civilized nation on earth, yet we can't deliver a payroll without an armored car.

In America we have more experts on marriage than any other country in the world—and more divorces.

But all in all, we're rather nice people. Calling a person a "real American" is one of the very nicest compliments that you can pay him. Most of the world is itching for what we have, but they will never have it until they start scratching for it the way we did. And they'll never enjoy American-type humor until they can laugh among—and at—themselves.

Happy New Year, fellow Americans.

Keep Small Communities Alive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I always welcome an opportunity to call attention to new industry in Wyoming, particularly when its operation gives indication of the vast potential of the State's attractive natural and business climate.

Just this week, I had occasion to distribute to visitors in my office samples of Wyoming cheese, handiwork of a flourishing dairy industry in Torrington.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of this new dairy plant in Wyoming is the guiding philosophy of Einer Pedersen, general manager and treasurer of Wyoming Dairy Foods, Inc.

Pedersen has given much thought to the development and growth of small communities and has said:

> It is important to keep the small community alive, and the way to do it is to develop homegrown industry that these communities can handle.

Naturally, there are limitations to the industry a small community can handle, but certainly the possibilities in agriculture-related industries have not been fully developed. The admirable growth record of Wyoming Dairy Foods Inc. is ample proof that a local community, working largely with local capital, can establish a solid, homegrown industry.

Wyoming Dairy Foods, Inc., is a comparative newcomer to the State scene, having begun operation in May of 1964 with a total complement of three employees. Within 16 months, it had advanced to a staff of 23 with an annual payroll of $70,000—a boost to the economy of Torrington and the entire State.

The extraordinary product has won a reputation from coast to coast for its distinctive taste.

The secret processes for Runesten, Wyoming Gold and Snowy Range cheese are stored in the corporation vault and in the mind of their originator, Mr. Pedersen, whose experience in cheesemaking dates from his native Denmark where he studied dairy bacteriology first at the University of Denmark, then as an exchange student at the University of Minnesota.

In 1933, Pedersen won his bachelor of science degree and soon entered the cheese business in Minnesota and then South Dakota. He first visited Wyoming in 1939 and went into the dairy business, moving to Cody where he developed his Runesten, a cheese he describes as "the Danish version of swiss cheese."

Pedersen moved to Torrington in 1964 where he and other Wyoming residents formed Wyoming Dairy Foods, Inc. Here he developed his Wyoming Gold and Snowy Range varieties. He says Wyoming Gold is excellent for cooking and Snowy Range "a fine sandwich filler and good with pumpernickel."

Perhaps the most unique product is the cheese stick—about 4 inches long and 1 inch square, covered with a protective wax coating and available in all three varieties. This is such a popular item that the Torrington plant is unable to keep up with orders.

An estimated 50,000 pounds of milk is processed a day at Wyoming Dairy Foods and on a peak day as much as 3 tons of cheese have been made.

Mr. Speaker, Wyoming is proud of Mr. Pedersen, the good people of Wyoming who have invested in this homegrown industry, and his fine product. Wyoming Dairy Foods has done more than demonstrate Wyoming's dairy potential—it serves as a living example of the strength and promise of our smaller communities. The example merits the attention of other small communities who are determined not only to stay alive—but grow.

Upward Bound—A Program of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exciting and promising aspects of the war against poverty is "Upward Bound"—a program which seeks to rescue disadvantaged but intellectually capable youth from the grip of poverty by preparing them for college. Youngsters selected for this program are placed with participating colleges and universities during the summer months. By summer's end, after weeks of intensive tutoring, the student faces a vastly expanded area of opportunity—in a word, he or she is truly upward bound.

Last summer, when the program was operating on a pilot basis, 18 colleges and 2,100 students participated. In the fall, the program continued on 9 campuses with 1,600 students participating. This summer, 20,000 youngsters will be enrolled at 150 colleges and universities. The story of Upward Bound is told in an article by Ruth Montgomery which appeared in the February 9 edition of the Baltimore News American. I commend it to the attention of the House:

"UPWARD BOUND" SHRIVER GOAL FOR 20,000 STUDENTS—PAYOFF IS EDUCATION

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—Twenty thousand disadvantaged high school kids will be upward bound next summer, with their sights newly set on a college education, if a $20 million gamble pays off.

Upward Bound is the name of one of the shiniest projects in Sargent Shriver's bag of tricks for licking poverty.

A sort of Headstart program for teenagers, it is aimed chiefly at 10th- and 11th-graders in the lower scholastic levels, who because of poor environment had never lifted their horizons enough even to consider going on to college.

Its director is Richard T. Frost, who has just relinquished the vice-presidency of upperclass Reed College in Oregon to test his hunch that "edgy, feisty kids" from slums and downtrodden rural areas can develop into community leaders if opportunity knocks hard enough.

Project Upward Bound began as a pilot program last summer, with about 2,100 teenagers from underprivileged Negro and white homes. These, in Frost's words, were "kids lacking in motivation who, in the judgment of some teachers, nevertheless had enough spark to hack it in college."

On 18 college campuses they underwent some "extensively beefed up tutoring in reading, writing, and arithmetic." They were exposed for the first time to such cultural activities as theater, music and art, and were persuaded that despite their lack of self-confidence they had organizational ability.

All expenses were paid while on campus. In addition, they received $10 a week pocket money, and such medical benefits as eyeglasses or hearing aids.

Fifteen hundred of them are now freshmen in college, and Frost ruefully admits that "I wake up at night wondering how they're doing." As an experiment three universities are offering further tutoring to the guinea pigs, but most are trying to make it under their own steam.

Frost, who had been experimenting with such a program at Reed College before joining Sargent Shriver's poverty program, thinks a summer's tutoring for such underprivileged high school graduates is insufficient to see them through a competitive freshman year at college.

He is consequently recommending to 150 participating colleges that they concentrate on 10th and 11th graders this summer, and follow through with tutorage during the remainder of their high school work. The tutors in most cases would be university enrollees in another poverty program called work study, who need part-time jobs to stay in college.

Recruiting will begin in April for the 20,000 high school students who will get upward bound training on college campuses next summer. Their expenses will be paid, plus a $10 weekly stipend.

If they later go on to college, as hoped, they must rely on other props which Uncle Sam is providing through the poverty program. These include Federal scholarships, Federal loans, and the work-study program. Frost said that all three projects—jobs, loans, and grants—are being tapped simultaneously by most students from poor families who go to college.

Frost has a hunch that educators are only beginning to learn how to cope with "disadvantaged" teenagers, whose background is such that no member of their family or community ever went to college. He cites this incident as an example:

A Negro student from a city slum attended upward bound classes at Reed College last summer, but deliberately turned his chair backward to the teacher. This rudeness was ignored, and as the weeks passed he gradually inched it around, until toward the end of the course he was avidly participating in class discussions.

Frost hopes that the program, "by giving kids a taste of college campus life," will help other high school students to realize that the road to higher paying jobs is a university education.

He thinks the sight of once indifferent students carrying books home to study may even inspire others to realize that there's something to be gained by book learning. At at any rate Unicle Sam is now up to his elbows in the high school educational field, which until recently considered the exclusive province of communities.

On a 4-Year Term for Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the President's recommendation to change the term of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years has caused considerable discussion throughout the Nation.

Public hearings are being held by the Committee on the Judiciary on the proposed amendment to the Constitution. This is a vital matter which should be fully debated, not on in the Halls of Congress but by the people across the country.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly news reports to constituents of the Kansas 4th Congressional District and two pertinent editorials—one published by the Newton Kansan, and another by the Wichita Beacon.

I commend these editorials to my colleagues.

CONGRESSMAN SHRIVER'S WEEKLY NEWS REPORT, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

The President has recommended an amendment to the Constitution which would change the term of a Congressman from 2 to 4 years.

This is not a new proposal. From 1789 to 1960 there were 120 proposals introduced in

Congress to change the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives. Two-thirds of those resolutions called for a 4-year term for House Members.

Legislation was again introduced early in 1965 to extend the congressional term. None of these proposals have seen the light of day.

However, the President's recommendation has prompted new interest, and there is the promise of committee hearings. The proposal has stimulated a healthy discussion, both pro and con, throughout the Nation.

During my 18 years of legislative service, I have learned something about both 2- and 4-year terms. I held 2-year terms in the Kansas House and am serving my third 2-year term in the U.S. House of Representatives. Prior to coming to Congress, I served two 4-year terms in the Kansas Senate.

The 4-year term does offer certain advantages. It permits more time to work on legislation. It gives continuity to the legislative process. It reduces the time necessary to campaign for reelection.

However, the major concern here should not be for the Representative. The central questions should be: Would such a change really provide more effective representation for the people? Would it mean better government? Would it strengthen the legislative process?

One of the principal objections to the President's proposal is that the congressional term would run concurrently with the presidential term. A Congress elected on the presidential coattails would tend to be a rubber-stamp Congress, regardless of who might be President.

This could downgrade further our doctrine of separation of powers and our system of checks and balances.

The growing influence of the Executive to legislate as well as administer our laws is clearly evident by this very proposal. Legislation introduced a year ago by a Democrat won little attention from the committee or House leadership. But a bill recommended by the President—drafted by the executive branch and introduced in the House—promises to move. There are too many such examples.

The primary consideration regarding the term of a Congressman today remains the same as when our country was founded. The legislative branch of Government must remain close to the people and the Representative must be responsible to the people who elect him.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon]

FOUR-YEAR TERMS?

In 1787, in a series of articles now known as the Federalist Papers, James Madison wrote two articles advocating at least 3-year terms for Members of Congress. His arguments were much the same as those advanced by President Johnson in his state of the Union message when he advocated 4-year terms.

Said Madison:

"Some portion of the knowledge (of government) may, no doubt, be acquired in a man's closet, but some of it also can only be derived from the public sources of information and all of it will be acquired to best effect by a practical attention to the subject during periods of actual service in the legislature."

Said President Johnson:

"The mark of government is far more complex than in our early years, requiring more time to learn and more time to master the technical tasks of legislation."

In the same year that Madison's plea for long terms for Congressmen was printed the Constitutional Congress established congressional terms at 2 years. This represented a compromise between advocates of 1-year and 3-year terms.

The framers of the Constitution were vitally concerned that government should represent the will of the people. Thus, the elaborate system of checks and balances between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

Many political scientists and legislators have argued long and hard that the Constitutional Congress put too many checks on the efficient operation of government. Off-year elections have been deemed the nemesis of Presidential promises which have met Waterloos after midterm elections.

To recount two: Franklin Roosevelt's prestige suffered a setback in the midterm elections of 1938 and the Republican victories in the 1946 elections were a reaction to the failure of Harry Truman to relax enough wartime restrictions in the early post-World War II months.

Advocates of the President's proposal note that it contains the advantages of a unified national government provided by parliamentary systems which elect both a legislature and a prime minister at the same time.

But the proposal does not provide for the principal check upon parliament—its ability to bring down a government and bring about elections at any time with a vote of no confidence.

At the heart of the arguments is the principle of democracy. Proponents of 4-year terms argue that if democratic government is to succeed in today's complicated world Congressmen must have more time to devote to their legislative tasks and that Congress should work with the President rather than at cross-purposes with him.

Under the President's proposal, all House Members would be elected during presidential election years. This would tend to give a President a working majority in the House because presidential contests are the only national elections and usually the outcome of many congressional campaigns follows the vote for President.

Citizens should not be deceived about the fact that 4-year terms would change the entire complexion of American politics. The advantages and dangers should be weighed with full realization of their inevitable effect on American civilization.

[From the Newton Kansan]

TWO-YEAR TERM BETTER

President Johnson has proposed that the terms of Members of the House of Representatives be extended from 2 to 4 years. One of the arguments for the change is that Representatives have to spend so much time worrying about being reelected that they can't give their full attention to legislative matters.

This argument, of course, has its merits. Seeking reelection every 2 years does impose hardships, both financial and physical, on Members of the House.

But there are arguments on the other side that overbalance this one.

Were Representatives to be elected every 4 years during the presidential election many inepts whose sole qualification to office would be that they belong to the same party as the successful presidential candidate would be elected. This is true now, but it is also true that they can be tossed out by the voters 2 years later when they can't tie themselves to the coattails of a popular President.

The 2-year term keeps the people in charge of one House of the Congress. Each election they can exercise their right to either approve or disapprove what Congress has done during the past 2 years. And at the President's midterm they can do this without being influenced by the popularity of a candidate for President.

It is easy to see why the executive branch would like to see the terms of Members of the House coincide with the term of the President.

But the framers of the Constitution built in a number of checks and balances and the 2-year term for Members of the House is one of these devices.

Lehigh University Announces New Chemistry Research Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Lehigh University, one of America's finest institutions of higher learning, announced last week that it will construct a new million dollar research center devoted to exploration of surface and coating chemistry.

Lehigh, I am proud to remind my colleagues, is located in Bethlehem, Pa., in my district and is rapidly becoming one of our Nation's most highly respected research centers. Its engineering school holds a reputation alongside the best of American colleges and universities, some of them many times Lehigh's size and wealth.

The new center will be under the direction of the internationally recognized chemist, Dr. A. C. Zettlemoyer, professor of chemistry at the university. I take pride in calling this announcement, together with the newspaper story about it from the Bethlehem Globe-Times, to the attention of the House of Representatives:

LEHIGH REVEALS MILLION DOLLAR CHEMISTRY RESEARCH CENTER

Lehigh University announced today it will construct a new million dollar research center devoted to surface and coatings chemistry.

In announcing the project Lehigh President Dr. W. Deming Lewis, revealed Dr. A. C. Zettlemoyer, distinguished professor of chemistry at the university, will direct the new center.

Ground will be broken later in the year for the three-story structure, Dr. Lewis said. It will be placed next to the existing Chandler Chemistry Laboratory and will be given the name "The Francis MacDonald Sinclair Memorial Laboratory," in honor of the cofounder of Sinclair and Valentine Co.

The center will combine the talents and efforts of chemists, physicists, engineers, mathematicians, life scientists and others into a single program on surface and coatings research and graduate training, the university said.

PURPOSE EXPLAINED

The major purposes of the program will be the enrichment and supplementation of existing educational programs and the strengthening and enlargement of current and long-term research projects in the two areas at Lehigh.

The studies will span such areas as the production of newspapers and books, preparation of nucleating agents for weather control, recovery of oil from the earth, manufacture of kitchen utensils, preparation of cosmetics and in the making of tires and paper.

They also span the areas of coatings applications for purposes of protection (rocket nose cones), decoration (household wall-paper), and communication (telephone electrical contacts). Coatings can also be of the inadvertent type such as those occurring in the corrosion of materials.

Dr. Zettlemoyer is an internationally known chemist who, in 1963, directed a team of Lehigh scientists in a breakthrough relating to man's probes into control of the discovery of why silver iodide works as a cloudseeding or nucleating agent.

He also initiated significant research on the synthetic rubber program in the United States during World War II, and he has served as director of the scientific and research program of the National Printing Ink Research Institute since the organization's founding at Lehigh in 1946.

The institute, which currently has close to a quarter million dollars of sponsored research in force, will become a major part of the coatings branch of the new center at Lehigh.

GIFT OF $500,000

The center is a direct outgrowth of the long-term work and investigations of Dr. Zettlemoyer and colleagues of the university's department of chemistry of which Dr. Edward D. Amstutz is head.

A major bequest in excess of a half million dollars from the late Mrs. Jennie H. Sinclair has been received at the university for this building in honor of her deceased husband. Additional support for the building is currently coming from other private sources and is being raised outside of the university's present $22 million centennial fund.

Dr. Zettlemoyer, a native of Allentown, was graduated from Lehigh in 1936 with high honors in chemical engineering. Two years later, he obtained his master of science degree in organic chemistry from Lehigh. In 1941, he was awarded the doctor of philosophy degree in physical chemistry by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

On the Lehigh faculty since 1941, he served as instructor for 2 years, was promoted to assistant professor in 1953, to associate professor in 1946, and to full professor in 1950. He was named distinguished professor of chemistry November 1, 1960. Prior to joining the Lehigh staff, he was an instructor at MIT and a research chemist for Armstrong Cork Co.

Remarks by the President Before the Convention of the American Association of School Administrators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in another moving speech, has given imaginative aim to his programs for a Great Society.

In a speech February 16 at Atlantic City to the American Association of School Administrators, he outlined the historic legislation of the Congress in 1965 and then concentrated on education.

He said he would send to Congress priority requests to enlarge Secondary Education Act programs; double funds for Operation Headstart; obtain funds for the National Teachers Corps; pass a Child Nutrition Act which will help pay for school breakfasts for children.

He also said:

If education is to achieve its promise in America, it can not be done in Washington alone. Each State and each community must fashion its own design and shape its own institutions.

The President sees a new and enlarged roll for our schools as the center of community life. I share his hope that more adequate and expanded use of our schools can be made.

He said in a significant paragraph:

It will provide formal education for all citizens—and it will not close its doors at 3 o'clock. It will employ its buildings round the clock and its teachers round the year. We can not afford to have an $85 billion plant in this country open less than 30 percent of the time.

The text of the speech follows:

Remarks by the President Before the Convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J., February 16, 1966

I am honored to accept your award and happy to be here with the big brass of American education. I might have been with you tonight under other auspices—except that 30 years ago I left teaching for a different pursuit.

Tonight, our professions differ, but we have the same task: to build a society worthy of freemen. Two hundred years ago, our fathers laid the foundations. Two years ago, I challenged my fellow citizens to get on with the job. I said that we must build the Great Society in our cities, in our countryside—and in our classrooms.

Tonight our work is underway. Much of the needed legislation has been enacted: more than a score of landmark measures in the field of education alone.

It is a thrill to me to read the rollcall of these historic acts: the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the civil rights laws of 1964 and 1965, medicare, the Natural Beauty Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965.

And—not last and not least—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Laws are only designs for achievement. The barriers we must overcome do not yield merely because Congress takes a vote or the President signs a bill.

Two barriers are the most unyielding, each reinforcing the other in blocking our progress.

The first is poverty. We who have worked in schools know what it means for someone who starts life as a victim of poverty. It is a hard to teach a hungry child. Poverty breeds handicaps of mind and body which cripple him before he has a chance to get ahead. And we have learned all too well that poverty passes on its curse generation to generation.

The second barrier is racial discrimination. Because of it, children grow up aliens in their native land. For a ghetto—whether white or black or brown—is less than half a world. No child can be fully educated unless his life is opened up to the wonderful variety this world affords.

Two weeks ago, I called for the International Education Act of 1966 to promote the worldwide commerce of knowledge—to declare that learning is not a commodity which can be confined at the water's edge.

Yet within our own country there are still racial walls against hope and opportunity. Between the slums of the inner cities and their spreading suburbs, there are gulfs as deep and wide as any ocean.

If education is to be worthy of its good name, we must find ways to span these gulfs.

I pledge to you that the Federal Government will not be a silent partner in this enterprise.

I am sending Congress five top priority requests:

To enlarge each one of the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—and to make them run through 1970;

To double funds for our imaginative and precedent-breaking Operation Headstart which will next year help more than 700,000 youngsters from poor homes get ready for the rigors of learning;

To fund the new National Teacher Corps so that our best college graduates can be recruited to work in our worst schools;

To pass the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to help pay for school lunches for those who really need them, without subsidizing those who can afford to buy their own. We also want school breakfasts for children who would otherwise start the day with empty stomachs.

Finally—and this summarizes reams of recommendations in a single sentence—my budget this year proposes a $10 billion Federal investment in education and training. In 1960 the Government was spending only a third this much. The Office of Education alone will spend on programs six times as much as it did 6 years ago.

And I promise you that this is only the beginning.

Almost 200 years ago, James Madison declared that Federal and State governments "are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people, constituted with different powers, and designed for different purposes." They are not "mutual rivals and enemies." They are partners.

Madison's definition has not changed, though the partnership grows closer and more creative.

If education is to achieve its promise in America, it cannot be done in Washington alone. Each State and each community must fashion its own design and shape its own institutions.

But we will need a common vision to build schools to match our common hopes for the future.

Every school will be different, but the differences will not range as they do today between satisfactory and shocking. We will have instead a diversity of excellence.

Tomorrow's school will be a school without walls—a school built of doors which open to the entire community.

Tomorrow's school will reach out to the places that enrich the human spirit: to the museums, the theaters, the art galleries, to the parks and rivers and mountains.

It will ally itself with the city, its busy streets and factories, its assembly lines and laboratories—so that the world of work does not seem an alien place for the student.

It will be the center of community life, for grownups as well as children: "a shopping center of human services." It might have a community health clinic, a public library, a theater and recreation facilities.

It will provide formal education for all citizens—and it will not close its doors at 3 o'clock. It will employ its buildings round the clock and its teachers round the year. We cannot afford to have an $85 billion plant in this country open less than 30 percent of the time.

In every past age, leisure has been a privilege enjoyed by the few at the expense of the many. But in the age waiting to be born, leisure will belong to the many at the expense of none. Our people must learn to use this gift of time—and that means one more challenge for tomorrow's schools.

I am not describing a distant utopia, but the kind of education which must be the great and urgent work of our time. By the end of this decade, unless the work is well along, our opportunity will have slipped away.

Many people, as William James once said, shed tears for justice, generosity, and beauty—but never recognize those virtues when they meet them in the street.

Some people are this way about rebuilding our society. They love the idea. But in the heat and grime, somehow they lose their zeal. They discover that progress is a battle, not a parade—and they fall away from the line of march.

You know that the job of building a better school and a better nation is hard, often thankless, work. Someone must take on the perilous task of leadership. Someone in shirtsleeves must turn ideas into actions, dollars into programs. Someone must fight the lonely battles in each community—make the accommodations, win the supporters, get the results.

Many of you have endured this hard journey from hope to reality—when the applause died, the crowd thinned out, and you were alone with the dull administrative details still to be done.

But this is how a Great Society must be built: brick by brick, and in the toil and noise of each day.

We have so little reason to be discouraged. Others face tasks so much more difficult than ours. Only last week I sat across the table from the very young leader of South Vietnam and heard him say of his country: "We were deluding ourselves with the idea that our weaknesses could not be remedied while we were fighting a war. * * * We will not completely drive out the aggressor until we make a start at eliminating these political and social defects."

The work of his government will not be easy. But these are not timid men. They have learned that government must meet the outreach of its people's hopes.

There at Honolulu, I pledged support to their plans for education in their country. This year alone we will help them build 2,800 classrooms, nearly three times the average for the last 10 years.

We will help them train 13,400 teachers, 8 times the yearly average of the last decade.

We will help them distribute nearly 6 million textbooks.

And we will help them educate almost a fourth as many doctors as the total number they now have.

This little country maintains 700,000 men in its armed forces, over 2½ times as many for its size as we have.

Yet, these leaders voiced no weariness before the task of getting on with reforms in education and health and agriculture. If they keep their commitment, they will be the real revolutionaries of Asia. For the real revolution is to build schools, and through them, to build a nation.

What they are committed to do, with our help, must be done under the most brutal conditions imaginable. Their civilian population lives in constant danger of terror and death at the hands of the Vietcong.

Last year over 12,000 civilians were kidnapped or killed by Communist terrorists. There were more than 36,000 incidents of terror—an increase of 10,000 over 1964. Two days ago, the Vietcong killed 39 civilians and wounded 7 others as they rode on buses.

Terrorism—deliberately planned and coldly carried out—continues to be the chef instrument of Vietcong aggression in South Vietnam. It is not just a byproduct of their military action; it is the way they hope to win the war.

Who—and what—are their targets? Schoolteachers and school administrators, health officials, village leaders, schools, hospitals, research stations, medical clinics—all of those people and places essential to the growth of a healthy, free society.

This is the terrible scarred face of the war too seldom seen and too little understood. Often it is not even reported by our journals most concerned about the war in Vietnam. These incidents usually happen in rural areas remote from the camera's eye. Observers are not invited when the Vietcong murder the mother of an officer in the Army of Vietnam as reprisal against her son—or torture and dismember the master of a local school.

But people who hate war ought not ignore this strategy of terror.

What is its purpose? It is through fear and death to force the people of South Vietnam into submission. It is as simple, and as grim, as that.

And it must not succeed.

If these tactics prevail in Vietnam, they will prevail elsewhere.

If the takeover of Vietnam can be achieved by a highly organized Communist force employing violence against a civilian population, it can be achieved in another country, at another time, with an even greater cost to freedom.

If this "war of liberation" truimphs, who will be 'liberated' next?

There is a job of liberation in South Vietnam. It is liberation from terror, liberation from disease, liberation from hunger, and liberation from ignorance.

Unless this job is done, a military victory in South Vietnam would be no victory at all—only a brief delay until the aggressor returns to feed on the continuing misery of the people.

We have the military strength to convince the Communists they cannot achieve the conquest of South Vietnam by force.

But the building of a better society is the main test of our strength—our basic purpose. Until the people of the villages and farms of that unhappy country know that they personally count, that they are cared about, that their future is their own—only then will we know that real victory is possible.

I came away from Honolulu filled with new hope and energy. I came away convinced that we cannot raise a double standard to the world. We cannot hold freedom less dear in Asia than in Europe or to be less willing to sacrifice for men whose skin is a different color.

If this young nation—ridden with danger can show such determination, we, with all our wealth and promise, must be no less determined.

Our time is filled with peril. So it has been every time freedom has been tested.

Our tasks are enormous. But so are our resources.

Our burdens are heavy and will grow heavier. But the Bible counsels that we "be not weary in well-doing." The house of freedom may never be completed, but it will never fall—so long as you and I and those who share our commitment keep this vision of what we seek to build.

"Candid Camera" Creates Comic Controversy in the Borough of Bath, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the most popular television programs, "Candid Camera," recently paid a visit to the beautiful little borough of Bath, Pa., in my congressional district, leaving in the wake of its visit some highly comic confusion and no little controversy.

Last Sunday night, Bath and a small number of its residents appeared in filmed interviews on the nationwide program. The fanciful notion of the program's producers was simply to stage a public rendezvous between Mr. Ed Warnke, the popular and hard-working mailman who serves the borough's business district, and a lovely young lady in a flashy and expensive new convertible. The results were amusing when the program's interviewers then began talking with some of the 1,736 people who inhabit Bath, checking on the rumors which nearly always start in a small community when something like this happens.

I am grateful for the national publicity "Candid Camera" gave to one of the fine communities in my district. And I herewith invite them to return, at any time, to take another look at the friendly, hospitable people who are the backbone of our American society.

Agricultural Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial by Mr. Harry Lawson, publisher, which appeared in the February 17, 1966, issue of the Eagle Rock, Calif., Sentinel.

Mr. Lawson makes what I feel is a meaningful contribution to the current discussions relating to agriculture in our Nation and food problems of the world which will be of interest to the Congress.

The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL

It was not long ago that we published an article on the agricultural industry in our country and the constant dwindling of farms as well as farmers themselves. We pointed out that in our humble opinion it was and is a crime that productive land should be retired and the production of crops thereon reduced when half the world is suffering from stark hunger—starving to death. Now we propose to meet this deplorable world situation by taking the money we are pouring into foreign countries and diverting it into the hands of our own farm industry to produce more and more surplus food to feed the hungry of the world—at least the free world. It's just as simple as that. We should reverse our present policy and, instead of holding down and restricting farm production, encourage production in every way.

We have been trying to lift up the farmer by his boot straps by restricting his acreage and his production. It simply can't be done. This policy is driving the farmer from the farms and turning his productive lands back to nature, which, in our opinion is all wrong. Up to the present time we have actually throttled down and made idle and nonproductive 50 million acres of land under government control programs. Think of it—50 million acres of virgin land that could and should be producing food for the hungry of our own country and the world. If these acres were again put under the plow and planted, we could easily double our production of wheat alone, more than double corn production, soybeans, and other crops in proportion.

The farmers of our country could continue to meet all needs for wheat in this country and increase exports millions of tons without dipping into reserve stocks. That is almost double the world's estimated wheat shortage. In addition to wheat, exports of corn, and other grains aside from rice, could go up millions of tons without touching our reserve stocks in them. Other grains can be substituted for rice, say the experts. Combined exports of rice and other grains could be increased by over 48 million tons, they say. The world's overall food shortage is estimated at slightly over 87 million tons. It is concluded, therefore, by our agricultural experts that if given the signal to go full steam ahead our American farmers would have little trouble in raising enough food products to meet the needs of the United States and all the free world countries as well.

What we now propose—and it is not an entirely new thought—is that we just reverse the policy we have been following with relation to our farm production, and, instead of retiring productive farmlands into the so-called farm banks where they become nonproductive, we encourage the cultivation of all productive farmlands to increase food for the starving world, and that we pay our farmers for it by suspending giveaway money to foreign countries as we have been doing for years and use that money to pay our own farmers for raising more and bigger crops to feed a hungry and starving world.

If the lands of our country can raise enough surplus food products to feed at least the free and hungry countries—and expert agriculturalists say they can—then they should be encouraged to do so. Even after paying for these crops from foreign aid moneys, we could well afford to sell them on long terms at low interest, or for that matter, give them away to those hungry and starving countries we invite to come and get them.

Our experts put the cost of closing the food gap in the world outside of Red China at $4 billion a year.

This would be in addition to nearly $2 billion a year now spent in the U.S. food-for-peace program.

It was wrong to kill off the little pigs to control prices.

It is just as wrong to restrict production on our farms when the world is suffering the pangs of hunger.

Restore farm production and thereby restore the rapidly disappearing farmer.

"Dr. Jack" Standifer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Weather Bureau has done a particularly fine thing by publishing the document entitled "The Cooperative Weather Observer."

In doing so the Bureau paid deserved tribute to the unselfish efforts of men and women who serve us at more than 12,000 places about the country.

Many have performed these unheralded but essential functions for 30, 40, or 50 years, and more.

One of those whose service has spanned more than half a century is a special sort of a person. This public service is simply typical of his whole altruistic life. With great pride I call to the attention of the House the biography of Dr. J. G. Standifer as it appears on page 22 of the Bulletin of the Department of Commerce:

Dr. J. G. Standifer

Dr. J. G. Standifer, affectionately known as Dr. Jack, was born in Blakely, Ga., in 1888, to Dr. Wm. B. Standifer and Mrs. Rebeccah Jeannette (Jones) Standifer. He began serving as weather observer at Blakely in August 1914 and was married in September 1914 to Miss Sarah Rebeccah Moore, of Macon.

Dr. Standifer attended the schools of Blakely, Staunton Military Academy at Staunton, Va., and Mercer University. He followed in the footsteps of his father and grandfather and graduated from the Medical College of the University of Georgia at Augusta, on May 1, 1911. He has practiced medicine in Blakely since that time, a total of more than 53 years. The combined service of the three Standifer doctors in Blakely, Dr. Jack, his father, and grandfather, extends from 1837 to 1964, a total of 127 years. Dr. Jack was named General Practitioner of the Year in 1960 by the Medical Association of Georgia. He is on the staff of the Early County Memorial Hospital.

Dr. Standifer has been active in freemasonry and has attained many positions of rank and honor. He is a Knights Templar, KYCH, of the York Rite and a 33d degree Mason of the Scottish Rite; a past potentate of the shrine, and a past grand master of the Grand Lodge of Georgia. He is a communicant of the Episcopal Church, a past president and charter member of the Blakely Lions Club, an ex-mayor of the city of Blakely and served on the local school board for 14 years. He introduced the game of football at Blakely High School in 1921 and the athletic field is named for him.

Dr. Standifer recalls some of the outstanding weather events in Blakely during the past 50 years as (1) the 17.25 inches of rain that fell in one 24-hour period on July 7–8, 1916 (more than 2½ feet fell during the month); (2) the 6° above 0 minimum temperature on January 6, 1924 (his T-model Ford almost froze up when he made an obstetrical call at 4 a.m., and since it was so near zero the baby girl was named Zelda); the heat wave of September 1925 when 15 days had a maximum temperature of 100° F. or above.

Dr. Jack has this to say about his 50 years as a weather observer: "I have really enjoyed recording the weather, watching the rain, wind, snow, sleet, hail, the clouds, the brilliant displays of electricity, the dust storms, the droughts, the floods, the towering thunderheads, the tornadoes, and the calm of a summer day. This close association with the elements was an opportunity to commune with nature and nature's God."

Laser Beam Used To Remove Tumor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, an awesome medical breakthrough is indicated by an operation recently performed by surgeons at the Children's Hospital in Cincinnati. A laser beam instead of a knife was used to successfully remove bloodlessly a tumor from a man's leg. And Dr. Thomas E. Brown who devised the operation says:

There's no apparent reason why we cannot use the same laser to cut into the liver, the spleen, or even the brain without fear of hemmorrhage. * * * I'm absolutely jubilant.

I'm sure my colleagues and people throughout the world share his jubilance. A story from the February 16 issue of the New York Times, outlining the breakthrough follows:

Laser Beam Used To Remove Tumor—Bloodless Method Is Hailed for Future Use in Brain and Liver Operations—Light Cauterizes Area—Patient's Thigh Never Bled in Operation Because of Intense Heat Generated

(By Thomas O'Toole)

Laser light has been used to remove bloodlessly a diseased tumor.

Previously, lasers were used in surgery on the eye to destroy tumors or to repair detached retinas. Their use in eye surgery was not considered bloodless, however, because their use did not involve any incisions that would sever blood vessels.

Surgeons at the Children's Hospital in Cincinnati have succesfully removed a tumor from a man's thigh by using a laser beam for a knife. Although numerous small blood vessels around the tumor were severed during the 15-minute operation, none of them bled because the intense light of the laser cauterized the blood vessels even as it was cutting through them.

"It's like finding yourself on the threshold of something you've reached for ever since you left medical school," said Dr. Thomas E. Brown, the doctor who devised the operation and one of three who performed it. "I'm absolutely jubilant."

SURGICAL EASE HAILED

One thing that made Dr. Brown especially jubilant was the relative ease with which he was able to cut out the tumor.

"There's no apparent reason," he said, "why we cannot use the same laser to cut into the liver, the spleen or even the brain without fear of hemorrhage."

Still another possibility envisioned by Dr. Brown is using the laser to cauterize the wounds of hemophiliacs, whose lack of blood clotting mechanism leads to their losing blood through simple falls that bruise the arteries close to joints and bones.

FIRST DEVISED IN 1960

If the laser proves to be a significant surgical tool, it would be making something of a medical comeback. First devised in 1960, the light beam of a laser is 1 million times brighter than ordinary light. This is because ordinary light scatters in all directions. Laser light is so intense that it can be focused through a hole 50-millionths of an inch in diameter.

This ability to create light or heat in tiny spots led many researchers to forecast a great medical future for the laser. Indeed, it was tried in eye surgery to destroy tumors at the backs of eyeballs and to "spotweld" detached retinas.

Other techniques, however, proved to be just as effective, less hazardous and less expensive, so laser drifted into disuse almost from the time it was started.

Before excising a human tumor with the laser, Dr. Brown made countless bloodless incisions on rats, rabbits, and dogs He said he had been so encouraged by the results that he decided to try the technique out on a human.

The patient chosen for the operation was a man in his fifties with melanomic skin cancer. Although he had as many as 20 lesions and tumors throughout his body, the tumor in his thigh was selected for surgery because it was the most diseased and one of the easiest to reach.

For the operation, which was performed on January 24, Dr. Brown used a gas laser known as the argon or "green" laser, which was developed at the Bell Telephone Laboratories in Murray Hill, N.J.

Most lasers emit light in brief, erratic bursts, but the green laser beams out a steady stream of light that can be more easily regulated and controlled by the user. This cuts down the chance that the laser beam will go astray to damage healthy body tissue.

The green laser also has a power output of up to 4 watts, which is far more than that of other lasers. This enables the user to generate enough heat at the beam's focal point to "cut through" human tissue. Other lasers are not powerful enough to pierce tissue.

CURVED MIRROR USED

The patient's leg was deadened with a local anesthetic, and an incision was made with an ordinary scalpel into the diseased area. Then, the laser beam was directed by a curved mirror onto a portion of tissue adjacent to the tumor, which was about the size of a golf ball and situated about a half an inch below the skin.

Slowly, Dr. Brown manipulated the laser beam around the tumor. Each time the beam struck an artery, it coagulated the blood in the vessel on either side of the beam at the same time it sliced through the vessel. An instant later, the heat of the beam cauterized the blood vessel at the very spot where the incision was made, thus preventing bleeding before it could begin.

One reason that the green laser worked so well is that its green light is best absorbed by red objects like blood cells.

"It was like a black box soaking up white light," explained Dr. Brown. "The red blood cells sopped up the green light so well they were able to transfer a maximum amount of the laser's energy to the surrounding body tissue."

No Holds Barred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, last year I was fortunate to have the services of Mr. Victor Ashe as my summer congressional intern. This young Yale student, who hails from Tennessee, performed invaluable assistance to my regular office operation. Mr. Ashe is now political editor for the astute Yale Daily News and has written a well-thought-out article on the shortcomings of the proposed 4-year term for Members of Congress. I have unanimous consent that "No Holds Barred" from the February 2, 1966, edition of the Yale Daily News be printed in the Appendix of the Record:

Four Years, No: No Holds Barred

(By Victor H. Ashe)

It takes no special gift of insight, after spending just a few minutes in a congressional office, to realize that a Congressman has far more to handle than he can presently take care of properly. The volume of work—attending committee hearings, researching speeches and legislation, running errands for constituents, to name a few—is increasing all the time.

President Johnson's solution to this growing problem is simple—House Members should serve 4-year terms instead of 2. He tells us that the time saved from campaigning every other year would go into legislative work.

He also wants the terms to run concurrent with the President's. As a result, those House Members who rode their way into Congress on a President's coattails are spared the awful prospect of facing the voters all alone in 2 years' time. (Also the Democrats seem to win by bigger margins on presidential years.)

ACCELERATION

No doubt the life of a Congressman would be more leisurely and relaxed in the first 2 years of a 4-year term, but in the fourth year the pace would be incredibly accelerated if only because the stakes would be that much higher (4 years instead of 2.)

Unless the candidate decides to run solely on the presidential candidate's coattails, he has the additional problem of trying to divert the electorate's attention away from the national contest long enough to focus on his own.

This brings up another point—since voters in a presidential year are primarily concerned with the two presidential candidates, less thought is given to the merits of candidates for lower offices than on the off years when the lower office (congressional seat) becomes the top office on the ballot. If this is the case, then thoughtful voting by the electorate tends to decrease on presidential years and increase on the off years.

However, the basic flaw in a 4-year term is that it weakens the power of the people to check the actions of the Federal Government. There is no legitimate reason, for example, why American voters should not have the opportunity this November to register their assent or dissent to the large volume of new programs passed by the 89th Congress. House Members who rode into office on the Johnson landslide should be forced to justify themselves individually and not wait till 1968 to do so.

EXPANDING DUTIES

Defeating this proposed constitutional amendment, however, does not deal constructively with the real problem the 4-year term is supposed to solve—namely, how to enable a Congressman to handle the expanding duties of his office.

The President could have been more helpful in this area if he had centered his attention on the staff problems of Congressmen. A nine-man staff today has enough trouble just keeping up with current work—let alone planning ahead. Larger staffs are needed. The overwhelming majority of a Congressman's work is done by the staff—not by their boss. Whether their man runs every year, every 3, 4, or 6 years, the staff is the group which must handle all the sundry tasks, and they need the extra help.

The minority party needs more adequate staffing on each congressional committee—staffing that is proportional to their numbers. Today the records show that for every one committee staffer responsible to the minority, the majority has nine. The Republicans in Congress have enough problems because of this patently unfair ration in just keeping up with the Democrats' proposals—let alone trying to offer their own alternatives.

The Office of Legislative Counsel (which writes proposed bills into legal form for introduction in the House) needs to be expanded. Last summer, Congressman Bill Brock, of Tennessee, had to wait 3 weeks before he could introduce a piece of legislation because the small staff had to answer requests of more senior Members first and also had a large backlog of work to dispose of.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, which currently does the bulk of research for 535 Senators and Congressmen, also needs larger appropriations and more manpower to quickly and carefully assist Members of Congress.

Congressmen themselves should start legislative hearings and committee business in earnest in the first 3 months of the year instead of waiting for spring to roll around as they do today. Better programing by the congressional leadership in the early months would reduce the haste in the closing days of a session.

Four-year terms don't touch on these pressing problems. No matter how long a man's term of office is, he needs adequate staffing and legislative facilities. And the minority by every rule of reason should have a fair share of the committee staffing. These innovations will be far more valuable to a Congressman than the proposal for 4 years in office.

USMA First Honored Birth of General Washington in 1831

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman who proudly represents the district in New York State where the U.S. Military Academy is located at West Point, I should like to take note of the historic recognition given for many years by the corps of cadets to the birthday of General Washington. First, I submit a history of this subject which appeared in the Newburgh (N.Y.) Evening News on February 21, 1966.

USMA First Honored Birth of General Washington in 1831

(By Joseph M. O'Donnell, Chief, Archives and History, U.S. Military Academy, West Point)

The national observance of Washington's birthday was first thought of, as far as I can determine, on February 22, 1862, when by the proclamation of President Lincoln and the joint resolution of both Houses of Congress George Washington's Farewell Address to the People of the United States was read at noon to both Houses of Congress assembled.

On hand were the President, the Cabinet, Justices of the Supreme Court, representatives of foreign governments to the United States, and such officers of the Army and Navy, and distinguished citizens of the city of Washington.

It was directed, also, that the Farewell Address be read to the troops at every military post, and at the head of the several regiments and corps of the Army.

Colonel Bowman, Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy, complied with the President's proclamation and George Washington's Farewell Address was read to the officers, professors, and the U.S. corps of cadets in the cadet chapel. Studies were suspended at 11 a.m.

Long before the first national observance of Washington's birthday in 1862, the American people in cities, towns, and academic institutions would commemorate February 22 with speeches, fireworks, dinners, and a ball in the evening.

The cadets at the Military Academy at West Point celebrated Washington's birthday in their particular fashion. Samuel Peter Heintzelman, USMA 1826, in his manuscript, "Journal of Samuel Peter Heintzelman U.S. Army, while a cadet in the Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., from January 1, 1825, to July 22, 1826, and to August

2, 1826"—described the way in which the corps of cadets observed Washington's birthday, February 22, 1825, in this way:

"Today it was proposed by the corps to illuminate. We obtained permission from the Superintendent to do it. We prepared a transparency with the name of Washington. At 7 o'clock the signal was given to light candles. In south barracks we closed the window shutters and lighted the candles before the time so that at the instant the signal was given we threw open the window shutters * * *. The lights were extinguished a little before 9 o'clock when the bugle sounded to retire to quarters. The officers had a ball."

Some 6 years later according to Battalion Orders, No. 19, West Point, February 21, 1831, the Superintendent, Brevet Col. Sylvanus Thayer, permitted the corps of cadets to commemorate the birth of General Washington by an illumination, which would begin at 7 o'clock when three taps on the drum were sounded, the last of which was the signal for lighting the barracks. At 8 o'clock, three taps would be sounded, the last was the signal to extinguish the lights.

The cadets commemorated General Washington's birth by an illumination the origin of which is the "Camp Illumination" celebrated each year at the end of cadet summer camp, and which was first observed by Gen. George Washington, his officers, and troops on May 31, 1782 in honor of the birth of the Dauphin of France, the nation which assisted us so ably during the Revolution.

Further, let me enter a copy of the orders issued at the Academy on February 21, 1831, to commemorate the birth of General Washington.

WEST POINT,
February 21, 1831.

Barracks Order No. 19:

A desire having been expressed by several members of the corps of cadets to commemorate by an illumination the birth of General Washington, permission is granted by authority of the Superintendent of the Military Academy. The preparations being made, there will be sounded at 7 o'clock tomorrow evening three taps upon the drum, the last of which will be the signal for lighting the barracks, at 8 o'clock there will be in like manner three taps, the last of which will be the signal for extinguishing the lights. The call to quarters will be suspended until 8 p.m.

By order of Captain Hitchcock.

W. CHAPMAN,
Superintendent of the Corps.

National Brotherhood Week, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members of this body are aware this is National Brotherhood Week. The national chairman of this year's observance is a close personal friend of mine and a highly respected business and civic leader from Omaha, Nebr., Mr. V. J. Skutt, president and chairman of the board of Mutual of Omaha. I think Mr. Skutt clearly defined the purpose of brotherhood when he stated:

> Let us all, as Americans, join with one another and work together in a renewed sense of confidence and faith in our religious beliefs and our national heritage.

Brotherhood Week is sponsored by an organization dedicated to the highest ideals of our democratic society, the National Conference of Christians and Jews. This great civic group was founded in 1928, and seeks through education and discussion to promote mutual cooperation and understanding among the men and women of good will who belong to our beloved country's many religious and ethnic groups.

Its solemn purpose is to narrow the gap that separates the reality of our American society from our stated ideal of "one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." The National Conference of Christians and Jews is wholly supported by voluntary contributions from individual citizens, business firms, community organizations, and religious groups.

One of the main objectives announced by the Conference for Brotherhood Week is a rededication to the basic ideal of respect for our fellow man.

The President, in his Brotherhood Week Proclamation, has joined with all his fellow citizens in recognizing the importance of this observance. He has said:

> Brotherhood Week, 1966, brings with it for all Americans a poignant realization of our awesome moral responsibility to uproot * * * injustice.

The conference began its Brotherhood Week observance back in 1934. It said then that:

> Brotherhood Week is not to deal with doctrinal differences. It will not promote common worship. It will deal with our relationships as citizens.

The first World Brotherhood Week was held in 1951. Now, the occasion is observed in thousands of communities, including many which adopted the idea even before the conference suggested that they do so. It is endorsed by the Governors of the 50 States, and the mayors of most of our cities.

Brotherhood has been described in these moving words by the poet, Joseph Auslander:

> Brotherhood is a dream we keep apart from
> cynic's sneer and fool's derision;
> Beyond the grasp of graph or chart.
> It is a hunger in the heart;
> And in the soul a vision."

Policies Hard To Criticize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, in today's economic-minded society, one hears many remarks which tend to accuse the present administration of not minding its fiscal affairs. The present extended boom in our economy is certainly not a matter of chance nor luck, but one of careful guidance and planning by the economic advisers for the Federal Government. Further, it is to be noted that this administration is not oblivious to the threats of inflation. It is not sitting idly by with no efforts to meet that threat. It is good to know that men of repute have taken cognizance of these facts and have publicly acknowledged them. I call attention to an article written by Mr. Malcolm Oliver, editor of the Whaley-Eaton Service, for the Washington Sunday Star which illustrates that some knowledgeable people in the country are aware of this situation and these people are also aware of where to give due credit. Under unanimous consent, I insert the pertinent portion of Mr. Oliver's column of Sunday, February 6, 1966, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that those who are not aware of our economic situation may become so enlightened.

POLICIES HARD TO CRITICIZE
(By Malcolm Oliver)

Economic policies of the Johnson administration are difficult to attack once the premise on which they are based are accepted.

The premise, of course, is that the Federal Government has the duty to intervene with fiscal, monetary, or any other actions, to stimulate a sluggish economy—or to slow it down if it is threatening to get out of control.

The constant worry of many businessmen, and particularly the banking community, in recent months has been that the administration would not move decisively enough if and when inflation threatened. The President's Economic Report is welcome, therefore, in that it at least expresses concern over such a threat.

This is a recurrent theme of both the report and the annual review of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The Chief Executive puts himself on record as being positive there will be enough plant capacity and labor to man it, so that domestic and defense programs can move along simultaneously without a destructive wage-price spiral developing.

The Council of Economic Advisers, however, issues a sharply worded warning on the danger of wage and price increases. Between the lines of the council's review can be read a deep concern that the guideposts for wage and price rises are being ignored.

It is fortunate, for the sake of the country, that not many wage negotiations of national scope are on the agenda for 1966.

Union leaders already have made it clear that they are not at all pleased with the Council's refusal to raise the permissible wage-hike guideposts above the current 3.2 percent.

Recognition of the threat of inflation by the administration is a good sign, but it is only one step in the right direction.

Contempt Citations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the citations for contempt of Congress from the Chicago hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities will soon be before the House of Representatives. The gravity of these charges impels us, as Members of the House, to take the greatest care and study in their consideration.

Under unanimous consent I am inserting these editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post—certainly among the Nation's leading and most respected newspapers—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I recommend thoughtful reading of these articles.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1966]

SHORT SHRIFT

"In the past 17 years," Representative DON EDWARDS pointed out to the House of Representatives on Wednesday, "the House has voted some 136 times to cite an individual for contempt of Congress; 129 of these citations were from the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Of this number there were only nine final convictions, 7 percent." Nevertheless, the House once more—unreasonably and unthinkingly, in our judgment—voted blindly to uphold the committee in its determination to punish certain recalcitrant witnesses. It makes no difference that these recalcitrant witnesses are unpleasant, unpopular men, allegedly officers of the Ku Klux Klan.

The House supported the committee's spleen, moreover, without knowledge of what was involved, without even an opportunity to acquaint itself with the facts. It did it on the basis of a lengthy, complicated record deliberately withheld from it until an hour and a half before the motion to vote for the citations was introduced. This is not an exercise of congressional deliberation or judgment; it is, at best, an expression of congressional solidarity and, at worst, an expression of prejudice against individuals suspected but not convicted of atrocious crimes or odious opinions.

Besides, there are a pair of important constitutional questions involved in HUAC's investigation of the Klan. One is whether the committee's demand for all of the Klan's records was a valid one. The Supreme Court held in connection with the State of Alabama's demand for the records of the NAACP that it is a violation of the first amendment guarantee of freedom of association to compel the production of membership lists. And there is also a serious constitutional question of whether the committee's acknowledged practice of summoning witnesses for the sheer purpose of exposing them is a valid exercise of the congressional investigating power.

Violations of law by the Klan are matters for the FBI and the Department of Justice to investigate. New legislation to protect civil rights, if it be needed, is a matter for the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate to study; they have performed very well in this respect during the past few years. Respect for civil rights and civil liberties is unlikely to be promoted by continuing the power of a committee which has blatantly ignored them for nearly 30 years.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1966]

LOYALTY TO WHAT?

The House of Representatives once again must decide whether contempt for its Un-American Activities Committee necessarily constitutes contempt of Congress. We think it does not.

The current contempt citations raise a special problem. They involve Dr. Jeremiah Stamler, a renowned heart specialist who is director of the Heart Disease Control Program of the Chicago Board of Health, and two of his professional associates. They declined, on advice of counsel and on asserted grounds of principle, to answer some abusive questions put to them by the committee. They also filed an action in a Federal district court—dismissed there but now pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit—challenging the committee's constitutionality and seeking an injunction against enforcement of its authority.

Deferring all judgment on the motives and merits of this action, we think the House of Representatives ought to await a decision by the court of appeals—and by the Supreme Court, too, if it should come to that—before citing these persons for contempt. For the questions they raise are important and cry out for judicial determination. Moreover, this kind of civil action is a far better way to find out if a witness is obliged to answer committee questions than a criminal prosecution putting him in jeopardy of a prison sentence.

Years ago, Kenneth Keating. when he was in the House of Representatives, introduced a bill which would have required the House to go to a Federal court for an enforcement order in the case of recalcitrant witnesses; this would have given the witnesses an impartial judicial decision as to the validity of the committee's questions and a chance to answer in the light of this knowledge. A witness refusing to answer after being ordered to do so by a court would, of course, be in contempt of court and punishable accordingly. This is at once more sensible and more civilized than a contempt citation by Congressmen blindly supporting one of their own committees.

In the Stamler case, HUAC violated its own rules by releasing the names of subpenaed persons in advance of the hearings and causing grave injury to their reputations. It asked questions redundantly, although it was clear that the witnesses did not intend to respond, in an obvious effort to pillory them. And it refused their request to testify in executive session. These circumstances and tactics have led more than 100 eminent law school professors to join in a letter to all Members of the House urging them to reject the contempt citations.

Congressmen owe a measure of loyalty, of course, to the committees they have established. But they owe loyalty also to the good name and the high traditions of the House of Representatives. For the sake of loyalty to the Un-American Activities Committee, they have voted contempt citations in more than 130 cases since 1950; and only 9 of these have resulted in final convictions. And they have allowed this committee, exercising the majestic investigating power of Congress, to browbeat, torment, and intimidate witnesses in a manner reminiscent of the Court of Star Chamber which was abolished in 1641. Now would be a good time to call a halt to this tyranny.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 8, 1966]

WHERE DOES THE CONTEMPT LIE?

The House of Representatives votes tomorrow on a resolution to cite three Chicago residents for contempt of Congress for their refusal to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The committee wishes to cite Dr. Jeremiah R. Stamler, who has won awards for his research as head of the heart disease control program of the Chicago Board of Health, and two of his associates. They were subpenaed to appear before the committee last May 25 as part of a series of hearings on communism in the Chicago area. The U.S. District Court refused to enjoin enforcement of the subpena, but an appeal is now pending. More than 100 law professors have signed a letter stating their opinion that there is a reasonable prospect that the Supreme Court may uphold Dr. Stamler and his associates.

A contempt citation at this time would in no way clarify the important constitutional issues nor would it provide information for a committee of the House. A contempt citation is a serious action. Like a grand jury indictment, it is not definitive, but it begins a process of judicial action that can lead to fine or imprisonment and, at the very least, it damages one's personal reputation. When it cites for contempt, the House is exercising one of its gravest powers against a private citizen.

In the past 15 years the Un-American Activities Committee has asked the House to cite 129 individuals for contempt and the House—routinely, mechanically, irresponsibly—has acceded to every request. Yet only nine of these citations resulted in final convictions.

Last week's action against seven leaders of the Ku Klux Klan was typical. Members of the House freely admitted that they had had no opportunity "to study all these citations, the statements of fact, or the hearings from which these citations have come," as one Representative expressed it. Yet the Members shouted down a sensible proposal to refer the cases to a select committee for review and voted instead to send them on their way to the Justice Department.

There is neither necessity nor sound historical precedent for such conduct. The House runs the danger of bringing itself and its own procedures into contempt. That is a far deeper wound on the body of free government than any recalcitrant witness could inflict.

Social Reform Next in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM D. FORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News, in an editorial on February 10, sounded a warning which should be noted by every Member of this Congress. Commenting on our attempts to find a peaceful settlement to the problem of Vietnam, the News pointed out that social reform is a pressing necessity in that war-torn country.

Without such reform, the News declared, "the guns, however effective, will leave only a vacuum after any possible cease-fire."

The newspaper praised the idea of escalation in social reform, or, as President Johnson phrased it, "the struggle against social injustice, hunger, disease, ignorance, political apathy, and indifference."

I found this editorial most interesting and thought provoking. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and under unanimous consent include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SOCIAL REFORM NEXT IN VIETNAM

The newest jet set roves the diplomatic circuit with statesmen, Cabinet officers, and generals in orbit all over the Pacific, either chasing after each other or crisscrossing each other's trails. And all because of Vietnam.

Vice President HUMPHREY now takes over where President Johnson left off at the Hawaii conference. He is in Saigon to see that the counterrevolution gets off the ground.

If words in communiques mean what they say and hope is not wishful thinking, the United States and the South Vietnamese are now not only determined to repel the Red armed terror. We are going to escalate in a new dimension, committing ourselves, as Mr. Johnson puts it, to "a struggle against social injustice, hunger, disease, ignorance, political apathy and indifference."

This newspaper believes the key words there are "political apathy and indifference." For 20 years the South Vietnamese have known little but war. The Vietcong, which formerly often got away with pledges of land reform and all the other lures of the Red utopia, is now having to use force and terror on the peasants almost everywhere as the tide of war shifts and the easy Vietcong victory is no longer in sight.

But the peasants didn't like what they experienced under the late President Diem either, and they still distrust Saigon and what it pledges to do for the rural areas. The only remedy is to clear out the terrorists, keep them out and then follow through with the kind of reforms Mr. Johnson talks about.

Humphrey's mission also includes talks with other free Asian nations to see what they can contribute militarily or technically to the Vietnam effort. It won't be easy. People who haven't got the tiger directly at their gates don't relish action that might entice it there.

In part, the 1954 SEATO pact came apart because only three of its eight members were nonwhite Asians. The most rewarding substitute would be some form of agreement that would get the free nations in Asia whose frontiers and security depend on the outcome in Vietnam to realize that no nation is any longer an island unto itself.

Interdependence—which was the magic formula for postwar Europe—should be the goal in Asia today. In Vietnam it's back to the drawing board of social reform. Otherwise the guns, however effective, will leave only vacuum after any possible cease-fire.

Tax Private Colleges?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8282, now being considered by the Ways and Means Committee, will make several basic changes in the unemployment compensation program. One of these seems to me to be particularly onerous, and this is the provision that compulsory unemployment insurance would be levied on nonprofit institutions, including private colleges. This same tax would not, however, be imposed on tax-supported schools. This unequal treatment would result in an unfair burden on the very colleges and universities that are today relieving government supported institutions of higher learning.

In Tennessee where there is a large number of non-tax-supported colleges, such a tax would place them at an unfair disadvantage and hamper the tremendous accomplishments now being made. A recent article in the Chicago Sun-Times forcefully points up this proposed inequity. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the Record:

On Unemployment Compensation

The Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities has called our attention to a bill now before Congress that would seriously impair the operations of not alone private colleges and universities but other nonprofit institutions.

This is House bill 8282, which would impose compulsory unemployment insurance upon nonprofit institutions. One curious aspect of the bill is that it does not impose the same tax upon tax-supported schools. This omission, as the federation points out, "would place the privately supported colleges and universities at an unwarranted disadvantage in their efforts to provide higher education for a large percentage of the students attending Illinois institutions."

The private colleges are too important to Illinois, and to the Nation, for them to be burdened with this disadvantage and expense. Preliminary estimates indicate that private institutions have enrolled 42.8 percent of the 312,180 students attending colleges and universities in Illinois, and the percentage is even higher if you deduct the numbers in tax-supported junior colleges who are not studying for academic degrees. It takes no slide rule to demonstrate that an insufferable tax burden would be created if all the students were enrolled in State schools.

Furthermore, the employees of the colleges do not need the protection of unemployment insurance, which is designed to protect workers during periods of depression or in seasonal or erratic industries. Colleges and universities offer steady, permanent employment that is not radically affected by season or business cycles. And other nonprofit institutions, such as the YMCA and the Goodwill Industries, which employ workers under very special circumstances, would be irreparably disrupted by the imposition of the tax.

The plan, in a word, seems to be a thoroughly unfortunate one that Congress should kill once and for all. It would create many problems and solve none.

War Is War, Debt Debt—by Whatever Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT McCLORY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in considering the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966—H.R. 12752—today, designed to increase revenues for the next fiscal year by more than $5 billion, it is most appropriate to appraise the budget policies and practices of the administration. Above all, there would seem to be a duty to be candid and straightforward with the Congress.

A serious question about the integrity of the Executive budget is raised by an article which appeared in yesterday's—Tuesday, February 22, 1966—edition of the Chicago Tribune by Dr. Melchior Palyi. The article follows:

War Is War, Debt Debt—by Whatever Name

(By Dr. Melchior Palyi)

Is falsifying the balance sheet to improve its public image a prerogative of the Government of these United States?

If your household spends more than it earns the difference may be covered by the proceeds from the sale of your home. Would you say that there was no deficit? Just who is to be fooled?

If a corporation covers its current loss by the proceeds from the sale of equipment, without allowing in the balance sheet for the loss of capital—I submit that a criminal case would be in the making.

But the Government can indulge in such deceptive practices and get away with them. In the budget for 1966–67, expenditures are scheduled to rise ahead of tax revenues by many billions of dollars.

Yet, the overall deficit will be reduced, allegedly, from $6.9 billion in the current fiscal year to a virtually negligible $500 million. The biggest single chief item that will produce this fiscal master stroke in the sale of Government-held loans to private borrowers. The deficit shrinks by $4.7 billion, thanks to the unloading of $4.7 billion worth of assets—as if net spending had been cut by that amount.

BORROWS TO FILL GAP

A deficit means that the Treasury has to borrow to fill the gap between expenditures and revenues. Who is so ignorant as to believe the claim that the $4.7 billion is no part of the deficit because they will not be borrowed openly?

This claim is a deliberate distortion of the Treasury's forthcoming position, camouflaging the assumption of liabilities and the simultaneous loss of assets. Selling loans held in its portfolio is no different in essence from issuing its own bonds. The Government has to guarantee capital and interest on the loans it liquidates.

Money is to be raised by offering guaranteed obligations in lieu of incurring a direct debt. But a debt is a debt, by whatever name it goes. The guarantee obligates the debtor exactly as the direct borrowing does—except that the cost is higher.

WILL LOSE REVENUE

The Treasury will lose the revenue it was earning on the loans in its possession. And it will have to accept an additional loss.

Interest rates have risen above the artificially low level that prevailed at the time it had bought the same loans; the debt instruments will have to go at values below their purchase prices. Moreover, guaranteed obligations being less popular than the direct ones, they have to yield a higher return. It costs the taxpayer less if the Government markets its own securities than if it raises money the indirect way.

But what does a difference of some millions of dollars in annual cost mean along the Potomac? The item was conspicious in the President's budget message by its absence. The faked image of having reduced the deficit while fighting a war and building a Great Society is what counts, and let the extra cost hang.

As to the financial effect, there is no difference either between the Treasury borrowing outright or selling its holdings of mortgages and Export-Import Bank loans. In either form, the appeal to the capital market will contribute to tightening it and to boosting interest rates.

OTHER MONKEY BUSINESS

There is nothing wrong about the Government getting out of the business of lending money. It should not have been in it to begin with. What is wrong, and indeed shameful, is to use a perfectly legitimate procedure for a legerdemain. Nor is this the only "monkey business" contained in the next fiscal year's budget, as presented last month.

Revenue estimates are based on the most optimistic assumptions; or on the shifting of tax collection dates, an exercise in financial futility. Expenditures are understated irresponsibly, relying on supplementary requests—which then will be excused as emergency requirements. It is assumed, as an example, that the monthly cost of the Vietnamese war will be lower in the second half of this year than in the first, while at the same time the same government warns us that the war will call for escalating human and material sacrifices.

Semantic tricks are old standbys of totalitarian statesmanship. A war is not declared formally; so, we are not at war. There are no more agricultural surpluses; they are called reserves. By the same token, a deficit is no deficit, provided we do not finance it by the sale of direct obligations. But let us remember: there is no difference in what really matters—the inflationary impact on the economy.

Elbie Jay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, our satirist, Arthur Hoppe, recently wrote two columns on the Elbie Jay family, the first published in the San Francisco Chronicle, on February 8, and the second published on February 18.

The columns follow:

Elbie Jay Goes Hawaiian

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, folks. How Y'all? Time for another tee-vee visit with the Jay family, starring ol' Elbie Jay—a kindly feller who loves nothin' more than settin' down and reasonin' together. With folks that agree with him.

As we join up with ol' Elbie today, he's conferrin' with his trusty foreman, McGeorge (Smiles) McBandy. And Smiles ain't smilin'.

Smiles. It doesn't look good, Chief. The Senators have started holding these televised hearings on Vietnam. And they're calling in all your top advisers.

Elbie (frowning). Whose advisers they think they are?

Smiles. And they're getting a lot of mileage in the press.

Elbie. Whose press they think it is?

Smiles. And they're asking all sorts of questions about the war.

Elbie. Whose war * * * well let's not wrangle about that. They can have it, if'n they want it.

Smiles. Frankly, sir, I think they'd just as soon let it be yours.

Elbie (shocked). Mine. Why the whole world knows it's the fine, democratic government of Vietnam's war. And we're just helping out 'cause we got to honor our commitment to our brave and loyal ally, General * * * what's the name of the premier over there this week?

Smiles. General Nguyen Ky, sir. But to tell the truth, sir, some critics are claiming he's just our puppet and will do whatever you tell him to.

Elbie. My puppet. Why, he's my equal. As much as anybody. We got to prove folks wrong, Smiles. Wait, I got a grand idea. Get me general whatshisname on the phone.

Smiles. Nguyen Ky, sir.

Elbie (happily). That's right. (Into the telephone.) Howdy there, General Whatsyourname. How's your old war going? Well, I'm glad to hear victory's in sight as usual. But we got us a problem: Some folks are saying you're the kind of feller who does what I tell him to. But I'm going to prove you're independent. Now, I'll tell you what to do. You get in an aeroplane and I'll meet you half-way. In Hawaii. We'll set down and reason together. As equals. About what's on my mind * * * I know you're busy. You got them sneaky Vietcong to deal with and I got them maverick Senators. Now stop palaverin' and do what I tell you. And for gosh sakes, look independent.

Smiles (as Elbie hangs up). That's a great idea, sir. I'll bet the Senators will look bad in the papers, investigating while you're out there in Hawaii conferring.

Elbie (humming). If'n they get in the papers. Now what aides will I take with me? Smiles get me a list of the ones them Senators plan to call as witnesses. My, I sure do like to see folks show their independence.

Smiles (puzzled). The Senators?

Elbie. I was thinkin' of General Whatshisname.

* * * * *

Well, tune in to our next episode, folks. And meantime as you mosey on down the trail of life, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy used to say:

"To be a leader, don't push folks around. Get out in front and tug'em along behind."

Elbie Jay at Planting Time

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, folks. How y'all? Time for another tee-vee visit with the rootin'-tootin' Jay Family, starring ol' Elbie Jay, a humble feller who always stands ready to confess his mistakes to the whole world. In the unlikely event he should ever make one.

As we join up with ol' Elbie today, he's watching tee-vee in the parlor. His trusty foreman, McGeorge (Smiles) McBandy is standing by looking a mite fidgety.

Elbie. Funny, I never took note before of how that Bill Fulbright's eyes are set so close together. 'Course, I wouldn't say it makes him look like a weasle.

Smiles (shaking his head). He's getting an awful big play in the press, investigating the way you've been handling Vietnam.

Elbie. More like a rat. But I can't figure no way to outshine him. I go to Honolulu, I send my unforgettable aid, Hubert Horatio Whatshisname, around the world * * * Nothing works. Folks just love investigations and * * * Wait, if you can't lick 'em, join 'em. Smiles, I'm going to help out my old friend, Bill Fulbright, in his search for the truth.

Smiles. You're going to go testify before his committee?

Elbie (smiling). Well, now, I wouldn't want to horn in on good, old Bill's show. Nope, the only fit person to investigate me is me. I'm going to submit myself to probing questions until we find out what I'm doing in Vietnam. Call a press conference.

Smiles. I'm not sure I remember how. Let's see, didn't we used to use the big State Department auditorium and invite hundreds of reporters and * * *

Elbie. Don't get all carried away. I mean one of them informal, friendly press conferences. Kind of an informal, friendly chat in my office with tee-vee cameras. You just go out informal and friendly like and ask a couple of ace newsmen to drop in.

Smiles. Should I make sure they look informal?

Elbie. Just make sure they look friendly. Now, let's see, what kind of probing, searching, hard-hitting questions are they going to ask me?

Smiles. Good thinking, sir. It's always wise to prepare the answers in advance.

Elbie. I don't want to prepare the answers. I want to prepare the questions. How does this one clutch you? "Sir, how have you managed to go from one smashing triumph to another in your incredibly wise handling of the Vietnam situation?"

Smiles. You mean you're going to plant the questions?

Elbie (pontifically). As ye sow, Smiles, so shall ye reap. Besides, if Bill Fulbright gets to ask his questions in his investigation of me, it's only fair I get to ask my questions in my investigation of me. Which reminds me, here's a good one: "Sir, do you consider asking a lot of divisive questions about our Vietnam policy to be treason or merely giving aid to the enemy?"

Smiles. Good question, sir. But how will you answer it?

Elbie (happily). With a shrug, Smiles, with a shrug.

Well, tune in to our next episode, folks. And meantime, as you mosey down the long trail of life, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy used to say: "Don't be one of them smart fellers who's got all the answers. Be one of them smarter fellers who's got all the questions."

Plea for Longer Terms May Face Hilly Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, to many of my colleagues here in the House, the recommendation by President Johnson for a 4-year term for House Members has drawn natural interest. Personally, I do not feel that a 4-year term is justified, although if this should come to pass, it should be on the off year between presidential elections so as not to tie the Congress to the President's coattails.

I am pleased to insert in the Record an editorial which appeared in the February 13 edition of the Chicago Heights Star. It very clearly and effectively states the objections to a 4-year term for House Members.

As We See It: Plea for Longer Terms May Face Hilly Road

It is encouraging to note that opposition has developed among Democrats as well as Republicans to President Johnson's proposal that U.S. Representatives in Congress be elected to 4-year terms, with the elections coinciding with the Presidential balloting.

We repeat that there are good reasons why the present 2-year terms should be retained. Not the least of these is the opportunity given voters during the off-year, or nonpresidential, elections to register their enthusiasm, or lack of enthusiasm, for the deportment of the party in power. Nor is it desirable that many areas be represented for 4 long years by candidates who ride to victory on the coattails of the presidential winner.

There is a chance that enough Members of Congress will recognize these and other deficiencies in the proposal as sufficient reason to vote against it. Barring this, we can take heart in the fact that a constitutional amendment providing for 4-year terms would require ratification by State legislatures.

If Illinois is typical, an attempt to lengthen terms of office might encounter tough sledding. Our Springfield correspondent has dug up the information that efforts to increase the terms of office for State legislators have been introduced six times and defeated each time.

One measure asked a constitutional amendment to provide 6-year terms for State senators and 4-year terms for representatives. Five others supplied variations on the theme. Since they could not win approval of the very legislators they might affect, it is reasonable to suspect that support for extending the terms of Congressmen would receive no greater support.

And for another thing, if States are to conform with the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote edict by reapportioning congressional as well as State legislative districts at appropriate intervals, the present 2-year terms for Congressmen have added value. They make it possible to implement the new representation at an early date.

Mr. Johnson's suggestion for longer terms in the Congress reportedly received the loudest applause when he made his state of the Union address. We hope and believe that after the applause died down, some serious thinking about the proposal began.

The Spirit of Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the observance of the 48th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Baltic nation of Estonia will be celebrated in the 12th Illinois Congressional District on Saturday, February 26, 1966. One hundred or more Estonians will gather in Woodstock, Ill., to sing together, pray together, and to listen to speakers extol the great qualities of a people to whom tyranny and sacrifice are words written in lifeblood.

It is my privilege to be listed among the speakers and to take to this patriotic gathering greetings from the legislative branch of the American Government. There is much I could say in the brief time allotted me about the history of their country in the four thousand and more years that it has existed. I might recall their stubborn resistance to the invaders who came from the north and from the east. I could recap their existence as a part of Livonia, religious subjects of far-off Rome, and remark that their cities were members of the Hanseatic League when Estonia was part of the German domain. I could mention Tartu and Tallinn with the grand structures which date back to the 14th century or earlier and the impressive church edifices from which Communist overseers have forced the worshipers.

But most of all will I think and speak of the spirit of the Estonians, that proud, free spirit which survives despite the terrors of conquest and subjugation, murder and rapine, and repeated reprisals. I will speak of the great natural resources of Estonia, particularly the waters which surround it and the lakes which dot its surface. More than 1,500 lakes are there, as well as the Baltic Sea and 2 of its arms, the Gulfs of Finland and of Riga. According to science "water is the major constituent of all living matter." And so the people of Estonia survive and their spirits carry on in the pervasiveness of water—the patient, irresistible force of the tide above the surface and the ground waters which feed the springs, the fountains, and the geysers; waters which become waterfalls and rivers, gulfs, seas, and oceans which surround the continents. Water which is self-fulfilling and lifegiving to others is the symbol of the Estonians. It may serve both as a defender and protector and as a relentless enemy sweeping back those who do not know its swift running currents and its unplumbed depths.

To those Estonians, who will not hear me, I send greetings—wherever you are. I applaud your spirit and the inward strength which bears and buoys you as you work on, toward the ultimate freedom of your country. I applaud your great creative contributions to the countries and nations where you have gone to wait and work for that day of freedom. In my own congressional district are two young Estonians, Enno and Tiiu Nomm, who were admitted to the coveted Phi Beta Kappa chapter at the University of Illinois at the same time—a most unusual feat for a brother and sister of any background. But the spirit of free-flowing water is there and they sweep on.

So may it be with you and your descendants, as you fulfill your destinies and share with your adopted countries the lifegiving energy with which you are endowed.

War Is War, Debt Debt—by Whatever Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we found the House forced to adopt a major legislative act made necessary by the war in Vietnam. I refer to the reestablishment of Federal excise taxes on telephone service and automobiles.

Dr. Melchior Palyi, an economist who is a regular contributor to the Chicago Tribune, emphasizes the duplicity of the administration budgetary juggling as it relates to the southeast Asian war in an article on February 22.

WAR IS WAR, DEBT DEBT—BY WHATEVER NAME

(By Dr. Melchior Palyi)

Is falsifying the balance sheet to improve its public "image" a prerogative of the Government of these United States?

If your household spends more than it earns the difference may be "covered" by the proceeds from the sale of your home. Would you say that there was no deficit? Just who is to be fooled?

If a corporation "covers" its current loss by the proceeds from the sale of equipment, without allowing in the balance sheet for the loss of capital—I submit that a criminal case would be in the making.

But the Government can indulge in such deceptive practices and get away with them. In the budget for 1966–67, expenditures are scheduled to rise ahead of tax revenues by many billions of dollars.

Yet, the overall deficit will be reduced, allegedly, from $6.9 billion in the current fiscal year to a virtually negligible $500 million. The biggest single chief item that will produce this fiscal masterstroke is the sale of Government-held loans to private borrowers. The deficit shrinks by $4.7 billion, thanks to the unloading of $4.7 billion worth of assets—as if net spending had been cut by that amount.

BORROWS TO FILL GAP

A deficit means that the Treasury has to borrow to fill the gap between expenditures and revenues. Who is so ignorant as to believe the claim that the $4.7 billion is no part of the deficit because they will not be borrowed openly?

This claim is a deliberate distortion of the Treasury's forthcoming position, camouflaging the assumption of liabilities and the simultaneous loss of assets. Selling loans held in its portfolio is no different in essence from issuing its own bonds. The Government has to guarantee capital and interest on the loans it liquidates.

Money is to be raised by offering guaranteed obligations in lieu of incurring a direct debt. But a debt is a debt, by whatever name it goes. The guarantee obligates the debtor exactly as the direct borrowing does—except that the cost is higher.

WILL LOSE REVENUE

The Treasury will lose the revenue it was earning on the loans in its possession. And it will have to accept an additional loss.

Interest rates have risen above the artificially low level that prevailed at the time it had bought the same loans; the debt instruments will have to go at values below their purchase prices. Moreover, guaranteed obligations being less popular than the direct ones, they have to yield a higher return. It costs the taxpayer less if the Government markets its own securities than if it raises money the indirect way.

But what does a difference of some millions of dollars in annual cost mean along the Potomac? The item was conspicuous in the President's budget message by its absence. The faked image of having reduced the deficit while fighting a war and building a Great Society is what counts, and let the extra cost hang.

As to the financial effect, there is no difference either between the Treasury borrowing outright or selling its holdings of mortgages and Export-Import Bank loans. In either form, the appeal to the capital market will contribute to tightening it and to boosting interest rates.

OTHER MONKEY BUSINESS

There is nothing wrong about the Government getting out of the business of lending money. It should not have been in it, to begin with. What is wrong, and indeed shameful, is to use a perfectly legitimate procedure for a legerdemain. Nor is this the only "monkey business" contained in the next fiscal year's budget, as presented last month.

Revenue estimates are based on the most optimistic assumptions; or on the shifting of tax collection dates, an exercise in financial futility. Expenditures are understated irresponsibly, relying on supplementary requests (which then will be excused as emergency requirements). It is assumed, as an example, that the monthly cost of the Vietnamese war will be lower in the second half of this year than in the first, while at the same time the same government warns us that the war will call for escalating human and material sacrifices.

Semantic tricks are old standbys of totalitarian "statesmanship." A war is not declared formally; so, we are not at war. There are no more agricultural surpluses; they are called "reserves." By the same token, a deficit is no deficit, provided we do not finance it by the sale of direct obligations. But let us remember: there is no difference in what really matters—the inflationary impact on the economy.

Sports Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, recent baseball events in Milwaukee, football events in Detroit, and hockey events in Baltimore lead one to conclude that professional sports are in a dilemma. Not certain of the application of the antitrust laws to them, professional team sports are greatly in need of legislation to spell out what their rights and duties are. I have introduced legislation which would do this. It is currently before the House Judiciary Committee but no hearings have been scheduled to date. We are doing a disservice to professional team sports by keeping them in this state of suspension.

One of the best news stories I have seen on this subject appeared in the Milwaukee Journal, under date of February 20, 1966, and was written by a Mr. Laurence C. Eklund.

I include at this point the article by Mr. Eklund:

AFL ASKS LAW TO LEGALIZE COMMON DRAFT

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The American Football League Saturday began a push for legislation providing for a mandatory common draft of players by the professional football leagues.

In seeking legislation that is mandatory rather than just permissive the AFL is seeking to get Congress to end its escalating salary war with the National Football League.

Commissioner Pete Rozelle of the NFL said his league had not even discussed a common draft at the annual meeting in Palm Beach, Fla., last week.

ADMISSION OF EQUALITY

NFL opposition to the common draft is due partly to a belief that such a plan might be construed as an admission that the AFL is an equal.

Harold O. Lovre, AFL attorney, has been urging Chairman CELLER, Democrat, of New York, of the House Judiciary Committee to schedule a hearing on the Senate approved Hart Professional Sports Act of 1965.

Now it develops that the bill the AFL really wants is the companion measure introduced by Representative BYRON G. ROGERS, Democrat, of Colorado, which adds to the Hart bill a provision legalizing and making mandatory a common draft.

THREAT REMOVED

The two bills put baseball under the antitrust laws along with football, basketball, and hockey, but they provide for certain exemptions relating to the playing aspects of the sports.

In addition, the Rogers amendment would remove any threat of antitrust prosecution if the two leagues entered into an agreement for a common draft.

They now draft separately. Outstanding college players are generally drafted by teams in both leagues, and have thus been able to play off one team's offer against another, with fantastic results in some cases.

Under a common draft, a player would be picked by one team instead of by one in each league.

Lovre, a former Republican Congressman from South Dakota, said Saturday that veteran players were rightfully enraged by what he and his AFL associates called the "unalloyed idiocy" of paying a rookie halfback $600,000 to sign a contract.

THREAT OF HOFFA

Lovre claimed that continuation of this trend would not only bankrupt pro football, but that it would lead to the unionization of players, as suggested by Teamsters Union President James Hoffa.

"If that ever happens, heaven forbid," Lovre said. The only answer is the common draft."

Sid Gillman, coach and general manager of the San Diego Chargers of the AFL, predicted that Hoffa's drive to unionize the players would succeed within 3 years unless the two leagues had "the common sense to have a common draft."

"They may be laughing now but the Teamsters will get in unless the club owners get together and put a stop to this crazy spending on bonus players," Gillman said.

"A couple of years ago, nobody would have believed the prices they're paying for kids today," he said.

"And it's not going to stop on its own. Unless something is done, the next big college quarterback will get a million dollars.

"And the veterans won't stand for it. Hoffa will have them organized in 2 or 3 years unless we get a common draft."

Gillman disagreed sharply with some club owners who counsel waiting until football, like baseball, is granted immunity from antitrust prosecution.

ROZELLE'S FAULT

"The owners can't wait," he insisted. "They've got to take a chance and start a common draft. Almost everyone in Congress would realize the owners have to do something to keep from killing each other."

Gillman said the reluctance of the NFL to agree to a common draft originated with Rozelle.

"He is the man and I can't understand why the owners tolerate it," Gillman said. "He is asking the owners to risk financial suicide."

Gillman said he felt that no college players should get bonuses of more than $15,000.

Another AFL club, the Denver Broncos, expressed fear of the consequences of the "outlandish bonuses."

ASSURANCE NEEDED

In a telegram Saturday to ROGERS, who is their Congressman, the owners of the Broncos expressed doubt that they could get a favorable vote on a new municipal stadium for Denver unless they got the relief sought by ROGERS' bill.

Gerald H. Phipps, Allen Phipps, and Dick Kitchen told ROGERS they needed to be able to assure the people of Denver that they would be protected from prosecution under the antitrust laws should a common draft be adopted.

AFL Commissioner Joe Foss called the Rogers bill an "absolute necessity" for the continued effective operation of professional football leagues.

The AFL's lobbyists want prompt hearings before CELLER'S committee not only on the Hart and Rogers bills but on proposals by Representatives CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI and LYNN E. STALBAUM, Democrat, of Wisconsin, to strip baseball of its exemption from antitrust laws.

Lovre believes that by considering all of the bills in one hearing, a bill satisfactory to ZABLOCKI, STALBAUM, and to Representative ROBERT KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, could be agreed upon.

KASTENMEIER, a member of the Judiciary Committee, had advised Lovre that he opposed exempting any professional sport from antitrust laws and would remain opposed until the situation regarding the Braves was cleared up.

Lovre insisted his clients sought only exemption for the "playing" aspects of football, not for "business" aspects like moves from one city to another for purposes of making more money.

Dedication of the International Synagogue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the building of the International Synagogue on the John F. Kennedy Airport grounds in New York is the culmination of untiring efforts on the part of many Americans.

It is most certainly a historic achievement. The institution will house a sanctuary, library, museum, and information center.

I wish to mention two individuals in connection with this venture who deserve special commendation. Rabbi Israel Mowshowitz, a resident of my district, former chairman of the board of rabbis of New York, has given years of patient work and energy to the project. Through his vision and labor as chairman of the board of the synagogue, the dream became a living reality.

The president of the International Synagogue is Charles H. Silver, a most dedicated person, who also serves as executive assistant to the mayor of New York for education and industrial development. At the dedication dinner in New York City on February 6, Mr. Silver made an inspiring address which I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL SYNAGOGUE, AT DEDICATION DINNER, FEBRUARY 6, 1966, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL

The opening of our great new international synagogue is only days away.

We are on the very threshold of a thrilling milestone in the history of our people as we set the Star of David on this mighty temple and lift the wonder of our ancient tradition to soar beside the wings of travel.

Tonight, dedicate this shrine and symbol of Israel's gift to civilization—the tablets of the law—the ark of the covenant—fixed as a seal of eternal faith upon the air crossroads of the world.

In this magnificient house of worship, we will put worldly cares aside and take comfort in the eternal truth of the Almighty.

For it is in the synagogue that our minds are wholly at peace. Our souls find serenity in the sacred words of our holy books. Out hearts are healed by immortal music as we give reverent thanks to our Creator.

There, we recall the precepts of our sages—the timeless teaching of the Torah—that have survived the torment of centuries, triumphing over deserts of adversity, to be preserved in our daily prayers and the ritual of our festivals.

Perhaps it is in the synagogue that we are most aware of the true significance of love and understanding. Its altar has held us together through centuries of hate and tyranny—of slavery and persecution—forged into one people—a strong people—by the flame of our faith.

Our people have persevered through unimaginable anguish, even within the last decade. Yet, proudly and prayerfully, we continue our journey on the winding highways of destiny. The hope of mankind is written in the story of our endless wandering.

Religion, too, seems somehow to survive. Not only ours, but in the growing mutual respect and fellowship of every faith.

The persistent voice of this universal conscience can be heard most clearly when we sit in silent communion with our Maker in His house.

And then we realize that religion is a very personal thing; that we are all walking through darkness, deeper now, perhaps, than ever before.

We need each other's light. And in such a sanctuary as our great international synagogue—flanked by the chapels of the other two great faiths—we find renewed evidence that the beacon of brotherhood is growing brighter in the world and in the hearts of men.

And I think you know what is in my own heart—as I echo the hope and joy in yours—on this memorable night of dedication.

In our times, we need a closeness, a coming together for worship more than ever before. We need communion with one another—with our conscience and with our forebears who admonished us to love justice, show mercy, and walk humbly with our God.

We must confirm our awareness that we are our brother's keeper and that this synagogue will stand as a source of help and a haven of hope for the homeless, the wanderers, and the wanting.

Though we may wander long, or fly to far places, the grandeur and majesty of our Creator, the sanctity of all His creations, and the imperishable principles of Israel will be eternally preserved within the walls of the international synagogue.

We will concern ourselves not with boundaries and differences, but with growth and intensification, so that the opportunity for prayer and the vital principles of Judaism may be a source of strength and inspiration for those departing and returning from every corner of the world.

Within its walls, the bond of Jewish unity will be self-evident, the heritage of Jewish thought will help to light the dark places of the earth.

That is our pledge and our purpose on this day of blessing—as we renew our vows, bowing before the hands of the Almighty and striving to be worthy of His safekeeping.

The site on which we have constructed our synagogue—in the very heart of civilization's largest community—has become the gateway to the new world with all its promise of freedom, liberty, and equality. It stands as a citadel of mankind's better self, proclaiming our unity—yesterday, today, and forever—with one God and with all men—stamped across the skyways of tomorrow.

Like the torch of liberty that blazed a welcoming light of hope over New York Harbor when our fathers sought refuge on these shores—so bright will be the flame to burn eternally above its altar.

Moving and memorable were the words inscribed for "The lady with the lamp" who thrilled the eyes and hearts of voyagers approaching our shores: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

But we shall carve a brave new credo on our shrine of worship for those who come and go across the seas—land to land—continent to continent—world to world—universe to universe—into the farthest reaches of space and beyond the veil of the future:

"Rest here and read the sacred scroll
  Whose flaming words of faith will never fade.
While we preserve the Torah in our soul.
  Rest here and pray, then journey unafraid."

Action Needed To Put Interstate Highway Program Back on the Track

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to repeal the Byrd amendment and allow the highway trust fund to borrow from the Treasury to put the interstate highway program back on schedule for completion in 1972. The bill is a simple one.

H.R. 13013

A bill to amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 by repealing section 209(g)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 209(g) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (23 U.S.C. 120, note) is hereby repealed.

I am certain that most States are experiencing the same problem that our State of Minnesota is facing. The State department of highways is ready to go, but Federal funds are lagging behind.

As a case history of the serious trouble facing our interstate construction program, I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following correspondence and report from John R. Jamieson, commissioner of highways, of the State of Minnesota.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,
St. Paul, Minn., February 21, 1966.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DON: Thank you for your letter of February 9, in which you note that you will introduce a bill to repeal the Byrd amendment. This in our opinion is the most important step that can be taken to put the construction of the Interstate and Defense Highway System on a realistic financial basis.

A brief description of the status of the Interstate System in Minnesota is enclosed with this letter and will perhaps serve to emphasize the quandary in which we currently find ourselves.

The enclosure does not include the 5-month prolongation of the interstate construction program that now appears inevitable, but this will have little affect on the problem that looms in Minnesota's immediate future. As is indicated in column 3 of the table on page 3 of the enclosure, sizable Federal aid will be required during 1967 and 1968 to finance the vastly increased construction activity programed for those years. Even with a limited extension current funding procedures will make it impossible to implement this program.

During the next few years the Minnesota Highway Department is capable of completing a great amount of highway construction if sufficient funds are made available. The first essential step which must be taken in making provision for adequate funding is repeal of the Byrd amendment.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. JAMIESON,
Commissioner.

Enclosure.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN MINNESOTA, JANUARY 1, 1966

There has been considerable information presented from time to time on the status of the interstate construction program, some showing the number of miles completed and open to traffic, miles under construction, and miles in the preliminary design stages. Most of these news releases make for interesting reading, but do not give the reader a clear picture of the status of the interstate program, as to the financing of the program or the possibility of the entire system being completed and open to traffic in accordance with the provisions of the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act which created the Interstate Highway System, as we know it today.

In order to give a little better insight into what is taking place toward completion of the Interstate Highway System in Minnesota, a few statistics will be presented showing the status of Minnesota's interstate highways as of January 1, 1966:

	Miles
Total miles of designated interstate highways in Minnesota	901
Open to traffic (includes 52.8 miles not completed to full standards)	277
Under construction	184
Preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way acquisition in progress	440

This means, to complete on schedule, Minnesota must complete and open to traffic an average of over 100 miles of interstate per year during the next 6 years.

It should also be noted from these statistics that Minnesota has some work in progress on every mile of the designated system in the State.

The published construction program has been tailored to complete the entire Interstate System in the State by the target date 1972, after giving due consideration to the necessary staging in the more complex construction projects. The Minnesota Highway Department has the capability of placing this work under contract and supervising the construction and it is confident the construction industry has the capability to do its part. The one element that is lacking in order to complete this huge and challenging assignment is an adequate supply of Federal-aid interstate funds as needed to maintain the construction schedule which has been set up to meet the 1972 completion date.

As we see it, there are two things that must be done to make adequate Federal-aid interstate funds available when needed.

1. Eliminate quarterly obligation controls to permit States to maintain an orderly construction contract letting schedule.

2. Increased revenue for the Federal highway trust fund so as to provide adequate funds to complete the Interstate Highway System on schedule and increase annual interstate apportionments to the States in such

amounts as to permit the States to maintain realistic construction schedules.

The present and future condition of Federal-aid interstate funds for Minnesota, as we see it, is as follows:

	Million
Total Federal-aid interstate funds obligated as of Jan. 1, 1966	$514
Balance, Federal-aid interstate funds required to complete system	442
Unobligated balance of 1967 fiscal year apportionment (Jan. 1, 1966)	[1] 57
Estimated apportionment, 1968 fiscal year	68
Estimated apportionment, 1969 fiscal year	68
Estimated apportionment, 1970 fiscal year	70
Estimated apportionment, 1971 fiscal year	$67
Total anticipated interstate Federal aid which will be available to Minnesota under present funding setup	330
Additional Federal-aid interstate needed to complete Interstate System in Minnesota	112

[1] Total 1967 fiscal year apportionment, $68 million: first quarter allotment made available Oct. 8, 1965; second quarter allotment made available Jan. 3, 1968; third quarter allotment expected on or about Apr. 4, 1968; fourth quarter allotment expected on or about June 30, 1966. Only three-fourths of annual apportionment will be available for obligation during this fiscal year (1966).

Federal interstate funds needed to implement 5-year program

[In millions of dollars]

	Preliminary engineering, right-of-way, railway, and utilities (1)	Construction contracts (2)	Total needed (3)	Apportionment (4)	Accumulative deficit (5)
1966	16	45	65	[1] 57	−4
1967	24	86	110	68	−46
1968	16	101	117	68	−95
1969	5	84	89	70	−114
1970	1	64	65	67	−112

[1] Balance, Jan. 1, 1966.

A nominal 2½-percent annual increase in construction costs would increase the $112 million deficit by another $20 million.

Attached copy of "Status of the Highway Trust Fund," a part of a Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, news release, dated February 9, 1966, shows the balance in the trust fund on December 31, 1965, to be less than $9 million, and expenditures exceeded revenue by $266 million during the first half of fiscal year 1966 (July 1–Dec. 31, 1965).

Recommendations: (1) Immediate repeal of Byrd amendment, (2) adequate additional revenue be diverted to the highway trust fund to cover present cost estimates plus a reasonable increase in the construction cost index.

TABLE IV.—*Status of the highway trust fund*

[In thousands of dollars]

	3 months ended Dec. 31, 1965	1st 6 months, fiscal year 1966
Balance at beginning of period	235, 613	284, 858
Income:		
Tax revenue:		
Motor-fuel taxes (net after refunds)	660, 624	1, 441, 651
Less motorboat fuel revenue [1]	11, 000	23, 400
Net for highways	649, 624	1, 418, 251
Trucks, buses, and trailers	106, 102	241, 983
Tires, tubes, and tread rubber	128, 395	254, 054
Vehicle use	10, 564	65, 102
Total excise revenues	894, 685	1, 979, 391
Interest earned	1, 716	4, 605
Advances from general fund	70, 000	70, 000
Total income	966, 401	2, 053, 996
Disbursements for highways	1, 193, 131	2, 329, 971
Balance at end of period	8, 883	8, 883

[1] Transferred to the land and water conservation fund pursuant to title II, sec. 202, Public Law 88–578, effective Jan. 1, 1965.

The Federal share of the Federal-aid highway program is wholly financed by highway users on a pay-as-you-build basis. The Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (as since amended) levied or increased certain Federal excise taxes on motor fuel and automotive products, and earmarked their revenue specifically to a highway trust fund, which is the source of money for Federal highway aid to the States both for the Interstate and the ABC programs. The taxes earmarked to the trust fund and their rates (until Oct. 1, 1972) are:

Motor fuel: 4 cents per gallon.

New trucks, buses, and trailers: 10 percent on the manufacturer's wholesale price.

Highway vehicle tires and tubes: 10 cents per pound.

Other tires, and tread rubber: 5 cents per pound.

Heavy vehicle use: $3 per 1,000 pounds annually on the total gross weight of vehicles rated at more than 26,000 pounds gross weight.

Under the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 certain trucks and trailers were exempted from the truck excise after June 21, 1965; and beginning Jan. 1, 1966 the following taxes will also accrue to the highway trust fund:

Lubricating oil: 6 cents per gallon, if used for highway purposes.

Parts and accessories: 8 percent on the manufacturer's wholesale price of truck and bus parts and accessories.

Menominee Aid Resolution Passed by Local 4–302, International Woodworkers of America, AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, Local 4–302 of the International Woodworkers of America, AFL–CIO, considered and passed a resolution memorializing the Senate Commitee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs to hold hearings on S. 1934 and H.R. 8034. The resolution also urged favorable action on these bills which were introduced in the Senate by Senator NELSON and here in the House by me as the Representative of Menominee County here in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the resolution which was passed by local 4–302 of the International Woodworkers of America, AFL–CIO, in the RECORD at this point:

Whereas in an effort to improve the condition of the workingman in Menominee County, Wis., the production, maintenance, and service employees of Menominee Enterprises, Inc., Neopit, Wis., most of whom are Menominee Indians terminated from Federal supervision in May of 1961, elected and organized as Local 4–302, International Woodworkers of America, AFL–CIO, in 1963, and

Whereas by negotiation and hard work some benefits have been gained for the employees, largely through their own efforts by improving and increasing the production of the Menominee forest and mills, and

Whereas even though we have made some gain, wages and employee benefits have not kept pace with increase living costs, particularly with the increase in property and other State taxes we have had to assume, and other new costs such as health and accident and automotive insurance, medical expenses, and other State fees and expenses from which we were formerly exempt, and

Whereas Menominee Enterprises constitutes almost the entire employment base and support for Menominee County (continued increase in property taxes may bankrupt this company) we realize that further improvement in wages and usual employee benefits will be most difficult, if not impossible, to realize without further development of the industry and tax relief during the interim period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Local 4–302 of the International Woodworkers of America, AFL–CIO, this 12th day of February, 1966, That the honorable chairmen of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are respectfully requested to proceed to hearings and favorable action on S. 1934 and H.R. 8034 now pending in the Congress, and that the representatives of the International Woodworkers of America are requested to assist and support the enactment of this Menominee workers aid legislation.

ALOYSIUS FRECHETTE,
President, Local 4–302.
THOMAS A. GRIGNON,
Secretary-Treasurer, Local 4–302.

Who's Kidding Who?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the battle over agricultural labor during 1965 was fought in the public prints, as well as in the fields. Many of the stories were bewildering to the informed, as well as to the uninformed.

During a recent convention of the Western Growers Association, Mr. J. J. Miller, of the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, examined some of the statements and placed them in their proper perspective.

The comments of Mr. Miller, reproduced in the January 1966 issue of the "Western Grower and Shipper" magazine under the title, "Who's Kidding Who?" follow:

AGRICULTURAL LABOR: WHO'S KIDDING WHO?

If all of the articles on the farm labor situation appearing this year in just the metropolitan press were placed end to end they would probably reach from the city of San Francisco to the front door of the Secretary of Labor and back again to the front door of Palmer Mendelson.

Some of these articles were factual, others were not quite so factual and still others reflected downright misinformation. There were claims and counterclaims and there were charges and countercharges; there was even the suggestion by one State official of a menu for the Thanksgiving dinner of another Federal official, and this, is perhaps the reason why your executive vice president, Mr. Castiglione, suggested that the title of my presentation be "Labor—Who's Kidding 'Who'?"

The problem of trying to get the impact of the agricultural labor problem over to the public might be compared to the story of 10-year-old Bobby who was asked what he had learned at Sunday school. He replied, "Well, our teacher told us about when God sent Moses behind the enemy lines to rescue the Israelites from the Egyptians. When they came to the Red Sea, Moses called for the engineers to build a pontoon bridge. After they had all crossed, they looked back and saw the Egyptian tanks coming. Quick as a flash, Moses radioed headquarters on his walkie-talkie to send bombers to blow up the bridge and save the Israelites."

"Bobby," exclaimed his startled mother, "is that really the way your teacher told that story?"

"Well, not exactly," Bobby replied, "but if I told it her way, you'd never believe it."

So, it seems to me that Government policies in the field of agricultural labor have fallen so short of their intended goals, that if the story were told as it truly exists, you would never believe it.

For example, one government official in a recent speech had this to say: "The big story, of course, is in California, where foreign workers were used in a dozen or more crops in 1964. That number has been cut in half in 1965 and through mid-August man-months of foreign worker employment for the year had dropped from over 176,200 in 1964 to 6,200 for 1965. And the total number of foreign workers in the State right now is only about a quarter of what it was at this time last year."

But what he didn't say is that there were probably 35,000 more green card workers in the State of California than last year, which, in my book, is still a foreign labor program without the many safeguards we had under the expired law permitting orderly entry of foreign workers to do these jobs;

And what he didn't say was that which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on September 28, 1965, that, "Federal and State officials report more than 15,000 Mexican aliens working illegally have been picked up so far this year * * *," and this again is a foreign labor program without any safeguards whatsoever compared to the controlled conditions that were previously utilized under Public Law 78.

And he continues, "in August seven Southeastern and Southern labor supply States participated in planning meetings to assess the availability of workers for Florida's citrus harvest; and later that same month, nine States and Washington, D.C. cooperated in a recruitment effort to obtain applepickers for Virginia and West Virginia. These are selected instances. There are many others. While success in recruitment varied, from the standpoint of experience gained all can be labled 'successful.'"

I'm wondering if the citrus grower in one of our largest valencia producing areas, where for the past 4 straight weeks the entire area has been unable to meet 39 to 40 percent of their prorate due to labor shortages, would consider this successful.

I am wondering if it is to be considered successful that our export loss in lemon volume alone approximates $1 million f.o.b. and, added to that, $250,000 f.o.b. loss in August on valencia oranges because our packinghouse were unable to fill orders due to insufficient experienced workers to handle the volume of fruit required.

I am wondering if it is considered successful that our cost per pound in lemon picking shows a 47.7 percent increase over 1964, or is it considered to be successful that our recruiting costs for labor have increased over 1964 costs from 89.9 percent to 206 percent depending on the area?

It seems as though, like the story of Bobby, perhaps if these things were told we woudl never believe it. So I will turn the question back and ask, "Who's kidding who?"

The question might also be asked of one of our State executives when recently he was quoted in the Los Angeles Times as saying, "We have produced a record or near-record crop with a labor force that was about 98 percent American workers and only 2 percent Mexican and other foreign nations."

But what he didn't say was that there were 15,000 illegal workers in California this year with no protection of the provisions of the previous statutory act;

What he didn't say was that which his own representative reported to the State Board of agriculture, i.e.: "Agricultural employment in California was off by nearly 41,000 workers the week after Labor Day compared to last year;

And what he didn't say was that there were 30,000 to 35,000 more green card workers introduced into the work force in the State of California. I submit that these still are not in the classic sense American workers.

What has not been said is that many carloads of lemons have had to be reconditioned before, as well as after, sale as a result of serious decay caused by late picking. Our field laboratories report the shippers, in the main, have done an excellent job with this fruit (referring to the lemons) that has been too long on the trees. But much of the fruit should have been picked two or three months earlier. Had this been possible it would have had storage life and not have shown the spoilage in the hands of the jobbers and retailers. This, I submit, results in losses to growers as well as increaed cost to the consumers.

What has not been said, according to our field laboratories, is that the spoilage of naval oranges due to decay in 1965 amounted to 400 cars as compared to 241 cars in 1964. In 1964, up to and including September 13, only 92 cars of valencia oranges showing decay were sold. However, in 1965, in the same comparable period, 248 carloads showed decay.

In researching this particular problem, our field laboratory manager had this to say: "I also note in Nelson Painter's report of an arrival in Hamburg on the MS *Loch Loyal*, 39,000 cartons had to be reconditioned because of decay. Last year there were only 5,000 cartons in the entire season on this ship showing decay. This did not have to be reconditioned. The *Loch Loyal* is one of the better ships and has a very efficient operating crew."

Continuing he said, "the lemons of the old crop remaining on the trees were pretty poor. This fruit should have been picked months ago."

Further in this report it is indicated that the percentage of decay on tree ripe lemons this year amounted to 22.8 percent and, as Mr. MacRill reported to me, I will quote him: "this fruit was picked in July but should have been picked in April. You will note that even the dark green lemons had many times normal decay for green fruit. It is rare to see decay in green fruit within 37 days of storage."

On still another occasion, a high government official in a speech in Los Angeles this year, among other things had this to say:

"In general, prices this year for fruits and vegetables have not risen or fluctuated any more for crops which braceros used to pick than they have for other food prices.

"If there should be any more of this tampering with the truth about fruit and vegetable prices, or evidence that prices are being raised unduly, the public is going to be fully and quickly advised. It has a right to know."

However, on Monday, October 25, 1965, the Wall Street Journal carried an article entitled "Costlier Meals." The article by John Barnett went on to say:

"Food prices head up as labor shortage, weather cut harvests. As supermarket shoppers are painfully discovering, food prices are going up fast these days.

"The trend started earlier this year with big boosts in the prices of meat. Now the cost of eating is being driven even higher by sharp jumps in the prices of canned and frozen fruits and vegetables—and the worst is yet to come.

"It all adds up to quite a blow for the household budget.

"The price hikes have become especially pronounced in the past few days. Some major packing companies have raised prices on canned fruits and vegetables more than 20 percent. The increases vary from item to item, but most increases are substantial. A packing company executive ticks off some of the changes from last year in cannery prices for canned goods: Yellow cling peaches up 12.2 percent, pears up 22 percent, pineapple up 77 percent, fruit cocktail up 18 percent, peas up 9 percent, corn up 10 percent, tomato juice up 7 percent, and lima beans up 13 percent.

"The price spurt already is apparent in the Government's wholesale price index for processed foods, which includes meats, dairy products, and canned and frozen vegetables and fruit. In September, the index hit 106.7 percent of the 1957–59 average, down a bit from August's record 106.9 percent but up 3.4 percentage points from the May level and nearly 5 points from August 1964.

"An early factor in the current price upswing was the Government's termination last December 31, of the bracero program."

This same Government official, not too long ago, in reply to statements that imports to the United States from Mexico have been on the increase, said that there was no appreciable increase in the import of agricultural commodities to the United States and no mass exodus of U.S. farmers to Mexico.

Assuming that this is true, the fact remains that the long-term effect of U.S. labor policies will be a serious and a continuing blow to the economy, not only of California, but of the United States.

For example, just recently I had occasion to check on this personally and a single nursery in the Coachella Valley has shipped in excess of 500,000 orange trees to the Hermosillo area of Mexico. These are enough trees for a planting of approximately 5,000 acres.

The same nursery is also shipping seed to Mexico in 100-pounds lots. It is estimated that enough seed has been shipped to Mexico to plant 20,000 acres.

Citrus in Mexico is being planted with the aid of loans by the Mexican Government. One of the prime purposes is to export to the U.S. market.

Let me, if I may, bring out another example, which I think the public has a right to know. If you will bear with me, I should like to read from a memo I received in my office not too long ago.

"A farming contract available in Mexico. A large dam has been built and is now ready to serve the farming area known as the Fuerte Valley in the west coast State of Sinaloa, Mexico.

"The landowners have formed a farming co-op and are looking for a contractor to clear and put into cultivation some million acres of level farmland.

"What they have in mind is for the contractor to make lump-sum contracts to clear and plant parcels of 75,000 acres at a time. He is to receive his pay from the sale of the crop produced; the Government will guarantee a definite price for his crop, or he may sell it through private sources.

"As a sort of bonus, they will give the contractor 25,000 acres for himself to clear, plant, and sell his crops to either the Government-subsidized farm-support program or to private buyers. On this 25,000 acres, he is to be reimbursed for all his capital and operating expenses first, and then he is to receive one-third of the profits on this venture for 5 years.

"They want some one who has the knowledge and ability to handle a project of this size, because as soon as he has finished the first 75,000-acre contract and his 25,000-acre bonus contract, he is to get another 75,000-acre contract until the entire valley is placed under cultivation. The contractor should have from $500,000 to $2 million working capital to handle this venture.

"The contract will be fully supported by the co-op and the Governor of the State of Sinaloa, who guarantees that they will give every needed clearance and legal help the contractor might require.

"If you are interested in a venture of this kind and size, you will receive proper evidence, detailed information and entree to the principals handling this project in Mexico."

In conclusion, the question might be asked, what has been done, and what is being done? Hundreds of thousands of pages in dozens of studies have been compiled—none of which seem to give the answers some people want—so they pile up and gather dust.

The most recent of these studies is a work by Harland Padfield and William E. Martin for the University of Arizona entitled "Farmers, Workers and Machines." This is, in my opinion, a well-prepared document, and like some other, I am afraid, their conclusions might not be what some people want.

For example, on page 294, this report states:

" 'Public Law 78 and Its Administration'

"1. Public Law 78 should be extended or some similar law enacted. However, no increases in the total foreign farm labor supply should be allowed.

"Even with an extension of this law, the use of Mexican national workers would decrease rapidly without the aid of restricted legislation under technological and economic pressures already set in motion. The only restriction should be on greatly increasing the importation of Mexican nationals, thus avoiding formation of some new capital-saving, labor-using technology. Ending the program now will cause chaotic conditions within some crops and regions as adoption of new methods and technologies will be forced at too rapid a rate. During this period, consumer prices may rise precipitously.

"The removal of the braceros simply implies the elimination of jobs they were performing. At the same time, the lower occupational classes, now complementary to the braceros' tasks, will also be eliminated. New but fewer jobs will be created for a different (and higher) occupational class. Continuation of the bracero program would cause these changes to occur more gradually while economic, social, and technological processes eliminate the program within the next few years in a smooth and relatively nondisruptive manner."

On page 295, we find the following:

" 'Other Forms of Alien Labor'

"To attempt to alleviate farm labor shortages by a naturalization process, such as under Public Law 414, is most undesirable. The green card worker cannot be regulated precisely in accordance with labor demand. Once admitted to the United States, he is free to move to any area and any industry. If he encounters social or economic difficulty he becomes a problem to society as a whole rather than being only a farm labor cost. He is a year-round problem imported to answer a seasonal labor demand."

And we quote from page 296 of this report as follows:

"Whose responsibility are these technologically obsolete workers? To use a specific example, whose responsibility are the Anglo-isolates described in chapter 17 or the Indians described in chapter 19? Certainly we cannot blame their impoverished condition on the farmers for whom they usually work. The farm provides them a job where no other sector of our economy can. The Anglo-isolates are on the farm because they have been rejected elsewhere. The Indians are on the farm because the farm allows them to continue to participate in reservation life."

And finally, may I go back to the front of the book under "Acknowledgments." It says this:

"This study was financed by contract funds from the Bureau of Employment Security of the U.S. Department of Labor."

Camp Gary: Educators Learn Some Lessons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM GIBBONS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate enough this fall to be able to inspect the Gary, Tex., Job Corps Center.

The Dallas Morning News in its Sunday, February 6, edition, ran a fine article on Camp Gary and its progress to date. The story should speak for itself. I hope all of the Members of this House will take the time to read it, both those for the war on poverty and those who would like nothing better than to see it fail.

CAMP GARY: EDUCATORS LEARN SOME LESSONS

(By Richard M. Morehead)

CAMP GARY, TEX.—Educators and employers, as well as students, are learning some important lessons at this Job Corps center.

Despite some criticism of the program, designed for training young men who have dropped out of regular school, and a dispute between State and Federal officials over its management, the vocational-technical school appears to be a successful experiment in education after its first 11 months of operation.

That's the opinion of those closely connected with the Camp Gary "urban" vocational training center.

Gov. John Connally calls it a "smashing success."

Dr. Arleigh Templeton, president of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and a trustee of the foundation operating Gary, said its experience is pointing up that the offerings of many public school systems are "completely out of step with the needs of modern society."

Dr. Oscar J. Baker, who left the superintendency of Dickinson public schools to become director at Gary, said:

"We're learning here how to deal with the 85 percent of our population who drop out of school before graduating from college.

"Forty-six percent never finish high school. There must be renewed emphasis in education on marketable skills, and providing vocational and technical training for the noncollege bound."

Wallace Dockall, a veteran teacher-administrator-coach from the Austin public schools, is the director of education and training at Gary.

"We see here an awakening of things we can do for these young men that weren't done in regular public schools," he said.

Realistically, Dockall expressed doubt that public school systems generally will rush to apply the programs being developed here.

The reasons include the expense of high-quality vocational technical education, the reluctance of parents and children to patronize such courses in schools where emphasis is on going to college, and the academic regulations which are imposed on the public schools.

None of the 2,500 young men will get a high school diploma here, for example. Some will pass high school equivalency tests. Some leaving Gary return to high schools back home, and a few have gone to college. Most "graduates" go into the military or jobs, however. Dockall hopes an arrangement can be made for teachers from the San Marcos public schools to teach some academic courses here.

Public school administrators are beginning to come here in large numbers to view Gary's operation. While there has been little staff turnover so far, others are seeking to recruit Gary-trained people. Its director of vocational training was recently lured away by the Connally Technical Institute, at Waco, which plans to start enrolling students this fall.

Employers, both by individual firms and groups, have been assisting in the project almost from the beginning, largely due to the efforts by Governor Connally. Growing numbers of employers are participating through a nonprofit corporation called Opportunities Inc.

This is viewed, by the staff and others, as a pet project of President Johnson in his Great Society campaign against poverty.

Meanwhile, this Job Corps center pushes ahead with courses—all originated by the staff here—to teach its students the fundamentals of making a living.

Thirty-nine vocational courses are offered. Several are based on automobile repair. Others include welding, dry cleaning, tailoring, laundry, machine shop, plant maintenance, sheet metal, custodial service, cooking, baking, meat cutting, office occupations, commercial art, printing, photography, hospital work, and licensed vocational nursing.

One of the most popular courses is the operation of heavy roadbuilding machinery. Seventy-nine giant bulldozers, draglines, and other shiny new earthmovers are operated 12 hours a day, digging holes in a remote area of this onetime Army air training field and then filling them up.

The instructor is a onetime employee of Austin Bridge Co., and the teacher and the students seem to enjoy this vigorous outdoor training. Those who finish the course expect to find good-paying jobs.

Eighty Texas industrial firms, including several based in Dallas, are assisting in the development of courses geared to the employment market. They are helping to lay out the classrooms (all held in former Army camp quarters), to devise the training, and to find jobs for those who finish the courses.

Most courses are scheduled to run for 2 years, although some are shorter. The students are given academic training only insofar as it applies to the skill they are trying to learn. The English, mathematics, and chemistry taught a welding student, for example, relates directly to his job. And the classroom-library is at one end of the same building where some 30 young men were busy with welding torches, directed by a teacher recruited from Howard County Junior College.

Many of the youths must learn how to read before entering the vocational and other courses.

Lem Railsback, a master-degree teacher, proudly presides over what he terms "the most modern reading laboratory in the world" housed in an unpretentious white-shingled building.

It includes an electronic console, connected to 30 booths where students with earphones learn basic reading from Railsback through the use of tape recordings.

Currently 312 Gary students are taking the course, aimed at reaching a 5.9 reading level (slightly below the average expected of a sixth-grader). The average age of Gary trainees is about 17.5 years, and they claim an average of 8 years' public school education when admitted. Most of them have achievement levels closer to the sixth-grader, say their instructors.

"I've had three boys here with high school diplomas who couldn't read on a sixth-grade level," said Railsback. One came from Georgia, another from New York, and a third from New Jersey.

Most of Railsback's students cannot read as well as a third-grader when they enroll.

In 4½ months, through the use of teaching machines, he "graduates" them as sixth-grade readers, who can then attend regular classes and read well enough to take vocational training.

Railsback, who came here from the faculty at Sul Ross College, holds bachelor and master's degrees in English plus considerable additional graduate instruction in college.

Like, many another Gary instructor, however, he couldn't work in a Texas public school system (except in an emergency) because he lacks a teaching certificate, granted by a college of education. Neither teacher certification nor course accreditation, which bind public schools, belong to the Gary plan.

All 94 teachers of basic education subjects, like Railsback, have college degrees but many lack teaching certificates. Only 35 of the 96 vocational instructors finished college. All are high school graduates, and every teacher must have had at least 5 years' recent experience in the specialty for which he is employed here.

Pay starts at $685 per month on a 12-month basis. Teachers' salaries average $825 per month—about 50 percent higher than the average for Texas public schools.

Competent vocational instructors are the hardest to find, and to keep. Relatively few are trained in the regular educational system, and industry snaps up those who are available. Also, many public schools and junior colleges are trying to launch vocational training programs, adding to the demand.

Gary's staff totals about 1,100 and the school is scheduled to reach its maximum of 3,000 students by June. The present staff—considerably larger than any which a regular system would employ for this number of students—can take care of the 3,000 pupils, says Dockall.

Likewise, Gary's cost has been high by standards of public schools. The first 202 students arrived March 2, 1965. Through June this year, its cost will exceed $13 million, much of it nonrecurring outlay for equipment.

Nationally, Job Corps officials estimate it cost an average of $4,500 to train a youth for 9 months, according to Business Week magazine. Critics have noted that the most expensive private colleges charge less.

But Business Week reported in its January 29 issue that the experience so far with the Job Corps centers has been encouraging both to industry and students. All of the urban centers except Gary are operated under contracts with such industrial firms as IBM, Zerox, and Litton Industries.

Texas Educational Foundation, a nonprofit corporation organized by Governor Connally, operates Gary. Its board includes Dr. Templeton, president of Sam Houston State College in Huntsville; Cecil Ruby, Austin-Buda contractor; and Robert Thornton, a San Marcos banker.

There seems to be general agreement that Gary is the showcase of all the Job Corps training centers in the United States. Directors of the other seven men's centers here recently said so, according to Gary staffers. They indicated that Gary—which has been much more experimental than the others in its brandnew approach to vocational-technical training—offers features which others plan to adopt. One is the widespread involvement of industry through Opportunities, Inc.

While training dropouts is expensive, the cost of failure to make them self-supporting is greater, Business Week pointed out.

"There are an estimated 1 million jobless youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 (in the Nation)," the magazine noted. "Each one, if he becomes a member of the hard-core unemployed, will cost society upwards of $100,000 during his lifetime, plus the loss of his productivity."

Gary officials say the public schools have failed to get across to youngsters the importance of learning vocational skills, particularly for those who are not going to college.

"I wish every school counselor could come to Gary and see what's being done for the young men they were unable to communicate with," remarked one official here.

Training Director Dockall said that one reason he came here was his feeling that public schools provide inadequate education for many students—the noncollege group—and he wanted to be a part of the effort to make some improvements.

Dockall came from the Austin public school system, one of the State's best, and was principal at Travis High when he came here. Before that, he taught chemistry (and coached basketball and football) at Austin High, and was assistant principal at Johnston High, one of the city's newest and best-equipped schools for vocational training.

Dockall (who holds a master's degree), a quiet-spoken, 42-year-older, has spent most of his life working with young men. In addition to coaching and teaching, he has 18 years' experience in the Army, Active and Reserve, and holds the rank of major. His Army and coaching background has been valuable here, Dockall says.

The average trainee is 17.5 years old, and comes from a family of at least six children (all families of less than $3,000 annual income). He must have been out of school and jobless for at least 3 months.

The 17,500 Job Corpsmen in the Nation represent the cream of the dropouts.

Most arriving here lack discipline and motivation. In about 60 to 90 days, say staff members, about 90 percent straighten out and become interested in learning. Most consider Gary (where they live in dormitories) to be their home. Many skip the opportunity for weekend trips into Austin, San Antonio, and San Marcos. There is much recreation offered here, mostly sports. Transportation was provided for the Corpsmen to go home at Christmas but many returned to the camp early.

Forty percent of the trainees are Negroes, 14 percent Latin-American, and the remainder Anglo-Americans. They come from all over the United States, many from broken homes. About one-third arrive from rural areas and the others from cities.

Physical training is stressed for all trainees, and each has daily work chores in addition to class and laboratory. One group, for example, is rehabilitating a dilapidated former Army structure for the city of San Marcos to use as part of an airport to be operated in connection with Camp Gary.

Dockall says the conduct of students at Gary about equals the public school pupils with which he is acquainted. Some 3 percent commit serious offenses and most of these are sent home. Five were involved in a shooting episode at San Antonio. One was stabbed to death in an East Austin Negro neighborhood fight. One drowned here. Two others have been killed in automobile accidents while on leave.

The biggest outlet for Gary trainees so far has been the military services.

Raymond Todd, an 18-year-old from Maplewood, N.J., a few days ago became the 49th Gary trainee drafted for military service. More than 100 others have volunteered.

Todd said he had hoped to finish his training as a construction equipment operator before going into the Army but commented, "I feel I've learned a lot of things at Gary that will help me whatever I'm doing."

He was drafted after spending less than 4 months here.

More than 200 of the youths enrolled here flunked their draft tests first. Gary offers a special course to help students meet the educational requirements for military service. Currently, 290 are enrolled.

The real results of the program here remain to be seen. Fifteen Gary trainees took jobs using their newly learned skills in the first 8 months the center operated here.

A booklet produced by Gary's public relations department (printed by trainees) concludes:

"With any group of men 16 through 21 years old, there will be unfortunate events, whether among college, high school, military groups, or job corpsmen. The events pertaining to corpsmen are making headlines while the others are generally taken in stride. This is because the Job Corps program is new and because it has not had time to prove itself.

"Those in the program feel that in time it will be recognized as a sound, logical program of dealing with this Nation's nonproductive youth—until a better way is found."

The operators here insist that Camp Gary is intended to be temporary—to teach the dropouts only until public schools revise their offerings to hold these youths. But nobody here will predict how long they think it will take public schools to make the necessary readjustments.

"—Not in my lifetime," commented one middle-aged ex-public schoolman.

Chester W. Nimitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz was a man who served his country well. He took command of our Pacific Fleet at a time when its fortunes were at their lowest ebb, only days after the attack on Pearl Harbor. He built that fleet into the mightiest the world had ever known and he led it to victory over the Japanese. When the surrender came that ended the war in the Pacific, it was Admiral Nimitz who signed for the United States.

After the war, and even in recent years, Admiral Nimitz continued to serve his country. Sunday he died. It is only right that we pause to pay tribute to this gallant man and to offer our sympathy to his family.

The Great Society: Can We Afford It Financially or Spiritually?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the editor of Babson's Washington Forecast Letter recently delivered a notable speech at the Babson 52d Annual National Conference on Investments and Business. Entitled, "The Great Society: Can we Afford It Financially and Spiritually?" this speech provides much food for thought for those Americans who are concerned about the direction in which our country seems to be going.

So that all of my colleagues will have an opportunity to read Mr. Henry's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The speech referred to follows:

THE GREAT SOCIETY—CAN WE AFFORD IT FINANCIALLY OR SPIRITUALLY?

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. John J. Henry delivered this speech at the Babson 52d Annual National Conference on Investments and Business. Mr. Henry is editor of Babson's Washington Forecast Letter, published by our affiliate, the Business Statistics Corp., of Babson Park, Mass.

Doesn't it make you feel wonderful to be living in the Great Society? All of us have aspired to a place in society, and many of us thought we'd never make it. But now—suddenly—with no effort on our part, and without even learning whether we're supposed to eat caviar with a fork or spoon, we have not only been catapulted into society, but into the Great Society. Because our debut was both sudden and recent, it is understandable that many of us have not achieved a full recognition of the characteristics and benefits of the high estate we have attained. Simply and directly—it is heaven on earth.

As in heaven, the design and promise of the earthly Great Society is the welfare and happiness of all our people. In less enlightened times, it had been thought that the individual held the basic responsibility for his own welfare and happiness and that of his family, and that an able-bodied person did not have the right to a living at the expense of the community. If he was able to work, he was expected to do so. If he could not find work in his chosen occupation for a period of time, he was expected to offer his services in some other line of work, to bridge the gap. Those who were incapacitated or otherwise unable to provide a livelihood for themselves and their families were helped by the community or by local organizations set up and endowed by the more fortunate. It was a simple way of life, but one that was understandably more difficult and demanding for those who found working distasteful. It did, however, provide a rather effective incentive for finding and keeping a job.

In those days, the rolls of those on the community dole were usually much smaller, because the great majority of our people harbored some sort of silly pride about not being supported by their neighbors. There seemed to be almost a social stigma attached to "goldbricking."

It was obvious that something had to be done. The people quite apparently needed enlightenment and help. It was self-demeaning, degrading, and downright humiliating for a person to be a recipient of human charity and to be put in a position where he might be expected to show gratitude to his fellow men and to his community in return for their helping hand in his time of difficulty. After all, he owed them nothing. He had the right to a living. It was part of his birthright as a free American citizen. What's more, he shouldn't and couldn't be required to care for his children or his elderly parents. He was a free man, and free man should not be burdened with such responsibility.

His freedom, in fact, needed expansion. He should be free to picket the Pentagon and the White House, calling for an end to our imperialistic aggression in Vietnam and he should be free to send aid to the Vietcong. And—if a teacher or college professor, he should be free to counsel his students on how to beat the draft. If an atheist, he should be free to demand that others refrain from praying in the presence of his children at school. If a Communist, he should be free to teach in the public schools. After all, the children are free to be influenced or not influenced. If a businessman—in this spirit and atmosphere of freedom—he should allow any and all Government agencies full access to all his books, records, and correspondence—and he should be willing to do any amount of free bookkeeping for Uncle Sam.

Although he has to pay taxes for medicare, he should be free not to use it. If his children happen to go to a free public school in a neighborhood which doesn't happen to have the proper chromatic balance, he should be free to demand that the taxpayers pay for buses to carry his own children halfway across the city so that the precise chromatic balance will be achieved.

If he's a fellow who wants to go into business for himself, he should be free to borrow what he needs through a Government SBA loan. This, of course, is not unfairly competitive with private banking, because an applicant cannot get an SBA loan unless his credit is so bad that he's first been turned down by at least two local banks. It's appropriate, therefore, in such confining circumstances, that he be free to borrow up to a quarter of a million dollars from us taxpayers.

If our uplifted American is a farmer, it's true that he can't grow as much wheat and corn as he might like to—but the Government pays him handsomely for his restraint. Remember, too, that this gives him more free time to do other things—such as play on the golf course the Government helped him build on the land he took out of production.

Our new-type citizen is also free to ignore any previous responsibilities placed upon him by his community for building schools, hospitals, public buildings, sewage disposal plants, or other public facilities. Of course, it costs more to have the Federal Government build these facilities for his community, but it seems like it's free.

If the beneficiary of this new-found freedom wants to build a house and is willing to agree to a number of restrictions on the design, location, construction, layout, and later rental or sale of the property, he is free to get a mortgage loan with little or no downpayment. And, if he objects to any of those restrictions, he's free to go and get a conventional loan on his own.

Then, there's the important new freedom in voting. Every citizen should be entitled to vote—if he is warm and over 21. How can a man be considered free if, as a prerequisite to voting, he must be able to read or write, or know anything about the candidates or issues? Why, that would be a denial of his inalienable right to vote in favor of requiring you taxpayers to appropriate more funds for his welfare.

Yes, this is the philosophy of the Great Society. In the words of its founder and patron, it is "the grandest design of all—a design which creates a state whose only reason for existence is the welfare and happiness of its people. Far from crushing the individual, [it] liberates him from the enslaving forces of his environment."

Once we decide that it is government's responsibility to provide for our personal welfare and happiness, we must next determine what is in the interest of our welfare—and what will make us happy. It doesn't make sense to allow the people themselves to decide what's required for their personal welfare and happiness. There would be too much confusion, too much difference of opinion. Besides, the vast majority of people don't know what they require for their welfare and happiness. They've never studied the problem. This should be left to the experts. Of course, if you can get a fairly good-sized group of voters together who all want the same thing, you can be reasonably certain that your demands will be met. It is no longer necessary to ask what you can do for your country. You need merely ask: What can your country do for you?

The basic idea of the Great Society is not new. It was not found on tablets of stone on the banks of the Pedernales. The theory that Government should be required to provide for the basic needs of all of its citizens, regardless of their contribution to society or to the national economy, has been proposed by other great thinkers of the past. One of these who comes to mind readily is Karl Marx, the father of communism, whose historic formula for the ideal state is somewhat of a paraphrase of the same principle. Marx put it this way: "From each according to his abilities; to each according to his needs."

It is somewhat disturbing to note that in every country or community where this theory has been put into practice, one of two things has happened. Either the whole thing has crumbled into complete failure, or it has evolved into a total dictatorship in which the people have no voice and no meaningful vote. Yes, it is rather disturbing to note that this theory, when put into practice, has never worked anywhere on the globe. I wonder if it will work here?

One of the major problems in the achievement of the goals of the Great Society is cost. What President Johnson calls the "fabulous" 89th Congress appropriated over $119 billion in its first session. And that's just the "initiation fee" to get into the Great Society. The much larger dues and assessments come later—$119 billion. Do you know how much a billion dollars is?

If you should give your wife a billion dollars and tell her to go out and spend it at the rate of a thousand dollars a day and not come back until it's all spent, you wouldn't see her for 2,739 years.

Let's look at that $119 billion appropriation in another way. It means that Congress voted to spend over $1,641 this year for every employed person in the United States. Yet, it is still incredible that the average American does not relate government spending to money coming out of his pocket. Instead, he thinks of it as something for nothing, a largess coming from the filmy nowhere. How often have you heard seemingly intelligent adults comment, in deep gratitude, that "the Government is paying for 85 percent of the cost of our highways, or part or all of the cost of any number of other projects or facilities? Yet, these dollars come from one source and one source alone: John Q. Taxpayer.

It's been suggested that considerable restraint would be put on Federal spending if Congress were required to send a bill to each taxpayer for his share of the proposed projects' cost. How long would foreign aid last if the average employed person got a bill for $66.56 for his share of our annual handouts to other nations?

There's another thing about cost that most of us don't realize. It's this: For every day's pay the Government gives someone for not working, there's someone working for a whole day without pay. The same is true of the mounting millions of individuals on Government payrolls.

In the Agriculture Department, for example, the number of employees has risen by 20 percent in the past 5 years, while the number of farmers in the United States has dropped by the same percentage in the same 5 years. Apparently, it takes more Government employees to pay fewer farmers more money to raise smaller crops. If we didn't do that, of course, we'd have enough food to feed the 30 percent of our population which we are told is living in poverty.

An economy-minded Congressman once told me that he placed great stock in what he called Hepplethwaite's Law of Diminishing Responsibility. The law states that the greater the distance between the man who spends the money and the man who pays the bill, the less the wisdom and efficiency with which the money will be spent.

You've all seen the application of this law in your own communities. When the town fathers want to build a school for a million dollars, you throw them out of office for being extravagant, and then vote a $750,000 bond issue for a more practical, more efficiently designed school building. But when the Federal Government offers to pay most of the costs for a $3 million school in your community—built to Uncle Sam's lavish specifications—you don't blink an eye.

Can you imagine your own community taxpayers agreeing to lay out $6,000 per year for each of your high school dropouts to pay for the training and rehabilitation of these youngsters? Yet, that's what the Job Corps is doing right now with money taken from your other pocket. The money spent on one of these Job Corps enrollees per year could send four worthy youngsters to college for the same period. And the irony of it is that almost one-sixth of the dropouts recruited into the Job Corps have already dropped out of the Corps.

Do you suppose that the taxpayers of Washington, D.C., would have voted an appropriation of $635,000 to run a day-care center for 1 year for 450 pre-school-age children if the money were coming from local taxes instead of Federal taxes? The cost works out to $1,411.11 per child per year. That's $61 more than the tuition at Washington's most expensive university, and $600 per child more than the cost of attending the most expensive, most exclusive, private kindergarten school in the whole Washington area and more than three times as much as the per-child cost in the District of Columbia public school system.

But cost is no consideration. You see, Washingtonians are getting this free from the Federal Government.

The people of Gibson County, Tenn., are very frugal. They're mighty careful about appropriating local tax money. If a local politician had suggested that $91,300 be appropriated to teach 60 Gibson County women how to cook, he would have been run out of the county on a rail. But this is exactly what is being spent for this purpose by the antipoverty program in Gibson County. How many people do you think would enroll in a cooking school at a tuition rate of over $1,500 per person? To Sargent Shriver, that's really cooking with gas.

Have you heard that the city of Chicago has a great thirst for culture? Uncle Sam is no one to discourage such interests—so he (and we) have provided Federal funds to the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity to develop rock-and-roll choral groups. The project sponsors look upon this as an opportunity to get double value from the taxpayers' dollar. They say—and I quote—"This project has cultural implications, but (it) also has a definite economic effect in the war on poverty, because it will give employment to persons who would not otherwise have jobs." I don't doubt it.

You know, the unemployment compensation rules decree that you can draw compensation so long as there is not available employment in your chosen field of endeavor. That's why it was possible for a man in New York City to draw the full spate of compensation, because his line was grooming camels. It just happened that there was a shortage of camels in the big city at the time and, according to the rules, he couldn't be required to take a job grooming horses, dogs, or cats. As for pushing a broom or mowing somebody's lawn, that was unthinkable and below the dignity of a camel groom.

I have given you a few examples. There are hundreds, yes thousands, just like them. They sound incredible—impossible to believe. Yet, they are there—in the record—to be seen by anyone who happens to be interested. Unfortunately, there are fewer and fewer people interested with each passing year. We are becoming less and less aware of the money we are spending foolishly, because we never get the chance to feel it. It doesn't actually pass through our hands on a payout basis. Yet, we are assuming and paying this full burden of taxation—direct, indirect, and double taxation—to our Federal, State, and local governments. True—some of the money is coming back to us in the form of buildings, highways, and hundreds of other helps and handouts—but the almost unbelievable costs of bureaucracy are being worn off those dollars before they are returned to us—and we have little or no choice as to how the money is to be spent.

There's another thing: We're assured that Government spending is a stimulant to the economy and, the more the merrier. Every dollar the Government spends goes directly into the economic stream. It makes work and it makes buying power. The formula for perpetual prosperity is really very simple. Why in the world didn't somebody think of it before? It doesn't matter that our Government's national debt is moving upward at the greatest rate in peacetime history. When you're moving forward, you can afford to assume more debt. And, if the time comes when you are standing still—or moving backward—nobody could expect you to be able to pay off your debts then. On the contrary, that's the time to borrow heavily, to give the economy a real shot in the arm, to preserve the Great Society.

Certainly, we must concede that present welfare programs can easily be financed through the combination of current prosperity-induced Federal revenues, plus limited Federal deficit spending (not more than $6 billion will have to be added to the Federal debt next year, assuming all continues to go well). Of course, our welfare programs will expand and that will require more money. For housing, rent subsidies, and urban development, we're committing less than a billion dollars this year, but over the following 3 years that will rise to almost $7½ billion. On Federal aid to education, we merely got the foot in the door this year with a paltry $672 million. Projected expenses reach almost $5 billion in the following 4 years.

For social security improvements and for medicare and public assistance, the projected 5-year cost is $32½ billion. Regional medical centers got only $50 million this year but the word is out that the 4-year cumulative total will soar to $650 million. We gave our hardworking and underprivileged Federal workers another raise this year, and, in this 12-month period, it will cost a paltry $621 million. But the civil service accountants figure it will cost an additional $6.8 billion over the next 5 years.

By the way, a minor executive working for the Government in grade 16 in 1958 received $14,190 per year. On the unlikely assumption that he was not able to better his position in the past 7 years—but was stuck in the same old job—he now receives $22,210 per annum. Anybody want a job with the Government.

One of the annoying problems which accompany deficit spending is the threat of inflation. Senator THRUSTON MORTON calls them the Siamese twins. You can't have one without the other. You can avoid this invitation to inflation by paying as you go. But that's too harsh a demand to make in the Great Society. We actually reduced taxes while committing ourselves to a domestic program with a cumulative cost of more than $60 billion. The ravages of inflation are not too costly to those who can ride with the tide—and who know exactly when to sell out. But to pensioners and to those with fixed-value assets, it's a losing battle. In actual purchasing power, the social security pensioner, with the recent generous 7-percent increase in benefits, has less purchasing power than he had 10 years ago.

Another of the ominous aspects of life in the Great Society is the rapidly increasing measure of control exercised by our Federal Government over the individual and over all lesser forms of government. Uncle Sam is generous with his gifts to all of us. There are no strings attached, at first. Recently, however, we have seen countless examples of Government threats to cut off this largess to specific recipients who failed to toe the line on Government-promoted policies in fields totally unrelated to that of the fund transfer.

Herein lies an important lesson. A Government which can make its subjects dependent upon it, can make those subjects dance to the tune it chooses to play. We must always remember that a government that is powerful enough to give you all you want is also powerful enough to take it all away. Are we really moving into a Great Society—or a regimented, ruled, planned, and dependent society? You know, you can't kill a frog by putting him into a pot of boiling water. He'll jump out. But, if you put him in tepid water and gradually increase the heat, he'll be a goner before he knows he's even hurting.

What can be the consequences of the excesses practiced by the Great Society? What if a recession should come, as they have come repeatedly in the past? Despite the resulting drop in Federal revenues, paternal government would feel obligated to take extreme measures to stimulate the faltering economy, thus committing many additional dollars in deficit spending. Considering the already weakened position of the American dollar in international finance, devaluation would almost certainly follow. The loss of international prestige which would accompany such a collapse of the dollar would abruptly jolt the United States out of its position of world leadership. There would be political chaos at home and diplomatic bankruptcy for our status abroad.

To many of you, this may sound extreme and unwarranted. Right now, the blossom of prosperity and well-being seems full-blown. But, even now, there are clouds in the sky that are hard to explain away. Why, in these lush times, should the home foreclosure rate for the first half of this year be the highest since 1935? Why should total installment debt be rising at a much greater rate than disposable income? Perhaps there's a point to the old story of the motorist who stopped just over the crest of a long winding hill to ask a native if the hill was dangerous. "Not here it ain't," the old man replied. "It's down at the bottom where they all kills theirselves."

Perhaps even more significant than the possible economic consequences of the Great Society are the spiritual, the moral effects on our American citizens. Throughout most of our almost two centuries as a Nation, our people have earned an enviable worldwide reputation as dynamic, hard-working individuals with almost limitless initiative and with a consummate faith in our ability to win the battle of life against any and all odds. We refused to limit our horizons by seeking the cushion of security. We loved our freedom with a passion and our Government was the servant, not the master, of its people. We were known, too, as a people who worked together for the common good and to whom the unsolicited and unconditional helping hand was a way of life. This was our formula for both greatness and human dignity. And how well it worked.

In more recent years, we have seen a gradual change in the composite American, away from those traditional characteristics and attributes. The new American is a more selfish individual, more security-conscious, less self-reliant, and more demanding of others. He seeks to avoid responsibility and feels little compulsion to practice the virtue of human charity. He has sought successfully to transfer his erstwhile responsibilities to his Government, the caring for the poor, the sick, and the elderly, the guaranteeing of his own security, the development of his community, his protection against the buffetings of the world, the education—even the raising—of his children, his economic insulation against the consequences of his own excesses and stupidity.

In return for this paternal benevolence, he has been willing to trade measure after measure of his personal freedom. He has become willing to conform to the master plan to become a number in the computer of life. He has surrendered his freedom of choice to a dominating government which prescribes the exact method by which he may seek the type of welfare and happiness which that government feels is best for him. It is becoming the same sort of welfare and happiness that is available to everyone else—no more, no less. Each new milestone in the path toward the Great Society takes more from the "haves" and distributes it to the "have-nots", places more burdens on the "can-do" individuals in order to give more benefits to the "couldn't-care-less" boys.

We haven't reached the end of this parade. The regimentation is only beginning. The longer we fail to realize what we are doing to ourselves and to our Nation, the more difficult it will become to lift ourselves by the bootstraps from the mire of personal and national mediocrity.

What is needed to alter this collision course with a fate of collective insignificance? The motivation must come from us, the people, millions of people inspired by the memory of their forefathers, those great Americans whose blood still runs—albeit weakly—in our veins. Fired by that inspiration, we must dedicate ourselves to a rebirth and remolding of the great American image, pledging our efforts and working tirelessly to enlist the efforts of others in the task of transforming our Nation once again into a land of industrious, responsible citizens who neither need nor want to live by Government handout. Until we break the shackles of Government subsidy—and the attendant shackles of Government control over our most private decisions and actions—we will not restore the priceless American freedom which we are now unwittingly selling—piece by piece—in return for the shoddy security of public charity.

Not Everyone Wants Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in these days when so many individuals and communities are out to get all the money they can from the U.S. Treasury, it is good to know that there are some who prefer to solve their local problems without help from Washington, D.C.

I recently received a copy of a petition which was signed by 1,500 residents of Maine Township High School District No. 207, which is located in my district. The petition, which was addressed to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, urged that he deny the school district's application for Federal aid.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the petition:

FEBRUARY 7, 1966.

Mr. HAROLD HOWE, Jr.,
Commissioner of Education,
U.S. Office of Education,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to our attention that high school district 207, Dempster Street and Potter Road, Park Ridge, Ill., is about to apply for a planning grant under title III of Public Law 89–10 for the purpose of planning for a center for diagnosis and remediation of reading and communication problems of children in the area it serves.

Your attention is called to section 304 (b)(2) of title III which expressly provides that applications for grants under this title may be approved by you only if the application is consistent with criteria established by you, which criteria shall be developed on the basis of a consideration, among other things, of the relative needs of persons in different geographical areas and "their financial ability to provide those services and activities, and * * * the relative ability of particular local educational agencies within the State to provide those services and activities."

We are advising you of the foregoing because in our opinion high school district 207 may be misleading your office by implying that the area concerned does not have the financial ability to teach its children to read. A review of the most recent census report concerning this area will quickly reveal that it is a stable and financially sound area, with the residents of the area enjoying an income substantially in excess of average.

We believe the filing of this application for a grant on the part of high school district 207 constitutes a typical example of people trying to get something for nothing, "as long as the money is there anyway."

We strongly urge you to deny the application of district 207 and to utilize the limited funds available for the purposes described in title III for more unfortunate segments of our State.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

Social Revolution for Vietnam

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent talks in Honolulu were directed toward a primary emphasis upon a program of social revolution in the Vietnam countryside.

Social reform must be an integral part of our efforts in Vietnam because the elimination of Vietcong terrorism can be of no permanent usefulness unless the people are able to rebuild their lives and their economy.

The Los Angeles Times, on February 10, discussed the urgent priorities involved in this social revolution. Their perceptive editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 10, 1966]

SOCIAL REVOLUTION FOR VIETNAM

Whatever new military steps might have been secretly decided upon at the Honolulu conference of top American and South Vietnamese leaders, the public emphasis of the talks—and thus the public commitment—was focused upon an ambitious program of "social revolution" in the Vietnam countryside.

This is the "other war," the war of reform, which has the dual aim of bettering the lives of the people and of eradicating the accumulated grievances upon which the Vietcong have built so much of their success.

It is a war we have not been winning.

President Johnson made it clear in his Los Angeles remarks that he knows how hard are the tasks the United States and South Vietnamese Governments have set for themselves. Officials in the field whose job it is to carry out the planned programs of social, economic and political construction know even better the enormous obstacles to be overcome.

Even assuming total dedication on the part of South Vietnams leaders and the ready availability of U.S. dollars, the going will be slow at best. The new programs, in fact, probably won't reach more than 10 percent of the village population by the end of the year. Nor will simply sending cadres into these villages of itself assure progress.

The first requisite, of course, is to clear areas of the Vietcong and to provide enough protection so that the Communists won't come back. Without security, peasants will have no incentive to cooperate and without cooperation there can be no reforms.

Next the Saigon government must find and adequately train the more than 40,000 teachers, health workers, technicians and administrators needed to start and carry out the social revolution. Without well-prepared and highly motivated personnel, reforms cannot even be talked about.

Recruiting these workers won't be easy.

Since the rebellion began, 20,000 of them have been murdered. They are Vietcong targets because they represent the government and because they carry the promise of improving life for the people, thereby undercutting the Vietcong appeal.

Those in this country and elsewhere who pretend to see the Vietcong as a movement against repression have yet to explain how killing nurses, doctors, teachers, and agricultural workers serves this end.

Finally, there is the task of overcoming deep-rooted attitudes which stand in the way of reform. Cynicism, corruption, suspicion, class prejudice, a reluctance to adopt new methods—all will be working against the new programs.

General Ky, his prestige bolstered by the Honolulu talks—the first time a Vietnamese Premier has met an American President—gives every public indication of being behind the reform program. It will take his full support, and much more besides, if there is to be any hope for success in this overdue but still vital revolution.

Pacification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, to bring pacification in South Vietnam—and a sense of identity on the part of the people with the Saigon government—will not be easy. Premier Ky could hardly have been more frank when, in describing to President Johnson the new rural pacification teams, he said:

> They will seek to instill in the rural people a sense of unity with our Nation, a feeling which I am sorry to say, Mr. President and gentlemen, has not always been prevalent in our country.

I feel that the difficulties and the challenge of the pacification program were well illustrated in a recent editorial in the Hartford Times. It stated:

> Reduced to particulars, President Johnson's official conference in Honolulu is intended to review and amplify the means to consolidate military gains made or expected in South Vietnam.

And it added:

> Such action is required if we are to eliminate the tidal waves of success and failure in establishing territorial control under conditions of guerrilla warfare.

The editorial is somewhat long—and extremely enlightening. Because I am certain that some of my colleagues will want to read it in its entirety I herewith make it available to them by inserting it in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Times, Feb. 7, 1966]

PACIFICATION PROGRAM

Reduced to particulars, President Johnson's official conference in Honolulu is intended to review and amplify the means to consolidate military gains made or expected in South Vietnam.

Such action is required if we are to eliminate the tidal waves of success and failure in establishing territorial control under conditions of guerrilla warfare.

In military operations designed to wrest territory from Vietcong dominance, pacification has been tentative and temporary. As our troops have moved on or as their direct grip on an area has been relaxed, there usually has been a reinfiltration of Vietcong influence. Territory once secured and returned to South Vietnam administration has often become a no-man's land, insofar as the firm loyalties of the local population can be measured.

Our troops crush Communists or force them to flee, but behind is left a vacuum of physical chaos and disorganization of life not easily repaired under present circumstances.

What contribution to stability can be expected of perpetual refugees, abandoned in a contest that grinds them again and again in the jaws of war? Uprooted and tossed about by repeated violence, they are maneuverable by the enemy for his purposes.

In the President's mission are included Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner.

Their task will be to devise ways to fill the aftermath voids of war with rural development and reconstruction programs aimed to encourage the return of production and confidence, if not of complete tranquility, to those parts of South Vietnam from which the Communists are expelled.

On several occasions Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge has urged the adoption of effective pacification programs of an economic and social nature. He has held these to be inescapable adjuncts of successful military action to free South Vietnam of its Communist subversives.

The President says that a substantial part of the Honolulu session is being devoted to a pacification program that will improve military security. "We want to be sure that we have our best planning and our maximum effort put into it," he explained.

Certainly it will be most difficult—if it becomes necessary—to wage more extensive war beyond a line of increasing rearward sabotage and terror.

It has been said that the American experience in Vietnam is militarily and politically unique for us. That is not quite so.

At this stage there exist in South Vietnam some remarkable resemblances to the conditions of the Philippine Insurrection, an almost-forgotten struggle that embroiled the United States in the islands from 1899 until 1902.

The operation involved 100,000 men. It was a guerrilla war with a "disappearing enemy" in which a majority of the engagements occurred within 50 miles of Manila. Our casualties were heavy. The insurrectionists seeking independence under Aguinaldo were well supplied with foreign arms. There was deep division of sentiment in this country concerning the propriety of U.S. military and political policy in the Philippines.

Eventually the United States prevailed and put down the internal revolt, but importantly contributing to that was a pacification program of rural aid, education and health services to reinforce the military campaign.

In character and in purpose the proposals for South Vietnam now under study in Honolulu recall measures that previously proved effective in the same area of the world and under comparable conditions.

A 4-Year House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Newsweek, Walter Lippmann discusses the proposal for a constitutional amendment that would extend the term of Members of the House from 2 to 4 years. Mr. Lipmann thoughtfully points out that many of the reasons for the establishment of the 2-year term in our Constitution are still valid and important. He argues, correctly in my judgment, that the way to improve the effectiveness of the House is to streamline its organization and procedures.

I ask unanimous consent to include Mr. Lippmann's column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 28, 1966]

A 4-YEAR HOUSE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President has recommended a constitutional amendment to lengthen the terms of Members of the House from 2 years to 4. This amendment would not go into effect before the election of 1972, until President Johnson himself is sure to have retired. Mr. Johnson proposed that election to the House be held in Presidential years, and he would therefore abolish the midterm election.

The main argument for the amendment is, in the President's words, that Members of the House would be "free of campaigning for a period sufficiently long to enable them to master the work of the House." In addition, a 4-year term would "reduce the cost—financial and political—of holding congressional office" and in general would, it is hoped, make the office more attractive to "the best men in private and public life."

The purposes of President Johnson's amendment are excellent. But it raises, so it seems to me, problems which are at least as serious as those which it proposed to solve.

Thus, as proposed by the President, the House of Representatives would be elected only in presidential years, and the term of each Member of Congress would coincide with that of the President. This would mean that the only consultation with the voters during the President's 4-year term would take place in the third of the States where there was a midterm election of a Senator.

THE PRESIDENT'S MEN

This would, as I see it, reduce greatly, if it did not destroy entirely, the function of the House as the organ of government which is closest to the voters. The Members of the House who belong to the President's party would tend to be the President's men. For since a President is usually renominated for a second term, the Congressman elected with a President would be under heavy pressure to follow the President obediently. Instead of the House being close to the voters, as the Constitution intended, the President would be interposed. This would leave a haphazard one-third of the Senate to exercise the role intended for the House by the Constitutional Convention.

I myself am a firm believer in strong presidential government, and I believe that Woodrow Wilson was right in his denunciation of congressional government. But the proposed amendment would remove the main check upon presidential government, and in the electronic age the President in office with his well-nigh monopolistic control of television would acquire undue and excessive power.

In order to cure this defect in President Johnson's proposal, it has been argued that the term be lengthened to 4 years but that only half the House be elected in a presidential year, the other half in the midterm. Though this is better than the President's proposal, it too raises great problems. The seats in the House would have to be divided in two parts, one-half being elected in the presidential years and the other in the midterm. It would be virtually impossible under such an arrangement to know whether or not the House reflected the views of the voters in the middle of the President's term of office.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 the discussion turned on whether the terms should be 1, 2, or 3 years. The 1-year term was rejected on the ground that it was too short, considering how slow was travel from the constituencies to the Capital. The 3-year term, which Madison supported, was rejected also—on the ground, I suppose, that it would call for the election of a third of the House each year, and that this would prevent or at least obstruct the election of a House which supported the President who was elected. If the voters want so-and-so to be President, they should be able also to give him a majority in the House. If, on the other hand, the voters have become seriously opposed to the President's conduct of the office, they should be able to express their disagreement by depriving him of a majority in the House.

So, the Constitutional Convention settled on the 2-year term, and it seems to me that no sufficient case has yet been made for reversing its decision.

The substantial argument in favor of the 4-year term is that Congressmen from close constitutencies do not have time to "master the work of the House" owing to "the inexorable pressures of biennial campaigning for reelection." This argument should be examined closely and thoroughly with a view to determining whether the real trouble is the shortness of the term or whether it is not, as Mr. Joseph W. Sullivan has pointed out in the Wall Street Journal, that the Congressmen have to devote too much time to such tasks as interviewing candidates for West Point and running errands for their constituents. This might well be remedied by providing them with a bigger staff of competent assistants.

This is the line on which we ought to begin to study the improvement of the quality of the House.

New Tactics in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Portland Oregonian of February 10 stated editorially that Vietnam "must be revitalized politically and economically before it can stand alone."

The President's announcement that there must be social and political reforms, as well as battlefield victories, was noted by the newspaper, which said:

> Mr. Johnson's new tactic would appear to be the result of the sudden realization that the rehabilitation of South Vietnam may be more important, in the long view of things, than the immediate problem of driving out the Red invaders; that the economic aid aspect of the overall effort is in more urgent need of escalation at the moment.

The paper believes that if we can convince more South Vietnamese that they have a better prospect of future peace and happiness under the Saigon government than under Red rule, then it might not be so difficult to clean out Vietcong strongholds and keep them clean.

I offer this thought-provoking article for the RECORD, convinced that others will find it as worth while as I did.

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 10, 1966]

THE OTHER SHOE

The declaration of Honolulu marks a significant change of emphasis in U.S. policy in South Vietnam. No longer will the United States appear to the rest of the world merely to be stubbornly fighting on in southeast Asia while attempting, through various stick-and-carrot techniques, to lure the enemies of the Saigon government to the conference table. Now President Johnson has declared his intent to export the Great Society to South Vietnam, to create conditions in which, once the shooting ceases, it may hope to survive as an independent and largely self-sufficient nation. It is an idealistic and possibly unattainable goal, but at least the approach is bold and positive. And it gives real meaning at last to the phrase, "peace offensive."

The shortcomings in our previous policy have become evident. It is not enough to seek a military solution, with a peace conference and inevitable compromises which probably would lead in time to the very situation we are battling to prevent—the ultimate Communist takeover of South Vietnam. Yet that weary and battle-torn country is in no condition to defend itself politically any more than it can do so militarily with its present resources. It must be revitalized politically and economically before it can stand alone.

The United States has of course been carrying on a civilian aid program, trying to better the lot of Vietnamese in areas not wholly dominated by the Vietcong. But it has been a relatively minor effort, subordinated to the seemingly more vital U.S. military objectives.

Mr. Johnson's new tactic would appear to be the result of the sudden realization that the rehabilitation of South Vietnam may be more important, in the long view of things, than the immediate problem of driving out the Red invaders; that the economic aid aspect of the overall effort is in more urgent need of escalation at the moment. Looking at it another way, we may not need so much manpower to clean out Vietcong strongholds and keep them clean if we can do a better job of persuading more South Vietnamese that they have a better prospect of future peace and happiness under the Saigon government than under Red rule.

Characteristically, having reached this conclusion, L.B.J. has moved suddenly and dramatically. The sending of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and top members of the White House team to Saigon may not contribute much to the effort from a practical standpoint; the real work must be done by those on the ground, with a better understanding of the Vietnamese peasant society. But the official presence of top Government officials cannot fail to have a beneficial effect in impressing anew on both our allies and enemies that we are determined to give South Vietnam her opportunity for freedom and independence, and we will not leave the field while a realistic hope of this remains.

Hear that thump, world? That was President Johnson, dropping the other shoe.

Peace Corps Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 27, 1965, two Peace Corps volunteers—Miss Karen Ann Hiner and Mr. Arthur G. Webster III—celebrated their wedding ceremony while on duty in Eastern Nigeria. The bride is a constituent of the Honorable WILLIAM S. AYRES, of Ohio, while the groom resides in the Second District of Michigan, which I am privileged to represent in this House.

The couple met in training last summer at West Michigan University in Kalamazoo, where their contingent spent 11 weeks preparing to teach in Nigeria.

The wedding was conducted in Enugu, the capital of Eastern Nigeria. The wedding party was dressed in traditional Nigerian attire for the ceremony.

Following completion of their Peace Corps service in 1967, Mr. and Mrs. Webster plan to pursue university teaching careers, and hope to return to the University of Nigeria after further study in the United States. Both are enthusiastic about the stimulating atmosphere of the new university, built with U.S. aid. The University of Nigeria is presently a partner school of Michigan State University, and participates in the international exchange program of American and Nigerian students and faculty.

Karen and Gary have expressed their hope that more projects of this type will arise as part of America's program of aid-in-self-development to the new African States. I am proud of their service; it symbolizes the dedication of some 9,000 Peace Corps volunteers, serving in every quarter of the globe. I know that my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. and Mrs. Webster a long and happy life together.

Interlochen Arts Academy Orchestra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I am bursting with pride because the great National Music Camp is located at Interlochen in the Ninth Congressional District which I am honored to represent. This cultural center, founded by Dr. Joseph Maddy, has become an institution and a way of life for many hundreds of talented young musicians from all parts of the world.

Last Monday evening, February 21, several hundred people were privileged to attend a concert of the Interlochen Arts Academy Orchestra held in the Department of State Auditorium. For all who were there, it was an experience that will be long remembered.

Set forth below is a review written by Cecelia H. Porter for the February 22, 1966, issue of the Washington Post, as well as a review by Wendell Margrave which appeared in the February 22, 1966, issue of the Evening Star:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 2, 1966]

INTERLOCHEN STUDENTS PERFORM LIKE ADULTS

(By Cecelia H. Porter)

Nearly 90 red-coated teenagers massed on the stage of the State Department's West

Auditorium last night to present an adult evening of music.

The players form the permanent orchestra of the Interlochen Arts Academy, a recent prep school expansion of the famed summertime National Music Camp in northern Michigan.

For this first appearance on a seven-concert tour of the East coast and Ontario, Thor Johnson, the director of the school, conducted three-fourths of the program. The founder of the summer camp, Joseph Maddy, took the baton for Berlioz's "Roman Carnival Overture."

The program, which also included Mozart's "Linz" Symphony, Kodaly's infrequently heard concerto for orchestra, and Shostakovich's First Symphony, showed a wise selection calculated to challenge all the players with at least one major responsibility for the 2 hours.

It is practically a norm for the conservatory orchestra to fall short in one or more sections. With high school groups, you note the enthusiasm, then quickly assemble the "but's" and "however's."

Yet few excuses are necesary for this orchestra, in which even the string section is a disciplined, many-splendored thing.

The five continuous movements of the Kodaly Concerto, composed in the midst of World War II, proved to be the apex of the concert. The solo violas and cellos, responding smoothly to an equally eloquent wind-assembly, transformed the Largo into a sumptuous, impassioned affair intensified with unbelievable nobility in the later tutti reaffirmation in Bachian motivic work.

The command shown in this movement, as in the first with its incisive brass punctuations, and in the two allegros, stunningly managed even in improvisational solos, could hardly be matched by good adult performers.

The certainty evident through all levels of the string section most obviously characterized the reading of the "Linz." The reading of the adagio indicated an unusual maturity in maintaining a slow tempo without sacrificing the metrical pulse.

The musicians languished tastefully over the protracted dissonances and solo episodes. Yet they never sank into that ominous quicksand of increasingly sluggish paces that drags performers into the mire of a new farewell symphony.

There was a wonderful pliancy in exchanges between sections and individuals in the Berlioz. Maddy drew forth a controlled rather than a weepingly sentimental cantilena.

Coming from the pen of a 19-year-old, the Shostakovich Symphony impressed its Russian hearers immediately and impressed the audience last night. All the elements—skilled pizzicato, light wind tonguing, luxuriant tutti mixtures—were there for a total suavity and grace that were outstanding.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 22, 1966]

Youth Concert Thrilling Event

(By Wendell Margrave)

The Interlochen Arts Academy Orchestra, Thor Johnson, Joseph E. Maddy, conductors. Department of State Auditorium. Program: Symphony No. 36 in C, K.425, "Linz," Mozart; Concerto for Orchestra, Kodaly; the Roman Carnival Overture, opus 9, Berlioz; Symphony No. 1, opus 10, Shostakovich.

Those fortunate enough to attend the concert last night at the Department of State Auditorium of the Interlochen Arts Academy Orchestra had the inspiring experience of hearing a fine orchestra concert, comparable in programing to that of any symphony orchestra in the world, played by 102 young people of high school age.

The school they represent, an outgrowth of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, is a college preparatory school for students gifted in the arts. The orchestra rehearses 2 hours a day, 6 days a week, for a 32-week season and is at present on a tour which takes them today to the University of Maryland, tomorrow to Carnegie Hall, then to three performances in Canada.

The orchestra members are mostly from the Middle West, but all sections of the country are represented, and there are members from Taiwan, Finland, and Japan. Three are from the Washington area: Violinist Nancy Cole from Silver Spring, Clarinettist Jonathan Lautman from Takoma Park, and Eugene Sittenfeld, percussionist, from Bethesda.

It was a thrilling performance. It is a student orchestra, to be sure, with not quite the routined confidence and mature sound of a professional group, but wonderfully competent, wonderfully accurate, wonderfully unified. The Kodaly Concerto for Orchestra and the Shostakovich First Symphony gave opportunity for much excellent solo work by individuals, notably Violinist Victoria Matosich; Cellist Jane Schroeder; a remarkable young bass player named David Currie; Miriam Jakes, a blond oboist with the embouchure a bit to the right but with a sweet sound and a musician's way of phrasing; and the spectacular and dedicated timpanist, Tsutomu Yamashita from Kyoto.

The best single section in the orchestra is the brasses, for they have the incisive attack and golden tone that is America's own peculiar contribution to brass playing. This rests as much on the example of the great jazz players as it does on the symphony tradition; and it gives a particularly vital thrust to the sound of the orchestra.

The conducting was in the experienced hands of Thor Johnson, who for years conducted the Cincinnati orchestra. Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, founder of the music camp and of the academy, who is everywhere a symbol of this kind of enterprise, conducted the Roman Carnival. At the close of the program, the concertmaster led the orchestra in the excerpt from Hanson's Romantic Symphony that is the Interlochen theme.

The Something for Nothing Theory Always Fails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago my distinguished friend and our former colleague, Millard F. Caldwell, now a member of the Florida Supreme Court, made an address before the Civitan Club of Jacksonville, Fla., which in my judgment was so outstanding that it deserves being printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the enlightenment of the Members.

Justice Caldwell is recognized as one of Florida's most distinguished justices. He has been a member of the State Supreme Court since 1962. His illustrious career includes a term as Governor of Florida as well as his service in the U.S. Congress. His speech presented here is typical of the clarity, profundity, and brilliance that are characteristic of his public utterances.

The title of the speech is, "The Something for Nothing Theory Always Fails."

The speech follows:

THE SOMETHING FOR NOTHING THEORY ALWAYS FAILS

RETROSPECT

As we watch the American people trade in their old and tried Constitutional Republic for the welfare state some of us find it interesting to look back through the ages and note the effect of similar exchanges by other nations.

If the examples of the past mean anything, we must agree history demonstrates the fact that the "something for nothing" theory has never worked; and the fact that everytime the calculating confidence men have promised utopia on earth in exchange for political support, the people have been taken to the cleaners.

But people, generally, like sheep, decline to learn from history. P. T. Barnum grew rich on his circus tricks because, as he said, a fool is born each minute.

Some 1,100 years before the birth of Christ, Samuel, later to be known as the Prophet, told the Israelites, as they clamoured for a paternal ruler, that the King would take their sons to be his horsemen, to run before his chariots, to plow his ground and reap his harvests; would take their daughters to be cooks and bakers, would give their fields and vineyards and olive orchards to his officers and make the people his slaves. And then he told them, when all that had happened, they would cry out against that ruler, whom they had chosen for themselves, "but the Lord will not answer you in that day." The Israelites, as is the way with people, did not heed Samuel's word of caution. They preferred to follow the will of the wisp quest for fool's gold.

And a thousand years later, when the Roman Republic was at the height of its glory, there was another movement to swap independence for the promise of beneficence under a dictatorship. The leading politicians, already intolerant of restraint and contemptuous of the Constitution which was designed to curb their ambitions, were offering their panaceas of "something for nothing" and the people were buying.

It was just then that Marcus Tullius Cicero, a student of law under old Scaevola, was about to suffer his first great disillusionment with unprincipled government. Although Rome dominated the world, its citizens had grown slick and fat, careless of their rights, and had fallen prey to the cunning politicians who craved more and yet ever more power and riches.

CHICANERY

Cicero's first client was a substantial man of business—a man of integrity who trusted his government. But he was a rich man and, because powerful politicians coveted his wealth, he was a victim of bureaucratic chicanery. Cicero, his lawyer, also a man of integrity and one who trusted his government, submitted documentary proof of his client's innocence, confident justice would prevail. But he lost his case. He asked his old friend, Scaevola, why he had failed. Scaevola was disgusted—he slammed the table and shouted, "Imbecile. Of what use are records * * * if the government is determined to rob and destroy a man * * * who possesses what they want? Have I truly wasted all these years on such an idiot?"

All this has a familiar ring—I dare say some lawyers and clients in this room have gone through experiences similar to those which plagued Cicero and his client.

But Cicero, undaunted, appealed his cause to the august Senate in these words: "We are taxed in our bread and our wine, in our incomes and our investments, on our land and on our property, not only for base creatures who do not deserve the name of man, but for foreign nations, for complacent nations who will bow to us and accept our largesse and promise us to assist in the keeping of the peace—these mendicant nations who will destroy us when we show a moment of weakness or our treasury is bare, and surely it is becoming bare. We are taxed to maintain legions on their soil * * *. We keep them in precarious balance only with our gold. Is the heartblood of our Nation worth these? Shall one Italian be sacrificed for Britain, for Gaul, for Egypt, for India, even for Greece, and a score of other nations? * * * They take our very flesh, and they hate and despise us. And who shall say we are worthy of more?"

LIKE 1966?

Does that sound to you like 1966, as we cuddle up to Cuba and spend billions of dollars on Tito and his ilk?

Notwithstanding his eloquence, Cicero failed to save his client. He lived to argue the cause of honest government with Sulla, the great white father of his day and to urge for his people, integrity, and fair dealing in government. But Sulla had little faith in the people. He believed them far more concerned with immediate than future safety, too timid to stand up for their rights. He told Cicero the middle class, the lawyers, the physicians, the bankers, and the merchants, would make no sacrifices. He said none of your lawyers will challenge the lawmakers and cry to them, "This is unconstitutional, an affront to a free people, and it must not pass."

He asked, "Will one of these (lawyers) lift his eyes from his ledgers long enough to scan the Twelve Tables of Roman Law, and then expose those who violate them? These fat men. Will six (lawyers) in this city, disregarding personal safety, rise up from their offices and stand in the Forum and tell the people the inevitable fate of Rome unless they return to virtue and thrift and drive from the senate the evil men who have corrupted them?"

INDIFFERENCE

Well, does that sound like 1966 and our indifference to government? Does it remind you of our preoccupation with our personal affairs and our unwillingness to "rock the boat"?

Rome continued to decay and the ambitious were fattening upon its bones. The liberties of the people were lifted one by one in the name of emergencies or traded in on benefits. Cataline, brilliant, uninhibited, and evil, was pressing his suit for leadership and, in his course, curtailing the rights of all those who disagreed.

Cicero, in his second oration before the senate, had this to say: "I tell you that freedom does not mean the freedom to exploit law in order to destroy it. It is not freedom which permits the Trojan Horse to be wheeled within the gates. He who is not for Rome and Roman law and Roman liberty is against Rome. He who espouses tyranny and oppression and the old dead despotisms is against Rome. He who plots against established authority and incites the populace to violence is against Rome * * *. We cannot be for lawful ordinances and for an alien conspiracy at one and the same moment."

REMINDED

As I read those words of Cicero I am reminded of our Government sponsored and nurtured demonstrations against lawful ordinances and the beatnik echo of the President's words: "We shall overcome."

Cicero continued his oration: "Though liberty is established by law, we must be vigilant, for liberty to enslave us is always present under that very liberty. Our Constitution speaks of the 'general welfare of the people.' Under that phrase all sorts of excesses can be employed by lusting tyrants to make us bondsmen."

That language must remind us of the incursions upon established law by the Supreme Court in the name of "the general welfare."

As the years went by Cicero continued to struggle, he became consul and, for a time, stopped waste and thievery. But, again, the people became careless, weary of well doing, and the avaricious and corrupt politicians moved in.

ONCE MORE

Once again he appeared before the Senate, this time to defend himself unsuccessfully against banishment. Crassus, Caesar, and Pompey were present. He turned to them, his old friends, but their faces were shut against him. His smile was sad as he told them, "You have succeeded against me. Be it as you will. I will depart * * *. For this day's work, lords, you have encouraged treason and opened the prison doors to free the traitors. A nation can survive its fools, and even the ambitious. But it cannot survive treason from within. An enemy at the gates is less formidable, for he is known and he carries his banners openly against the city. But the traitor moves among those within the gates freely, his sly whispers rustling through all the alleys, heard in the very halls of government itself. For the traitor appears no traitor; he speaks in the accents familiar to his victims, and he wears their faces and their garments, and he appeals to the baseness that lies deep in the hearts of all men. He rots the soul of a nation; he works secretly and unknown in the night to undermine the pillars of a city; he infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. A murderer is less to be feared. The traitor is the carrier of the plague. You have unbarred the gates of Rome to him."

As we observe the subversives in high places who have been exposed and those who are suspect but not yet exposed, we are reminded of Cicero's plight in Rome 2,000 years ago.

And then once more we are reminded of Cicero as we contemplate the Great Society. He was exiled from Rome but he continued to plead the cause of sound government. Unfortunately, the people he pleaded for were not concerned. His friends, the lawyers, the doctors and the businessmen told him: "We do not meddle in politics. Rome is prosperous and at peace. We have our villas in Caprae, our racing vessels, our houses, our servants, our pretty mistresses, and our comfort and treasures. We implore you, Cicero, do not disturb us with your lamentations of disaster. Rome is on the march to the mighty society, for all Romans."

NOBODY CARED

Cicero was in despair. He began to write his book De Legibus but Atticus, his publisher, asked, "But who will read it? Romans care nothing for law any longer, their bellies are too full."

And then, later, Brutus, the longtime sycophant of the ambitious Caesar, came to his senses and went to Cicero with his plea that something be done to save the nation. He confessed his error, he said he had believed in Caesar, he had believed he would restore the Republic but that he has betrayed his trust.

Cicero's bitter reply was "Do not blame Caesar, blame the people of Rome who have so enthusiastically acclaimed and adored him and rejoiced in their loss of freedom and danced in his path * * *. Blame the people who hail him when he speaks in the Forum of the 'new, wonderful good society' which shall now be Rome's," interpreted by Cicero to mean "more money, more ease, more security, more living fatly at the expense of the industrious. Julius was always an ambitious villian, but he is only one man."

REMINISCENT

That wonderful good society of Rome's sounds suspiciously like the Great Society of America—it sounds suspiciously like "more money, more ease, more security, more living fatly at the expense of the industrious."

I am not sure just where this country is going nor what life in America will be like 5, 10, or 50 years from now. But it's clear that the old ideas of obedience to law, public thrift, and common honesty, the old laws of supply and demand and the old concepts of local self-government and individual responsibility have been discarded.

And it staggers the imagination to contemplate the changes which have occurred in the last 30 years. Our manner of government and our way of life are, for the United States, new and novel, with little in common with what has gone before. Our forefathers would be astounded by the insidious encroachment of centralized government in our every day life.

IN BUSINESS

Government is in the business of housing the people, in prescribing the hours we can work, with whom we must work, the salaries we are paid and the tax to be withheld from that salary, the schools our children can go to and with whom they must sit and play, the highways we can drive on, how and where our food is grown and processed. It concerns itself with the products you buy, the conditions under which they are manufactured, the manner in which they are advertised, the kind, the shape and the size of the package in which they are offered and how they are labeled. It is meddling with your health, your general welfare, your old age and your retirement, your security after retirement, your savings and the banks in which you place your savings, the conduct of your city, its police department and its department of health; the conduct of the affairs of your State, its law enforcement, its elections, the composition of its legislature and every other facet of your life, private and public.

But the people of this country may like all this—to say the least, they have asked for it. They have elected the public officials who brought it about and they sit around with their tin cups waiting for more. If that's what a majority of the people of this Nation want, those of us who disagree can't complain. The majority has the right to change our form of government if it wishes.

TOO LATE

But one unfortunate aspect is that, once the die is finally cast, it will be too late to change our minds; it's altogether unlikely we could then ever reestablish the kind of government, the kind of independence and individuality our forefathers conceived and anticipated for posterity. We will have come too far and given up too much.

For that reason it is important that we give some thought to what is happening and reach some conclusions about what we'd like our future to be. We must count the cost of all the politically inspired humanitarian claptrap and be sure we're willing to pay the price in freedom, liberty, and independence.

FEEBLE HOPE

The cause of sound government is not without a feeble hope. There is an overriding suspicion and uneasiness. The taxpayers complain of the complexities and the inequities fostered by internal revenue; the farmers complain of regimentation; the lawyers complain of the Federal judiciary and its whimsical construction of the Constitution; the police deplore the judicial pampering of the criminals; citizens generally are alarmed by the Government stirring up of the caldrons of racial hate; students of government seeking the truth are handicapped by managed news and the dominance of news media by the extreme liberals; many are apprehensive of the coddling of Communists in high office and the people generally resent America's subordination to the United Nations and the waste of multiple billions on Red satellites.

Well, we ask, in the light of the precarious situation, what can we do? The first thing to decide is whether we want to live in a constitutional Republic or under a socialistic depotism. Theoretically, I suppose the vast majority would say they prefer constitutional government but, as a matter of truth, that same majority is unwilling to jeopardize the spurious but temporary prosperity linked to current socialistic practice. Instead, it may be we are irrevocably committed—too many of us have sold the future for the hope of free medical care, free college education, social equality and security against poverty.

RESPONSIBILITY

But if you are concerned, I suggest you assess the responsibility for what's happening in government. If you are honest with yourselves you will admit we cannot blame the weak Congress or the bureaucrats, the tax gatherers or the judges or the Communists—the responsibility must rest upon our own shoulders as individuals.

And while it's painfully obvious that our conduct of public affairs, under both political parties has long been lacking in the forthrightness and courage so essential to our independence, we cannot take the easy way out and charge the Nation's ills to the ADA, the Bobby Bakers, or the Supreme Court. To put it very simply, you and I and the people generally have been negligent in attention to our public business.

In good conscience, we cannot say the Federal encroachments upon our rights and the rights of the States have come with any surprise. We have been warned and warned again. Three thousand years ago Samuel warned us. Two thousand years ago Cicero told us what to expect. When our ancestors were considering the adoption of the Federal Constitution for the new Republic, Patrick Henry, distrusting a central government, with true and unerring foresight, told the people to "be extremely cautious, watchful, jealous of your liberty. Instead of securing your rights, you may lose them forever." He said, "There will be no checks, no real balances in this Government," and looking ahead to 1966, he said "this Government will * * * destroy the State governments and swallow the liberties of the people."

FEARFUL

George Mason was fearful of centralization and thought there was a very real danger of losing all the Revolution had gained. He said that a consolidated government "is totally subversive of every principle which has hitherto governed us."

William Graywon was suspicious of the proposed Supreme Court. He said, "this Court has more power than any court under heaven * * *." George Mason agreed and said the creation of the Court would result in the destruction of State governments because, in the absence of restraint, the Court "will be the judges of how far their law will operate."

Benjamin Franklin, after the Constitution was adopted, anticipating a people negligent in safeguarding their rights, said he thought our Government would be well administered for a few years but that it "can only end in despotism."

At the conclusion of his two terms as President and in the light of his experience, George Washington thought the people of the future should be warned of the dangers inherent in an unrestrained Supreme Court—he said: "If * * * the distribution * * * of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Thomas Jefferson foresaw the evils of judicial encroachment when, in effect, he said the Court, under its philosophy, made the Constitution a mere thing of wax to be twisted into any form they pleased, that to consider the Judges the ultimate arbiter of the Constitution would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy.

WARNING

Some years later Lord McCauley, the English historian, after a careful study of our government in general and our Constitution in particular warned the American people, "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. Either Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by the barbarians in the 20th century, as the Roman Empire was in the fifth—with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and your huns and vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions" It is reasonable to assume he thought the Supreme Court was one of the institutions which would destroy us from within.

Abraham Lincoln thought it necessary to tell the people: "If the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by the decisions of the Supreme Court the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of the eminent tribunal."

Robert Moses had this to say the other day: "We are living in a second American Revolution, as critical as the first one which established our Nation * * * the Supreme Court now legislates and executes * * * It now bypasses the State courts and delegates to lower Federal courts authority to tell the States what to do and how to do it * * * the States are reduced to peonage * * * until we change our Constitution, any five judges out of nine—distinguished men no doubt but political accidents not chosen by the people—are ruling the country and determining its future."

No, we cannot have been surprised by what has happened because, from our earliest days, we have been on notice it would happen. We, very simply, have refused to heed the warnings or to acknowledge that our freedoms can be preserved by vigilant action and not otherwise. We have refused to acknowledge that bad government and bad public officials are but the reflection of ourselves as we have cast our votes—that the elected official is nothing more nor less than the instrumentality through which we express our will.

THE DIFFICULTY

The whole trouble is that, in our civic stupor, we have forgotten that major policies, whether the gift of our substance to the Communists or the regimentation of industry, agriculture, business, and the professions, require either the approval or acquiescence of the citizens of this country. What has been done, both that which has contributed to our stability and that which has endangered our future, has been with our consent.

But I should tell you that the time is growing short. We must make a choice between the form of government conceived by those who captured our freedoms from Great Britain in the Revolution and this new form of government, a centralization, advocated and practiced by the left-dealers. Whether this Nation is to be governed by the rule of law, under the Constitution, or the rule of man, unfettered by any restraint, constitutes the most vital problem of our time.

It is no longer of first importance whether we collectivize the professions or bankrupt the Nation in abolishing poverty or in supporting our enemies abroad—the vital question, the question in the face of which all others fade to insignificance, is whether we save the Constitution of the United States and the republican form of government established by it.

AN ESSENTIAL

If we can succeed in that respect and retain the right to elect the Congress and the President, all of us, the timid and the brave, the generous and the greedy, the conservatives, the liberals, and the middle gender moderates, can live with wisdom and folly, frugality and waste, the ADA socialists, and the crafty politicians. But, and never forget it, we cannot exist as a free people nor our Nation as a Republic without a Constitution, observed in fact and not in the breach.

Whether the Nation moves even further to the left as a socialistic despotism or is reestablished as a republic depends entirely upon the will of the majority. The answer does not hang upon whether you are liberal or conservative, a Democrat or a Republican—the answer, the sole answer, is whether you believe in and are resolute in trying to save the Constitution—as it was written and intended—upon whether you are determined to elect public officials who believe in that Constitution and are willing to boot them out of office without ceremony if they falter in their conviction.

You must face the fact that we have spent 30 years setting up the machinery to destroy that Constitution and it will take dogged determination and constant unwavering purpose to save it. You will have to reckon with the human inclination to avoid unpleasant facts. We are reluctant to admit our conversion to socialism or that the Supreme Court has usurped the rights of the Congress to legislate.

But we must admit that many people, many splinter groups, approve one or the others of the encroachments by the Supreme Court upon the rights of the majority. The Negroes are happy in the belief that the Brown decision established superior rights for them over the majority; the criminals are happy with the Mallory and Escobedo decisions because of the great advantage gained over the law enforcement officers and society in general; the Communists thoroughly approve the Schware, Konigsberg, and the Slochower cases which insure their right to infiltrate the legal profession and the schools. The labor unions like the decisions which gave to them enormous advantages. The urban politicians like the reapportionment decisions which insure their control of the statehouses and the Congress.

AS PRESCRIBED

Some of the changes made in the Constitution by judicial fiat were useful. Some, I would actively support in the political arena, but, as George Washington advised us, they should come in the manner prescribed by the Constitution and not through the unconstitutional usurpation by a Court not subject to the vote of the people.

But you must remember that, by coddling particular self-interest groups, one after the other, the "rule by man" forces have built a strong following—a following which is active, vocal, and organized.

The devotees of the "rule by man" theory include the moderates, the ADA'ers, most of labor, practically all of the minorities, many ministers, and many of the business and professional world. But I do not believe the tincup crowd constitutes a majority of the people of this country.

The simple majority, and I emphasize the word simple, composed of decent, ordinary businessmen, doctors, farmers, mechanics, preachers, and just people, does not realize how it has been duped. The honest fellow has always been an easy mark—the easiest to rob.

SLOW TO ANGER

The simple majority is slow to anger, they are not given to sit-down and sit-ins, to placards and to violence and to hate. But neither is that majority watchful of its own rights and the freedoms it inherited from brave ancestors. The majority is slow to express its opinion—slow to write the Congressman or the President or the Supreme Court or the newspaper; it is, because of its supinely acquiescent attitude, slow to stand up and be counted.

If you, per chance, are among those who would rather be governed by constitutional law than by the whims of men unfettered by restraint your war, if it succeeds, will be fought on a wide front. You can't win with brush fights in special areas. You will have to coordinate your efforts with the professions, with business and industry, with agriculture, and all facets of American society concerned with the preservation of personal liberty. The centralizers can lick the isolated groups but they could not defeat a sustained drive by the consolidated believers in constitutional government.

The conservatives should scrutinize every political candidate, at whatever level, and support the man who believes in our traditional form of government. They should examine every major governmental proposal and express their convictions at the ballot box and by letter, telegram, and in person.

The liberals, the moderates, and the ADA extremists should oppose invalid Executive orders and all usurpations by the Supreme Court of the United States, remembering that the historic method of stamping out liberalism is to undermine constitutional government and substitute the rule of man—remembering that, in Russia and Germany, in Italy and Red China, the leadership, as a prelude to the dropping of the ax, promised more liberality and fast action by fiat. They said, as our Supreme Court now says, let's do these good things—let's not wait for the processes of the law.

Those minorities unhappy with membership in their own races, remembering how, in countries where constitutional law has been abolished, minorities have been either deep fried or deep frozen, should urge their causes by lawful means, under the protection of a strong Constitution.

DESPOTS' ROAD

And we must all remember that the road to despotism can be negotiated after, not before, the fiber of the country is destroyed; after the people have been beguiled with handouts which entail a false sense of security—after they have become accustomed to the exchange of their liberties for temporary benefits.

What I've said is not just a theoretical abstraction—that's the way it's been done throughout history and, the indications are, that's the way it will be done here.

But perhaps all this is in keeping with natural law. The children of Hamlin followed the Pied Piper to ruin, the people of Germany and Italy followed Hitler and Mussolini, the lemmings of Norway rush to the sea to drown and the grunnions of the west coast rush from the sea to flop on the beach and die. The Roman Republic was destroyed when the urban leaders pampered its populace with free handouts and a promise of a better day.

Perhaps Benjamin Franklin knew what he was talking about when he told our Founding Fathers, after they had adopted the Federal Constitution, they had gained a free and independent nation but the people did not have the commonsense to keep it.

Connally Suggests Use of Job Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM GIBBONS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Texas, the Honorable John B. Connally is an able public servant, and he speaks as such from a wealth of experience, as administrative assistant to then Senator Lyndon Baines Johnson, of Texas, Secretary of the Navy under the late President John F. Kennedy, and now as the great Governor of the Lone Star State.

The Dallas Morning News of February 6, contained an interesting story about some of Governor Connally's thoughts on the Job Corps program of the Johnson administration's war on poverty. I am always interested in knowing the thinking of the Nation's Governors with respect to the war on poverty since after all, these programs are carried out in their States, on the local level.

I commend the article about the Governor's comments to my colleagues.

CONNALLY SUGGESTS USE OF JOB CORPS

Schools should exploit Federal youth training programs as experimental laboratories to develop new ideas and systems in public school vocational training. Gov. John B. Connally said here Saturday night.

"The Job Corps program * * * gives us a rare opportunity to experiment and innovate in an atmosphere of complete freedom from established concepts," Connally said.

If used in this way, the Governor said, the war-on-poverty youth programs can provide "invaluable lesson in developing first-clas vocational-technical systems in the public schools."

The Job Corps program also offers excellent opportunities for training vocational teachers, he said, because "many of the instructors will return to the public schools with fresh knowledge on the needs in vocational education."

Connally was the main speaker for the final session of the South Central Regional Conference of the National Education Association's department of classroom teachers at the Sheraton-Dallas Hotel.

About 500 persons from 7 States attended the 3-day conference.

Youths participating in the Job Corps training program represent a failure by the public schools, the Governor said, in that they were not motivated by the schools to complete their education or learn a vocational skill.

"They look upon the Job Corps as their last chance," he said. By studying the methods and the reasons for success of Job Corps programs, "we can learn a great deal about our shortcomings in education—and especially in the vocational programs."

Connally cited the Federal Job Corps center at Camp Gary, near San Marcos, as an example of how experimental programs in vocational training can be developed.

The sponsors of the Camp Gary project enlisted 80 leading business and industrial firms to devise job training programs that would best meet their needs.

"By enlisting the tremendous know-how and resources of private industry—at no profit to themselves—vocational courses have been planned and equipped to offer the best job opportunities for enrollees (after graduation)," he said.

In addition, "Management systems and procedures common to sophisticated industry have been devised to bring the program the highest possible efficiency," Connally said.

"And by making industry a partner in a unique enterprise, industry itself is being made aware of the caliber of training it is possible to develop."

Report to Constituents of Congressman James G. Fulton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

As your Congressman, I feel a strong obligation to report to my constituents. The new Congress session has now begun, so I am sending you personally a short report of current developments in Washington, D.C. Both our Pittsburgh and Washington officies are open to serve you.

The President has addressed the joint session of Congress on the state of the Union, and presented the new budget—1,296 pages and $112.8 billion expenditures. The President is now submitting messages to Congress in various legislative fields, several a week.

We Members of Congress are facing over 12,000 undisposed bills, which is a real workload. As this is an election year for Congress, this work will have to be completed earlier, with adjournment expected in July or August.

President Johnson submits the largest Federal spending budget ever, and expects a substantial deficit. The President has already recommended tax increases; telephone users, automobiles, etc. Bureau of Budget now estimates $6.9 billion Federal cash payment deficit in 1966.

Last year on August 16, 1965, in my questionnaire on Vietnam I asked the following:

"Favor my votes to reduce domestic spending in current Federal budget by $7 billion plus?—use savings to eliminate present deficit (1965) of $3 billion—and use remaining $4 billion for new and better weapons and helicopters, etc. to guarantee our U.S. combat troops around the world have enough of the best?"

I wish the administration had followed this policy of a balanced budget, with no deficits which cause inflation, and $4 billion more for the best weapons and equipment for our troops in 1965; we would be far ahead.

The President now asks an increase of $12.4 billion for carrying on Vietnam war, so that the new defense budget is $57 billion compared with 1965 defense budget of $46.8 billion. Count on my voting to reduce the nonmilitary part of the new Federal budget by $10 billion to avoid deficits, prevent inflation, and keep a sound economy for U.S. security in war and peace.

When the first session of Congress recessed last fall, as a specially appointed member of the investigation group of the Committee on Southeast Asia and the Pacific, I spent the recess going to the troublespots of the world to learn conditions firsthand, and to check the Vietnam war on the scene. I went to the following fronts and military installations by U.S. Air Force planes: Wake Island transshipment base for U.S. Vietnam troops, U.S. Okinawa military base, Vietnam staging area, island fortress of Quemoy—5 miles off Red China coast, Vietnam, Red China border-Hong Kong, Thailand border with Laos and Cambodia, India northern border-Kashmir fighting zone, India-Pakistan border fighting regions.

We had extended consultations and conferences with Presidents, Ministers, Foreign Secretaries, general, admirals, and U.S. Ambassadors of Japan, Korea, Ryukyu Islands, Formosa, Philippines, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Iran, Turkey, Poland, France, Italy, and Spain. The work schedule was exhausting as we visited 17 countries. But it is absolutely necessary to have firsthand knowledge of world conditions to make sound decisions for me as a member of the House Foreign Affairs, and Space Committees.

I have pointed out since my return we must stand firmly behind our U.S. servicemen in Vietnam to provide most modern equipment, ammunition, and supplies. I have further reported the tragic shortages our troops are enduring through lack of foresight and adequate planning under Secretary of Defense McNamara. Count on my working hard to cure these conditions as soon as possible, as we servicemen with experience in World War II in the South Pacific know what the necessities are and under what conditions our men fight.

We in Congress must make every legitimate effort for peace. As I reported on my return from Vietnam and the Far East: "We are in a real war—the United States must negotiate from strength and not weakness."

Count on my continued cooperation and help in any way that I can be of assistance. Contact my Pittsburgh or Washington office by phone or letter.

We work hard to give good, efficient representation.

Right Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson felt that the air strikes over North Vietnam had to be resumed "to play fair with our own fighting men, to keep down their casualties and losses, and to help end this miserable war without an endless cycle of tragedy," the Columnist Max Freedman believes.

In a recent column, he points out that about 150,000 men in North Vietnam were engaged in repair work and antiaircraft defenses before the pause in the bombing for 37 days. He added:

> Had the bombs never fallen, these people could have been at work in war factories or might even have been sent to strengthen the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

Mr. Freedman says that while the rulers of North Vietnam do not complain about the people being killed in South Vietnam, they do complain bitterly about the bombing "because it is hurting them and is interferring with the war plans of North Vietnam."

Mr. Freedman has made some strong points and because his column will be interesting to many, I am inserting it in the Record.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 8, 1966]

ENEMY DOESN'T AGREE THAT OUR BOMBING IS FUTILE POLICY

(By Max Freedman)

The best estimates available to the administration indicate that some 150,000 men in North Vietnam were engaged in repair work and antiaircraft defenses before the pause in the bombing for 37 days. Had the bombs never fallen, these people could have been at work in war factories or might even have been sent to strengthen the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

The size and strength of these Communist forces are of course very important. But equally important is the momentum with which their attacks can be launched and sustained. This question of momentum has rarely been mentioned in the public debate but it is absolutely crucial in the thinking of the President's military advisers.

They told the President that the war in South Vietnam would grow uglier and deadlier if the Communists were able to mount wave after wave of sustained attack. This kind of assault would be stark and discouraging proof to the people and Army of South Vietnam that they faced defeat and would be wise to quit. The defections would soon assume the dimensions of a panic.

As it was, the months of bombing before this last pause averted this disaster. Three-quarters of the railroad and road bridges were knocked out and had to be repaired. All important traffic during many months moved furtively and with difficulty at night. The Vietcong, never having faced the concentrated mobile fire power which the American troops poured on them, now shunned the risks of large battles. For the first time the Communists had to worry seriously about their own defections. None of these results would have happened if the bombing had not imposed severe strain on the Communists' lines of supply, had not delayed and disrupted their military campaigns, had not prevented the momentum of sustained attacks from sweeping into South Vietnam.

The critics of the northern bombings raids are trapped in a fatal ambiguity. They say that they want to avoid a big land war in Asia. Everyone agrees with them. But they want to deny the use of air power to the United States in North Vietnam even though that power would be used in attacking military targets directly related to the war in South Vietnam. By a strange and insensitive paradox these critics recoil from limited bombing raids on North Vietnam but accept the heavy ground fighting in South Vietnam where the really large American losses will occur.

How can the United States avoid the misery and tragedy of an endless land war in Asia if it cannot make even limited and measured use of its air power?

The President, before he ordered the resumption of bombing detailed an abundant evidence that only the bombing had kept bigger battles with larger casualties from being fought in South Vietnam.

The opponents and critics of the bombing raids often argue that they embody a futile military policy. The Communists do not share this view. In every Communist capital in the world the one central point on which they have fixed with stubborn tenacity is precisely this northern bombing. It seems a reasonable assumption that they complain so bitterly about the bombing because it is hurting them and is interfering with the war plans of North Vietnam.

Significantly enough, the rulers of North Vietnam do not complain about the people being killed in South Vietnam. They accept these losses as part of the inevitable costs of war. Yet the losses have been frightening. The American troops have been killing the Vietcong at the rate of 15 to 1 and the South Vietnamese have been killing the Communist guerrillas at the rate of 2½ to 1. These figures apply to those actually killed, not to those wounded or captured. Yet this slaughter is borne without complaint by North Vietnam which reserves its protests for the bombing raids. The President's critics in Congress and the press find themselves in opposition to the one policy which the Communist side likes least and wants to end most quickly.

The President felt that he could not look an American soldier on duty in Vietnam in the face if he allowed the Communist attacks to be renewed with steady momentum as a result of being fed with supplies and men from North Vietnam without intermission. He believes this bombing order was necessary to play fair with our own fighting men, to keep down their casualties and losses, and to help end this miserable war without an endless cycle of tragedy.

Milwaukee Sentinel Records War on Poverty Program in Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Sentinel recently summarized the excellent work being done under the war on poverty in Milwaukee.

As of December 21, 1965, more than $5 million in Federal funds had come to Milwaukee to help the city's poor help themselves to better and more useful lives. The community action program, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, the college work-study program, the adult basic education program, the work-experience program, and the small business opportunity loan program are all involved in this growing citywide effort.

As an example of the progress being made in one city I include hereafter the article by Georgiana Pilley from the Milwaukee Sentinel of January 11, 1966:

MILLIONS EARMARKED FOR POVERTY WAR HERE

(By Georgiana Pilley)

Milwaukee is feeling the effects of the first national welfare program designed to help the poor help themselves.

As of December 21, more than $5.1 million had been allocated in 1 year to Milwaukee County as part of the Nation's war on poverty.

Although Milwaukee still is trying to meet Federal requirements for the community action program (CAP) phase of the antipoverty program, it appears snags will be cleared soon.

CAP is coordinated by the human relations-social development commission in Milwaukee County. The commission has to be reorganized to include representatives of the poor to fulfill Federal requirements that the poor help plan and develop CAP.

SDC's economic opportunity board, a subcommittee which recommends antipoverty programs for Federal funds, was reorganized to include poverty representatives, temporary, pending the development of a plan for choosing permanent poverty members. The plan is being developed by representatives of the poor.

About $1.9 million in Federal funds has been allocated for CAP. Another $3.2 million has been alloted for other antipoverty projects.

The Federal Government pays 90 percent and the local sponsoring agency contributes 10 percent to CAP. Any of the component parts may be vetoed by Governor Knowles. Sargent Shriver, National Antipoverty Director, may override gubernatorial vetoes, however.

To participate in the antipoverty program, people generally live in a household with an annual income below the number of individuals in the family. A family of four with income under $3,130 annually is poor, as is an individual earning less than $1,540. There are some exceptions.

Eleven antipoverty projects have been funded as part of CAP. Eight are underway and three are scheduled to begin soon. The 11 projects are:

Intensive casework unit to help 50 children and their families, sponsored by the Milwaukee public schools.

Lay work projects in which residents of poverty areas serve as a liaison between the community and the school under the direction of the welfare division of the Milwaukee public schools.

Prekindergarten centers with a program similar to Project Head Start, sponsored a program * * * for strengthening basic skills and providing experiences, such as field trips.

Special remedial teachers of the public school system have been assigned to certain schools to give children help in the basic skills of reading, writing, language, and arithmetic.

Inner city development project (ICDP), designed as a neighborhood centered attack on multiproblem families, or families alienated from society, under the sponsorship of United Community Services of Greater Milwaukee (UCS).

Inner city day care for preschool children, sponsored by Child Care Services, Inc., at the Kennedy Center, 1749 North 16th Street.

Family oriented day-care center, which offers parent participation in connection with day care for preschool children, under the sponsorship of Phillips Day Care Center, 3432 North Teutonia Avenue.

Assisting the aged poor to use community health and welfare services, sponsored by UCS.

Helping families new to the community get oriented to urban living, sponsored by Milwaukee Urban League.

Community youth organization project, wherein youth, regardless of religion, may participate in group programs, under the sponsorship of the Catholic Youth Organization.

Six programs not under CAP are:

Project Off, designed to train 1,000 women household heads on relief to become self-supporting under the county welfare department.

Job Corps screening centers for men and women. The program of remedial education and job training in rural and urban centers is for young people, 16 to 21. The youth opportunity center, operated by the Wisconsin State Employment Service at 710 North Sixth Street, screens men and the local branch of Women in Community Service (WICS) screens women.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC), which provides full or part-time work experience and training for youths. One NYC project, designed to keep youths in school, is sponsored by the Milwaukee public schools. Another, designed to encourage dropouts to return to school, is sponsored by the county.

A college work-study program encourages students to remain in college by providing part-time employment for full-time students from low-income families. Six Milwaukee area colleges and universities are participating.

The Milwaukee Small Business Opportunities Corp. center, 2332 North Third Street, recommends applicants to the Small Business Administration for loans from a special poverty fund.

An adult basic education program offering reading, writing, and arithmetic, sponsored by the Milwaukee vocational, adult, and technical schools.

Headstart Program Gets Boost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Operation Headstart has been amazingly successful in all parts of the country. In Tampa, we have witnessed a rather dynamic and new approach to conducting the Headstart program on a massive basis allowing as many children in the 5- and 6-year-old category to participate as possible. This has been through the use of portable classrooms.

This mobile approach to the war on poverty shows the type of local initiative and leadership which I feel will insure success in not only the Headstart program, but all the antipoverty efforts.

An article in the Tampa Times, of February 9, tells of the mobile classrooms. I commend it to my colleagues:

Portable Classrooms: Headstart Program Gets Boost

Operation Headstart, an antipoverty war program, began moving into full operation today with the delivery of the first shipment of portable classrooms.

Headstart Director David Hernandez said six of the units are being installed at training centers in the East Hillsborough area.

Delivery of 29 more units is expected this month, he said.

Hernandez' project, designed to prepare underprivileged 5- and 6-year-old children from low income families for the school, ordered 35 portable classroms last year when the program became a year-round operation.

The units, costing $294,000, are to be paid for with Federal funds secured through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Each portable will measure 24 by 32 feet and will accommodate 20 children, 1 teacher, a teacher aid and a Neighborhood Youth Corps worker. The units are air conditioned and heated, and include running water and toilet facilities.

Social workers and child development specialists, working in teams, will circulate periodically among all classrooms.

Hernandez said the portables will provide a solution to major problem of conducting a massive program like Headstart.

"Usually, available classrooms are never located in the areas where the children we want to help reside. And transporting them long distances doesn't work out well," he said.

With the portables, "we'll be able to locate them where they are needed, and hit the problem where it exists," he said.

The World War on Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, seldom do I include in the Congressional Record testimony which has been presented before the Committee on Agriculture, but I am doing so today. The Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the committee today in support of the concept of a world war on hunger and I feel that what he had to say is of such importance and such general interest that it should be made available at once to all the Members of the House and all those who read the Congressional Record.

The testimony follows:

Statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, Before the House Committee on Agriculture, February 23, 1966

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, President Johnson, in his message on food for freedom less than 2 weeks ago, proposed that "the United States lead the world in a war on hunger." You, in this committee today, are beginning to mobilize our forces in that war.

I sincerely believe that, as you begin your deliberations today, you have the opportunity to set in motion a policy and a program that will be heralded in the years ahead as one of history's greatest steps forward. This policy, if carried out successfully, will do much to advance and insure a bright future for American agriculture. It will provide continued assurance of abundant supplies of high quality food and fiber at fair prices for all Americans. And it will firmly establish the United States of America on a course of world leadership toward total victory in the war against hunger—a war against the enemy of all mankind.

Victory in this war will save more lives than have been lost in all the wars of history. In opening the door to achieving the potential of enough food and fiber to meet the needs of all people in all nations it will open the door to progress in every other aspect of their lives.

To the millions of people in the newly independent and developing nations of the world, victory in this war means the opportunity to realize deep and urgent aspirations for higher levels of living under freedom.

To those in the highly developed nations that already enjoy material prosperity in a free society, it means continued growth in the future under conditions that make their freedom more secure.

I suggest that never before have the Agriculture Committees of the Congress of the United States had so great an opportunity to launch a policy and a program that means so much to so many.

A NEW PROGRAM

In this opening testimony on the food-for-freedom bill recommended by the President of the United States I should like to review with you the basic reasons for this new program.

These reasons are to be found in problems facing the world. They are to be found in new conditions prevailing here in the United States of America.

THE THREAT OF HUNGER

The worldwide problem, only recently commanding widespread public attention, has been highlighted as a race between population and food supply. There can be no better tribute to the breadth of vision and the high sense of responsibility of this committee, Mr. Chairman, than the fact that you have devoted your first week of hearings to testimony on the nature and magnitude of this problem from some of this Nation's most distinguished and competent authorities.

You have heard lucid and compelling descriptions of the population explosion that has come upon us only recently as death rates in developing countries have sharply declined.

You have heard how millions of lives that have been saved by successful public health measures are now threatened by hunger. Improved food production in these countries has not kept pace with increased needs.

You have been told of the urgent importance of policies and measures to control population growth in the developing countries. But even if such policies succeed as well as can be reasonably expected, there will remain an urgently critical need for food for at least one or two decades ahead.

Some of the authorities to whom you have listened have been less pessimistic than others. But all who have given serious study to the problem are agreed that unless present trends are altered much of the world will face famine of massive proportions within the next two decades.

Those trends, therefore, must be changed.

President Johnson, in his message on foreign aid and on education and health, expressed this administration's determination to offer help to those countries that seek to develop effective programs of population control.

And, in his message on food for freedom, the President charted the course for help to those countries determined to become more self-reliant in providing enough food for their people.

If these policies and programs are adopted, and if the developing nations will do their part, the trends that forecast the dark shadow of famine can be reversed.

The population trend can be altered downward.

The food production trend can be altered upward.

It is with the latter that we are primarily concerned today. We are concerned with it in terms of its import for a world in which peace and freedom can prevail. And we are concerned with it in terms of its meaning for American agriculture.

USDA'S CONCERN

Long before American newspapers and magazines publicized world food needs in black headlines with even blacker forecasts, the Department of Agriculture was seriously concerned.

For more than a decade the USDA has been involved in helping to meet the food needs of some 70 countries under Public Law 480. True, the extent to which our agricultural abundance could be used for this purpose was measured by that which could be termed surplus. Yet the $14 billion we have spent in providing food and fiber to developing nations have done more than any other program in history to avert hunger, malnutrition and famine.

Our Public Law 480 program has been increasingly directed toward encouraging economic development. We have consistently used our agricultural surpluses for assistance to developing countries to the maximum extent feasible under existing conditions at home and abroad.

Five years ago, when I assumed the responsibilities of this office, one of my major concerns was to insure that the unparalleled productivity of our American farms would be used most effectively—not only to provide a fair reward to the American farmer and abundant supplies to the American consumer—but also to alleviate hunger and want in less fortunate countries. I have never been able to accept the idea that there was any real surplus, in human terms, as long as human beings, even on the other side of the globe, suffer for want of food and clothing.

One of my first inquiries, back in 1961, was for an assessment of the extent of the need in the years immediately ahead. When I found that there was no ready answer I requested the Economic Research Service to make a careful study of world food needs. In October 1961 we published the World Food Budget, 1962 and 1966.

This provided our first comprehensive study of world food needs. It helped to guide our programs to expand commercial markets for the products of American farms. It helped us to plan exports under our food-for-peace program. It highlighted the opportunity for using food abundance to help build self-sustaining economies in countries receiving food aid.

This effort was only a beginning. In October 1964 we published the World Food Budget, 1970. This study presents the results of an expanded effort to examine the supply and utilization of food commodities throughout the world. It assesses world food needs and highlights the food deficit that prevails in two-thirds of the world. It evaluates the possibilities of closing the food gap. And it outlines the problems involved in that effort.

In its closing paragraph, the World Food Budget, 1970, presents the following conclusion: "While U.S. food aid will likely continue to play an important role in helping developing countries meet emergency needs and achieve more rapid economic growth, food aid is at best a temporary and inadequate measure. Higher food production is the only permanent way to overcome the food gap in most diet-deficient countries, although in some countries, development of nonfarm resources will result in foreign exchange earnings that can be used to pay for commercial imports of food."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CHARGE

A few months after the publication of the World Food Budget, 1970, President Johnson presented his 1965 farm message to the Congress. He said then:

"The disturbing downward trends in food output per person in both Asia and Latin America in recent years must be reversed. And these trends can be arrested and reversed only by a massive mobilization of resources in both the food-deficit countries and the advanced countries of the industrial West.

"We must use both our agricultural abundance and our technical skills in agriculture to assist the developing nations to stand on their own feet. Under our assistance programs we will make full use of the agricultural know-how in the Department of Agriculture and in the land-grant colleges and State universities. We will enlist the support and cooperation of private agencies and enterprises of all kinds.

"I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture and others concerned to study and recommend changes in agricultural policy that may be needed to accomplish these goals."

These were the guidelines under which we have carried out studies to determine what legislation ought to be proposed as the current Public Law 480 expires at the end of the year. We studied the question in cooperation with the Agency for International Development and other agencies and departments concerned. The President's recommendations for a new bill are made in the light of two major changes that have taken place since Public Law 480 was enacted back in 1954.

FOOD NEEDS INCREASE SHARPLY—SURPLUSES DECLINE

The first of these changes I have already noted. The world situation in terms of food needs is much more alarming today than it was 12 years ago.

The second change arises out of the success of our domestic farm commodity programs. With the legislation you enacted last year, and the laws already on the books, we have succeeded in supporting farm income while gradually eliminating unwanted surpluses. We now expect that within a few years available stocks of most agricultural commodities will have declined to a level no higher than need for an ever-normal granary. It is therefore no longer possible to envisage an effective program of food aid based on surplus commodities.

Our first task in developing a new program to meet these changes was to examine, in as specific quantitative terms as possible, the extent of food needs that can be expected to occur in aid-recipient countries in the years immediately ahead. In this task we built on the information that has been brought together in the World Food Budget, 1970, but we projected our estimates forward to 1975 and beyond. We then related the needs thus projected to America's capacity to produce.

MEASURING THE FOOD DEFICIT

In estimating the magnitude of the food gap we used grain as an indicator to simplify our projections. On the production side we based our assumptions on a continuation of recent trends in grain production in the developing countries—rising at a rate of about 2.6 percent annually, barely keeping up with population growth.

On the consumption side, however, we recognized that recent trends are unacceptable. Per capita consumption—now averaging 10 percent below minimum standards—has been increasing only about one-third of 1 percent a year. At this rate it would take three decades to bring the calorie content of consumption up to bare minimum standards.

This rate is clearly unacceptable to the hungry nations themselves.

It is morally unacceptable to us.

We therefore based our estimates on a more acceptable target that is within reach—the achievement within one decade of an average per capita consumption that would meet minimum standards.

If agriculture in these countries fails to improve any faster than its present rate they would experience very little overall economic growth—because so large a proportion of their total output comes from the agricultural sector. This means that these countries could not afford to pay for imports of food to fill that gap. It would have to be provided by food aid. Let's look at the magnitude of that food aid.

Beginning at a little over 18 million tons, it would reach 25 million tons by 1970, 42 million tons by 1975, and 62 million tons by 1960.

CAN U.S. FOOD FILL THE GAP?

Now let's turn to the supply side. This represents the amount of grain that would be available for food aid—over and above all domestic uses and commercial exports—if American farmers were to bring back into production all of the acres now diverted. This is based on expected yields under current price levels, and therefore represents more feed grains than wheat, even though wheat is most useful as food aid.

This study assumes that if diversion programs were ended all diverted acres would probably be back in production by 1970. That accounts for the sharp rise in availability shown for the first 3 years. After 1970 the more gradual rise represents an expected increase in yields per acre.

If we were to follow this pattern, by 1970 we would be producing 44 million tons more than food aid requirements. By 1975 we would still have an annual surplus of 30 million tons. (Where would we put it?) By 1980 there would still be a small annual surplus.

By 1985 there would be no way to fill the gap. As President Johnson said in his food-for-freedom message, "the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all the agricuturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations—unless present trends are changed."

This disaster cannot be averted by calling back into production all of our diverted acres and shipping the surplus to the hungry world. It is true that we could put these acres back into production. We could use them to produce some 60 million more tons of grain for use in food aid programs. If our commodity programs were adjusted so that at least two-thirds of this grain would be wheat (which now constitutes nearly 90 percent of our grain shipments under Public Law 480) the cost would be at least $2 billion higher than present programs. (This is assuming that we would maintain farm income at its present level.) This estimate does not include the high cost of constructing in recipient countries the port and related facilities that would be necessary to handle such an increased volume of food aid.

But even at this cost we could only postpone the disaster for a few years. The greatest cost would be the lost years—the years during which those massive amounts of our grain would serve as a crutch—as a deterrent to delay action on the part of recipient countries to help themselves. We would be contributing to, rather than working to prevent, that disaster.

ONLY ONE SOLUTION

The disaster can be averted in only one way—by greatly accelerating the expansion of food production within the hungry nations themselves.

There is no time to be lost. The hungry nations are faced with a tremendous task in increasing their agricultural productivity. Those most densely populated will have to do it the hard way by increasing yields, for they already have under cultivation most of their available acres.

Their efforts to increase yields face many serious roadblocks. Some of them even lack sufficient government stability for the establishment of effective policies. Most of them lack incentives adequate to make it worth while for farmers to make any great effort to produce more. They face low rates of literacy, lack of know-how, and the absence of means by which to help farmers use new and better methods. Essential purchased inputs (fertilizer and other chemicals, machines, and tools) are scarce, and the hungry nations have little foreign exchange with which to buy them. Lack of roads, marketing facilities, farmers' cooperatives, and sources of credit are other handicaps. Most of them are in tropical regions where agricultural research and technological advance lag far behind that which has developed in the temperate regions of the world.

With all these handicaps, these hungry nations will need to increase their agricultural productivity at a rate higher than that ever achieved by the agriculturally productive nations. Clearly the task cannot—must not—be delayed.

HELPING NATIONS TO HELP THEMSELVES

This is why the food-for-freedom program places highest emphasis on self-help.

We can and will provide technical and capital assistance to help those countries that undertake effective programs to increase their own ability to provide food for their people.

We can and will help to fill the gap in their food and fiber needs as they pursue those self-help efforts and until they reach a level of self-reliance where they can either produce or buy what they need.

The task is difficult, but not impossible.

The Department of Agriculture has studied in detail increases in agricultural productivity over the years 1948 to 1963 of 26 developing countries, some in each of the major geographic regions of the world. Twelve out of the twenty-six have increased their agricultural production at annual compound rates of more than 4 percent per year. This surpasses rates ever achieved by the new economically advanced nations over comparable periods of time.

Many factors have contributed in varying degrees to their success. The 12 countries differ widely in climate, literacy rates, land resources, culture, and governmental systems. They had only one factor in common—a national determination to carry out self-help policies to improve their food production.

With similar determination and with assistance from highly developed nations, other countries can do as well. An annual average increase in agricultural production of 4 or 5 percent would go a long way toward defeating hunger in the decade ahead.

The food-for-freedom program is directed toward that goal. It is directed also toward one apsect of that goal that deals with quality as well as quantities of food.

One of the most serious manifestations of hunger in the developing nations lies in nutritional deficiencies, particularly the lack of proteins and vitamins, among infants and young children. It is estimated that in the developing nations of the free world some 171 million children under 6 years of age and 98 million between the ages of 6 and 14 suffer seriously from malnutrition. Millions die because malnutrition has sapped their resistance to childhood diseases. Millions who survive are permanently handicapped, physically and/or mentally. Progress in education as well as the nation's capacity to carry on vigorous economic development are seriously retarded by the degree of malnutrition that prevails in many parts of the world.

Today we know how to meet such nutritional deficiencies. We have developed new methods by which essential food requirements can be produced and processed at low cost. In the Department of Agriculture we are stepping up our own activties to meet the problem of malnutrition.

Other agencies of the U.S. Government are also attacking this problem. The AID is already fortifying donations under its Public Law 480 programs. I know that you will hear more about this aspect of the war on hunger when Mr. Bell presents his testimony.

WAR ON MANY FRONTS

Our Government is mobilizing for the war on hunger on many fronts. One of these fronts was described by President Johnson in his message on foreign aid. He proposed that the Agency for International Development increase its effort in the field of agriculture by more than one-third, to a total of nearly $500 million. One-third of this total will finance imports of fertilizer from the United States. The remainder will finance: Transfer of efficient farming techniques; improvement of roads, marketing and irrigation facilities; establishment of extension services, cooperatives and credit facilities; purchases of American farm equipment and pesticides; research on soil and seed improvements. I am sure that Mr. Bell will emphasize the importance of this effort to assist these nations to help themselves.

The President's message on health and education likewise offers intensive new programs, many of which will either directly or indirectly benefit the agriculture of the developing countries and help to win the war on hunger.

THE FOOD FOR FREEDOM ACT

You in this committee are now taking under consideration a major front in this war. Two companion bills are before you, one to authorize a new 5-year food aid program to replace Public Law 480 when it expires on December 31, 1966, and one to provide for an "ever-normal granary" by setting up commodity reserves.

The Food for Freedom Act of 1966 has two new features of utmost importance.

FOOD AID LINKED TO SELF-HELP

The first is the emphasis on self-help. This principle is referred to four times in the bill itself. It becomes an integral part of our food-aid program.

This link between self-help and food aid is essential to economic progress and growth in recipient countries. Instead of becoming increasingly dependent upon the United States they can build toward the freedom that comes only with self-reliance. Instead of an economy whose growth is seriously held back because the great majority of the people in rural areas are still outside the market economy, the recipient nation can look forward to the overall economic progress that follows when agriculture becomes more progressive and prosperous. Only when farm people begin to both buy and sell will these countries really begin to move their economies forward.

The link between self-help and food aid is likewise important to the people of the United States. Paradoxical as it may seem, agricultural development in the poor and hungry nations offers to us the best opportunity for expanding exports of the products of our farms and factories.

We know that economic development is the basis for expanded commercial trade. We have seen proof of that many times in recent years as we have observed how dollar sales of U.S. farm products have climbed in countries where economic growth is taking place most rapidly. For example, dollar exports of U.S. farm products in the 5 fiscal years 1961–65 increased over the 5 years 1955–59 by 16 times in Greece; by 13 times in Taiwan; by 10 times in Spain. They almost doubled in Israel, and increased by one and one-half times in Hong Kong. We have further observed that for every 10-percent increase in incomes in developing countries we can expect their imports of our agricultural products on commercial terms to increase by 16 percent.

And since economic development in the hungry nations depends so much on increased agricultural progress, it is only by hastening that progress that we can hope to begin to tap the great potential market that lies dormant in the underdeveloped world.

Finally, the link between self-help and food aid is of paramount importance because it is the only way to insure victory in the war against hunger. By means of this link, food from American farms today can help to insure that, by that time in the future when needs would be so great they could not possibly be met by American productivity, productivity in the developing world will have increased enough to meet the need. It is only by this link with self-help that American food aid can make its major contribution to banishing famine from the face of the earth.

END OF SURPLUS CONCEPT

The second new feature of importance in the Food for Freedom Act is the elimination of the surplus requirement. Commodities to be furnished would be those determined to be available by the Secretary of Agriculture, taking into account productive capacity, domestic requirements, farm and consumer price levels, commercial exports, and adequate carryover.

Food-for-freedom needs would be taken into account by the Secretary when he exercises his responsibilities under domestic farm programs. These programs are flexible enough so that production can now be geared to potential use. They will be administered so that American agriculture will produce enough food and fiber to meet domestic needs, commercial exports, food aid for those developing countries that are determined to help themselves, and reserves adequate to meet any emergency and to insure price stability.

Commodities available to food recipient countries will no longer be as limited as they have been in the past. The commodity "mix" sent abroad under concessional programs will be geared to the kind needed rather than circumscribed by the kinds held in stocks. We can expect the trend to be in the direction of commodities with special nutritional values.

Other features of the Food for Freedom Act reflect the best provisions of Public Law 480.

Emphasis on expanding international trade and building markets for American farm products is continued, with special emphasis on the long-term development of markets expanding under the impact of economic growth. Financing will continue under the Commodity Credit Corporation. Private trade channels will be used to the maximum extent practicable. Usual marketings will continue to be safeguarded. Donation programs through voluntary agencies will continue. There will be increased emphasis on combating malnutrition both in terms of selection of the commodities and in the authorization of the CCC to finance the enrichment of foods.

In the proposed act all sales, whether for foreign currencies or for dollars on credit terms, are placed under title I. The policy is established to shift from foreign currency sales to dollar credit sales at a progressive rate, so that the transition can be completed by December 31, 1971, except for U.S. requirements for foreign currencies.

All donation programs will be under title II of the act. Donations are authorized for such purposes as to meet emergency food needs, to provide food-for-work community and economic development programs and to carry out the U.S. pledge to the world food program.

Title III provides for uses that may be made of foreign currencies that accrue from foreign currency sales. Among the authorized purposes are: To finance U.S. expenses abroad; to develop new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities; to procure equipment for common defense; to promote economic development; to finance educational exchange programs; to make Cooley loans; and to finance research. Any U.S. agency having authority to operate abroad can use those currencies to carry out its programs.

I know you will study this bill carefully. I will be glad to go over it with you to answer any specific questions you may have.

FOOD AND FIBER RESERVES

The companion bill recommended by the President would authorize establishment and maintenance of reserves of farm commodities. This bill is important to the people of the United States as consumers, to our customers abroad, and to those developing countries who must depend on our food for a few more years.

For many years, the need for such reserve policy has been overshadowed by concern with excessive supplies of agricultural products. But wise legislation, improved administration of our farm programs and increased foreign demands have now depleted the stocks of most farm commodities. We do not want to permit the inventories of key food commodities to decrease to the point that we cannot meet our domestic, export and food-for-freedom commitments and still have a safeguard against an unforeseeable increase in demand or an unexpected reduction in supply.

The bill would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities primarily to assure a continuous, adequate, and stable supply to meet domestic requirements at fair and reasonable prices, and also to meet the requirements of commercial exports, domestic food programs, and the food-for-freedom program.

The commodities to be reserved and the reserve quantities for each marketing year would be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture after consultation with other interested agencies such as the Departments of Defense and State. They would be announced in advance of the marketing year. The Secretary would be authorized to adjust support prices, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas to achieve the production necessary to establish and maintain reserves. Commodities in the reserve would be available for disposal through sales, barter, donations, or redemption of payment-in-kind certificates.

Such a reserve is not a new idea—it was the basic principle of the ever-normal granary. In periods when supplies exceed expectations and needs, we set aside a reserve for periods of unusual demand or a short crop.

Actually, public concern over reserve levels for agricultural products goes back nearly 15 years to a report entitled, "Reserve Levels for Storable Farm Products," published in 1952 as Senate Document No. 130.

Department specialists estimated at that time that a reserve of 350 to 400 million bushels of wheat held by CCC, in addition to normal working stocks of around 100 million bushels held by the trade, would have been sufficient to offset the effects of one serious drought year followed by a moderate drought year.

For corn and other feed grains, a reserve supply of 700 to 800 million bushels would have been sufficient, in addition to normal working stocks of around 300 million bushels held in trade channels.

Since that time, we have done additional research on this problem, much of which contributed to the 1964 report of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission on the subject.

Under present law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is under a mandate to dispose of its stocks as rapidly as possible consistent with its price-support program and orderly market. The proposed legislation would permit us to stop short of total disposition of our inventories, to use the reserve to meet priority needs, and to encourage production of those items for which larger reserves are needed.

Wheat and dairy products offer current examples of how this authority might be used. Our wheat stocks will have been reduced to about a reserve level by next June 30. We have advised spring wheatgrowers that there will not be a program to reduce 1966 acreages below allotments. If it appears by midyear that the June 30, 1967, stocks will be below reserve needs, we may wish to increase wheat allotments by enough to build our stocks to reserve levels by mid-1968.

Dairy products are currently in short supply. We have virtually no inventory, although we expect to acquire some products again this spring. We have already announced our offer to purchase dairy products for school lunch programs at market prices above support levels. Under this bill, authority would be provided to take actions to build up reserve stocks if that course of action seemed to be required to assure adequate supplies and stable prices.

CCC inventories of rice, fats and oils, and nonfat dry milk, are presently low, but some of these commodities may be increased as a result of 1966 production.

To the extent possible, reserve commodities would be maintained as a part of the Commodity Credit Corporation's overall inventory for the particular commodity without individual lot specification. Government-owned stocks of reserve commodities in most cases would be stored under existing Commodity Credit Corporation storage contracts, and handled in the same manner as price-support commodities—utilizing the usual and customary channels of trade. Reserve inventories would be stored in or as near the area of production as possible so as to minimize the cost of transportation and handling and to permit greater flexibility in making dispositions.

Our aims would be to use the reserve agricultural commodities in the national interest. Under emergency conditions, the nature and extent of the emergency would dictate the disposal procedures to be followed. Under normal circumstances, dispositions from the reserve would be made under procedures now used for disposition of Commodity Credit Corporation price support inventories. We would plan to announce our procedures as far in advance as possible, so that producers and the trade could make their plans for the year.

This is an important bill at a crucial time. We need it to protect our consumers at home. We may need it to meet commitments abroad.

It will supplement the food for freedom program.

THE OPERATION OF THE NEW PROGRAM

In many ways, the new food-for-freedom program will operate in a manner similar to the operation of our food-for-peace program under Public Law 480. But the new legislation, designed to meet new conditions and urgent needs in the years ahead, will call for some significant modifications in the operation of the program. We expect that these will evolve with experience. But I know you are interested in our expectation as to how the new features of the program will be implemented. I will try to summarize some of the highlights of these new features.

GREATER RESPONSIBILITY

Food-for-freedom programs and domestic farm commodity programs, while not dependent upon each other, must complement each other. This will add to the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture, who will be called upon to administer commodity programs in a manner that will assure the availability of commodities needed for food aid as well as to meet all domestic requirements and commercial exports.

Our commodity programs are flexible enough for us to meet that requirement, especially when buttressed by legislation for the establishment of commodity reserves. We expect that quantities needed for food aid may increase in the years ahead. As needs increase we can call back into production some of the acres now diverted.

Obviously, if this is to be done responsibly and effectively it will require more forward planning, a more careful evaluation of prospective needs and probable supplies, than was required when food aid was generally limited to "surplus" commodities. The resources and procedures of the Department of Agriculture, as well as those of the Agency for International Development, for estimating needs on both a short- and long-range basis will need to be expanded. The Secretary of Agriculture will need to take into account the foreign policy aspects of food aid and the degree of success of self-help efforts in recipient countries before he can make final determination about commodity programs.

ADAPTATION OF EXISTING INTERAGENCY PROCEDURES

A higher level of interagency coordination will be further implemented by adapting existing interagency operating procedures that have worked well under the old program.

Coordination under Public Law 480 has been carried out through the Interagency Staff Committee, on which representatives of Agriculture, State, AID, Defense, Treasury, Commerce, and the Bureau of the Budget meet under the chairmanship of the USDA. I would expect something like this interagency structure to continue, but that its increased responsibilities would enhance its importance.

CLOSER COORDINATION OF FOOD AID WITH OTHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The new food-for-freedom program contemplates closer coordination of food aid with other assistance programs directed toward food and agriculture in recipient countries. President Johnson, in his message on food for freedom, emphasized the need for a unified effort. He said: "To strengthen these programs our food aid and economic assistance must be closely linked. Together they must relate to efforts in developing countries to improve their own agriculture. The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Agency for International Development will work together even more closely than they have in the past in the planning and implementation of coordinated programs."

The Department of Agriculture and the AID have for several years been developing closer working relationships with each other in the food aid part of U.S. assistance programs. But the kind of unified effort to which the President referred means that Agriculture will also be called upon to participate in the planning of agricultural assistance activities and in reviewing the progress made in agricultural development.

This means that we are called upon to develop closer interagency operating relationships that will involve the Department of Agriculture in a shared concern for—not only the food component of assistance programs—but also that part of economic assistance that relates to self-help in the agriculture related sectors of developing nations.

This planning is primarily the responsibility of the AID. In discussing this problem with the Administrator, Mr. Bell and I have agreed that both the AID and the USDA could carry out their respective responsibilities most constructively if representatives of the Department of Agriculture accepted AID's invitation to participate in the planning—particularly for those major aid-recipient countries where problems of food and agriculture are of critical importance.

Specific procedures will be worked out under which such participation in agricultural planning can be carried out effectively. Through such participation the Secretary would be currently informed about the level of success of self-help efforts, and of needs which Agriculture might be called upon to meet.

INCREASED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM USDA

President Johnson also pointed out that AID's policy of "calling upon the Department of Agriculture to assume increasing responsibilities through its International Agricultural Development Service" would "become even more important as we increase our emphasis on assisting developing nations to help themselves."

Mr. Bell has indicated his hope that the USDA will be increasingly helpful in this area. We have just signed a new interagency agreement under which AID seeks to "enlist as fully and effectively as possible on a partnership basis the pertinent resources of the Department in planning, executing and evaluating those portions of the foreign assistance program in which it has special competence." Under this agreement we expect to expand USDA's participation through participating agency service agreements with the AID.

The Department of Agriculture will thus become increasingly involved in providing technical assistance in agriculture and related fields. We will be able to, as the President said, "extend to world problems in food and agriculture the kind of cooperative relationships we have developed with the States, universities, farm organizations, and private industry."

EFFECTIVE ENCOURAGEMENT OF SELF-HELP

The new food-for-freedom program can truly be an instrument under which the millions of lives that are now threatened by famine under present trends can be saved. But this will result only if it proves effective in changing those trends by stimulating, encouraging, and—if necessary—insisting on effective self-help measures. This may mean agreements for no longer than 1 year, with provisions for periodic reviews of progress made toward self-reliance.

A FORECAST

I should like to conclude this testimony by sharing with you my own forecast of the course of this new war against hunger—a view of the potential outcome of the frightening race between population and food supply.

I make this forecast in the light of another explosion that has taken place in our generation—one that can hold far greater meaning, and that certainly holds far greater hope, than the explosion of population. I refer to the explosion of knowledge that characterizes our times.

Science and technology have progressed so far that it is now physically possible to produce enough for abundance for all.

But science and technology have likewise progressed so fast in the physical and material fields that our knowledge about the social, economic, and political relationships necessary to realize that abundance has not caught up.

This gap lies behind one of the most significant statements that I find in the World Food Budget, 1970: "The race is not so much one between population and food supply but a race between what could be done and what will be done."

What could be done has been largely determined by scientific and technological progress.

What will be done can be influenced in a large measure by how you, in this committee, take the lead in launching an all-out war on hunger by passing the Food for Freedom Act of 1966.

Under this food-for-freedom program, I foresee, in the years ahead:

A likely increase in our food aid programs, as they are used to meet the deficit in developing countries making a major effort to increase their own food production.

A consequent corresponding increase in American farm production, responsibly carried out under our flexible farm programs. As I see it, some, but not all, of our diverted acres will be needed in the years immediately ahead.

A gradual shift from aid to trade, under which our declining exports for food for freedom would be more than made up by increasing exports on commercial terms. These increased exports for dollars would be a product of the development that our food aid had helped to bring about.

As agricultural progress would stimulate accelerated economic growth in the developing nations I would hope to see higher standards of living, rising incomes, and a growing volume of international trade. As poverty, dependence, and insecurity decline, and as more of the developing nations become able to stand on their own feet and enter the international commercial market, I would expect a more rational pattern of international trade to develop. That would mean, for the American farmer, a very substantial increase in our exports of those commodities for which we have a real comparative advantage.

Most important of all, I would look forward hopefully to a future of peace and freedom, where peace would be more secure and freedom more widely cherished because the fear of hunger no longer threatened the people of any nation.

The food-for-freedom program proposed by President Johnson less than 2 weeks ago is directed toward that goal. Its appeal has already aroused deep interest around the world.

I have seen cables and reports telling of that appeal. I have personally seen the hope that kind of program offers to the peasants in Vietnam.

The United States of America today has an unparalleled opportunity to use its abundance to the benefit of all.

Mr. Chairman, and members of this committee, the bill—and the opportunity—are in your hands.

School Aid Funds Should Be Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, when I became a Member of Congress a little more than 3 years ago in January 1963, my first speech and the first bill I introduced dealt with education. At that time time I introduced a bill to extend the Federal assistance programs under Public Laws 815 and 874 to local school districts in impacted areas. I cited figures to show how the schools throughout the Nation and also in the State of Connecticut have benefited over the years from these two programs.

I was extremely perturbed over the fact that the budget recently submitted to Congress provides for a drastic cut in these funds from an estimated need of $416 million to $183,400,000. A cut of this size will seriously affect a number of school districts and communities in my district, especially in southeastern Connecticut where there are several important Government installations and industrial plants working on important Government contracts.

In the past week or two I have received several letters and telegrams from school superintendents and chairmen of local boards of education emphasizing how the proposed cuts will affect their school system and pleading for a restoration of funds. I am forwarding these letters to the Appropriations Subcommittee handling this legislation for its consideration. At the same time, I wish to insert copies of these letters into the RECORD so that other colleagues will have the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the problem and the difficulties this is causing for our school districts.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting several letters, telegrams, and a newspaper article on the subject published in the February 16, 1966, issue of the New London, Conn., Day. They are as follows:

STONINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Pawcatuck, Conn., February 18, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
Representative in Congress, Second Connecticut District, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ST. ONGE: We have learned that an effort will be made in the House Appropriation Education Subcommittee next Wednesday to include action of $40 million in an emergency supplemental appropriation bill to insure 100-percent payments on 1965–66 entitlements established under Public Law 874, 81st Congress.

We hope that you can see your way clear to encourage favorable action by the subcommittee on this item and to support it throughout its course through the House.

We understand that the largest single factor in producing a deficiency in the 1965–66 budget appropriations for the Public Law 874 program is the recent legislation lowering the minimum requirement for eligibility of the large cities (those having over 35,000 ADA) to 3 percent federally connected, the same as with all others. This move was well justified but in effect it leaves the rest of us in the position of being forced to contribute toward meeting the newly established entitlements of the large cities.

As always, it is important that estimated income from this source, based as it is on the formula embodied in the law, be dependable in local school budgets. Our loss would not be large as current figures go, roughly $5,000, out of an estimated $35,000, but every bit counts.

On the project for Public Law 874 income in 1966–67 and beyond, we await with apprehension the proposals for revisions in the program expected to be presented soon to the Congress to accomplish the cut which the Bureau of the Budget has made in the fiscal 1967 proposed appropriation from an estimated need of $416 million on the law's present basis to $183 million, we are told. Again, we hope that you will be willing to oppose changes in the essential present operative provisions which has for 15 years served such a worthy purpose for towns like those in our area.

From what we have learned about likely proposals stemming from the Stamford Research Institute survey it appears quite probable that the town of Stonington will become ineligible for any funds. When we learned the actual provisions of the proposed new legislation, we may wish you further use to its effect on us.

A curious notion appears to have gained currency even in the Congress, that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 makes up at least in part for the prospective losses to be incurred by school districts which have been receiving payments under Public Law 874. The new law, worthy as its objects are, serves entirely different purposes, and in no way compensates local school districts for school expense burdens borne on account of Federal activities.

Undoubtedly you are receiving many communications on these matters but we would appreciate it very much if you can advise us of your position at this crucial juncture.

Sincerely yours,
STONINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
THOMAS P. CURTIN,
Superintendent.

LEDYARD BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Ledyard, Conn., February 14, 1966.

WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
1405 Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ST. ONGE: The recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget to Congress of $183,400,000, for financing Public Law 874, represents an estimated decrease of the actual needs of approximately $236,600,000 during the next year. This will obviously result in a proration that can only result in a curtailment of educational programs in Ledyard and those towns presently eligible for assistance under Public Law 874.

We are now facing a loss of between a 10- and a 15-percent proration on the current year's entitlement and suspect that the Bureau of Budget has no intention of suggesting additional appropriations to avoid this loss. I respectfully request that you support and urge the Appropriations Committee to provide a supplemental appropriation to pay the full entitlements for the current year.

As a result of the rapid pupil population increase in the town of Ledyard (1959–60, 945 pupils, to 1965–66, 3,042 pupils), a continual building program has been in effect.

During this period of time the school budget has increased from $420,705 in 1959–60 to $1,419,767 in 1965–66. Also, the number of federally connected pupils has increased from 438.01 in 1958–59 to 775.41 in 1964–65.

Although school construction is going on, the Town of Ledyard found it necessary this year to construct an addition to the high school, rather than build a facility to house junior high school students because we had reached the limits of our bonding capacity. As a result of the curtailment of Federal funds under Public Law 874, this will mean an additional 2-mill increase beyond the anticipated millage increase.

A recent evaluation of our elementary schools indicated a need for special services which we have not been able to adequately supply because of our continuing building program and pupil population increases. Any decrease or curtailment of funds under Public Law 874, would make it literally impossible to even maintain the slight gains we have made in recent years.

Also, I wish to request that you let me know what you learn from the committees which will first be involved in carrying out both proposals.

Sincerely,
ANTHONY T. TEDESCHI,
Superintendent of Schools.

WATERFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Waterford, Conn., February 7, 1966.

WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
Representative, Second Congressional District, 1405 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ST. ONGE: Deep concern is felt in Waterford with regard to Federal budget appropriations far below the estimates covering towns eligible for assistance under Public Law 874.

It would appear that a 10- to 15-percent reducton is imminent for this year, and a drastic 56-percent for next year ($183,400,000 recommended appropriation against $416 milllion estimated entitlements).

The impact of such a cut would be extremely serious on this whole area, especially as it follows, in the case of Waterford, what amounted to a more than 50-percent reduction with the removal of the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics from the list of eligible properties.

It will be much appreciated if you will do everything in your power to secure additional appropriations to provide full entitlements for this year, and to avoid the major cut in the recommended appropriation for the following year.

Sincerely yours,
HOWARD C. SCHINK,
Chairman, Board of Education.

GROTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Groton, Conn., February 21, 1966.

Congressman WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ST. ONGE: We are greatly concerned about President Johnson's request for a cut in funds allocated for assistance to impacted school districts under Public Law 874. We are fully aware of the budgetary problems created by the Vietnam situation and our military commitments throughout the world and we are in full accord with the necessity of expenditures for these commitments. We do not believe, however, that the funds for such expenditures should be obtained by budgetary cutbacks in such a vital area as education.

In his budget message for fiscal year 1967, President Johnson stated: "Our military needs are heavy. But they have not led us to a short-sighted policy of abandoning the war on poverty, ignorance, blight, and disease. We will continue to advance toward our goals for a Great Society. This budget provides for significant increase in programs which attack urgent domestic problems."

We interpret this statement to indicate that increased military expenditures will not be undertaken at the expense to programs of a vital domestic nature such as education.

We currently have 1,921 families residing on Government-owned property within the town of Groton. These families are exempt from any contribution to the tax base of the town, but the education of their children, numbering 2,370, is accomplished through the expenditure of town funds that are partially reimbursed by the Government under Public Law 874.

It is our understanding that the President has requested up to a 40-percent decrease in the funds available under this law and this could mean as much as a $600,000 decrease in the assistance to the town of Groton. It is also our understanding that an increase of 5 mills on the tax rate will have to be implemented to replace this decrease in Federal assistance.

From this, you can readily understand our concern. We will appreciate your assistance in maintaining the current levels of reimbursement available under Public Law 874.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT L. LORD,
Chairman, Education Committee.

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Groton, Conn., February 1, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ST. ONGE: We are much concerned in this area by what appears to be happening to Public Law 874. Last week the Bureau of the Budget recommended $183,400,000 for next year's operation and stated that amendments to Public Law 874 would be proposed to reduce the need to this amount.

The estimate made for funding Public Law 874 in its present form was $416 million. Thus, the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is only 44 percent of the need.

Secondly, it is apparent that we will be short 10 to 15 percent in this year's budget to meet entitlement. It does not appear that he Bureau of the Budget has any intention of asking additional appropriations to avoid this loss.

We do not know, of course, what changes will be proposed in Public Law 874, nor how they will affect us here. If all sections of the law were treated the same, our loss in Groton would be over one-half million dollars next year. This would be a calamity. The theory that 89–10, ESEA, would take up the slack is just plain myth. For example, our entitlement under title I of ESEA is less than $100,000.

Perhaps we shall have to wait until the proposals for change in Public Law 874 appear before knowing how to act. However, we would respectfully request that you contact Appropriation Committee members urging a supplemental appropriation to pay full entitlements for the current year. A 10- to

15-percent reduction in this year's entitlement would mean a loss to Groton of from $115,000 to $172,500 if our estimate of entitlement ($1,153,400) proves correct. Needless to say, this would be a crippling blow to us.

We would appreciate knowing what you learn from the committees which will first be involved in carrying out both proposals.

Sincerely yours,

WM. M. FARRIS,
Superintendent of Schools.

GROTON, CONN.,
February 18, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your reply to my letter regarding Public Law 874. Have now learned effort to be made in House Appropriations Subcommittee on February 23 to add $40 million to emergency supplemental to insure 100 percent payment 1966 entitlements under Public Law 874. Funds now available for fiscal 1966 would cost 12 to 15 percent proration and a serious loss to all. Request you contact committee members and urge favorable action on the supplemental appropriation.

WILLIAM M. FARRIS,
Superintendent of Schools.

COLCHESTER, CONN.,
February 23, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
Member of Congress, Second Congressional District, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Colchester Board of Education vitally interested in move before education subcommittee of House Appropriation Committee tomorrow to include provision in emergency supplemental appropriation sufficient to pay this year's entitlement be met under Public Law 874 in full. Your support in encouraging success of this effort urgently requested; also greatly concerned over expected proposal from Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to receive basic provisions of law tailoring program to Budget Bureau's cut of over 50 percent, in estimated need for 1966–67 appropriation. Present indications are that proposed provisions will wipe out Colchester eligibility involving approximate annual loss of $10,000.

WILBERT A. MARVIN,
Chairman, Colchester Board of Education.

[From the New London (Conn.) Day, Feb. 16, 1966]

SCHOOL-AID CUT IMPENDING

The Federal aid program which provided $1.5 million in school funds in southeastern Connecticut last year will be cut 12 percent this year, and is threatened by proposed legislation for a near 75-percent reduction next year.

Public Law 874, providing financial aid to federally impacted areas, was the subject of a recent emergency session of concerned New England schools superintendents, following the Bureau of the Budget's recommendation to cut back the national appropriation next year from $416 million to $183,400,000.

The superintendents agreed the cutback could be crippling to towns which depend on the law for school income. They approved a proposal to encourage correspondence to Congressmen, urging the Bureau's recommendation be rejected.

COULD HURT

New London Schools Superintendent Joseph V. Medeiros, who attended, told the board of education, "Some communities could suffer severely."

He said the Bureau's recommendation stems from a Government-authorized study of Federal aid to education by Stamford Associates of California.

"The firm indicated that many of the costs previously financed by the law are now being absorbed by the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which is a source of money for such programs as New London's expanded school."

The expanded school project is a planned experiment in cultural and recreational education for disadvantaged pupils in the city's poverty pocket.

MORE REQUESTS

This year's 12-percent decrease, Medeiros said, is a result of approvals of new applications to participate in the program, which now has an inadequate appropriation that must be spread too thin.

It means the $105,000 New London anticipated in its next entitlement will be sliced to a figure similar to its previous allotment of $91,928.

Computing entitlements under Public Law 874 requires employment and residential data about the families of students. The amount of entitlement is geared to the number of students whose parents reside or work on Federal property.

It is a less-than-stable situation, requiring school officials to make periodic counts of eligibles, sending the information to Washington and then receiving a part payment of the total annual anticipated estimate. The final payment usually resolves errors in the advance total estimate.

MOST FOR GROTON

More than half of the most recent Public Law 874 money given in southeastern Connecticut went to Groton, which received $925,000. Waterford was next in line, with $93,686.

On the other hand, Lyme is now ineligible. Its small entitlement ended when General Dynamics Electric Boat purchased the property it uses from the Government.

Most school boards in southeastern Connecticut include in their annual budgets the estimated anticipated revenue from Public Law 874. Many estimates are equal to the previous entitlement.

Boards' current estimates, some approximate, followed by the most recent entitlements they received, include:

New London, $105,000, $91,928; Groton, $1,100,000, $925,000; Norwich, $37,857, $29,311; East Lyme, $35,000, $39,348; Waterford, $93,686, $93,686.

Also Ledyard, $91,951, $88,443; Montville, $75,000; $70,578; Stonington, $32,290, $32,290; North Stonington, $11,000, $10,000; Old Saybrook, $13,500, $14,209; Old Lyme, $5,000, $6,000; Salem, $3,914, $3,914.

New Emphasis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, whatever the difficulties of carrying out a pacification program in South Vietnam, to which this administration has dedicated itself, this program can help make things better than they are.

On this theme, the Hartford Courant has noted that—

> It is good that our authorities are now talking of plans to better life among the rice paddies.

And it adds:

> Had we pressed such plans on President Diem, the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese might not have found the going in the south as easy as they did.

The Hartford newspaper has found it encouraging that the administration is putting emphasis now on social and economic reforms within the country. It states that "the deliberate emphasis on improving life in South Vietnam's villages emphasizes the fact that holding back the Vietcong and North Vietnamese is but part of the task."

The editorial represents a scholarly review of the problems—and the hopes—which the program offers, and because of its informative nature I think it should be made a part of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Feb. 8, 1966]

A CHANGE OF EMPHASIS IN THE VIETNAM WAR?

We shall have to await the events of coming weeks and months to be certain of the significance of President Johnson's Honolulu meeting with South Vietnam's generals. Beyond question General Ky and General Thieu want increased American military aid. But the President's entourage has encouraged the thought that the chief end of the meeting is social and economic. The presence of Secretaries Gardner and Freeman, in addition to Mr. McNamara and Mr. Rusk, serve to dramatize the fact. And such information as has been put out about the meeting, since its unexpected announcement last week, has centered on the theme of economic, social, and political improvement in the villages.

To be sure on his arrival President Johnson reverted to the military theme. This was simple aggression, he said, like that of Hitler and Mussolini and Stalin in Europe in and after World War II. But the deliberate emphasis on improving life in South Vietnam's villages emphasizes the fact that holding back the Vietcong and North Vietnamese is but part of the task.

This emphasis is right. Vietnam is one more in the long series of social revolutions, of the worldwide overthrowing of the old order that has marked the years since World War II. It is good that our authorities are now talking of plans to better life among the rice paddies. Had we pressed such plans on President Diem, the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese might not have found the going in the south as easy as they did.

Reports from Saigon indicate that, desirable as the aid-to-the-villages program is, under present conditions its application will not be easy. One dispatch says for example that "The Johnson administration cannot, even with the best of intentions, guarantee the allegiance of the Vietnamese to their government merely by pumping more money and techncial skill into South Vietnam to give people the better life of which officials speak."

The reason is, acocrding to this report, that 20 to 25 percent of the country's area is so firmly in control of the Vietcong guerrillas that no civil and political programs are possible there at all. And other large areas are so sharply contested that for the time being rural-improvement workers cannot operate. Rural pacification has to be concentrated in one-third or fewer of the hamlets that the Government claims to control.

If the Vietcong seem to find it easier than the Saigon government to control the villages, that doesn't mean that it should not be the first order of the government's business, and ours, to use these means to win and hold the allegiance of the peasants. Emphasis on rural pacification may not convince a world that refuses to believe we are in Vietnam merely to get out again as soon as we can. Nevertheless this kind of work in the villages is in accord with the basic realities there. Therefore, whatever the obstacles and difficulties, this program should help make things better than they are. Let us hope that is what the meetings are about.

Minks, Yes; Milk, No—A Comment on Tax Adjustments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in today's debate on H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, I gave reasons why I was unable to support this legislation.

The Sheridan Press in Sheridan, Wyo., had an excellent editorial in its Thursday, February 17, issue which also calls attention to the inconsistency of a program which would cut back federally subsidized hot-lunch programs from our public schools while doing nothing to restore excise tax cuts from a host of things such as mink coats, jewelry and luxury items free of the burden of checking inflation, supporting the war effort, or helping to feed our schoolchildren.

The editorial follows:

THE ONLY LOGICAL THING TO DO

Almost on a par with mother, apple pie and Old Glory as sacred American symbols is the national school lunch program, now in its 20th year of operation. Some 18 million children in 71,000 public and nonprofit private schools will be served federally subsidized hot lunches under this program in the current school year.

Now comes President Johnson with this word: Because of the high costs of war in Vietnam, the Federal contribution of cash and surplus food to the lunch program will have to be cut back in fiscal 1967, except in poverty areas. Before the battle of the hot lunch is settled, however, the President may wish he had chosen to save money elsewhere in his budget.

The lunch program enables children to enjoy a complete lunch for an average payment of 27 cents. This lunch actually costs about 50 cents. But the Agriculture Department donates about 8 cents worth of food from surplus stocks and supplemental purchases, and 4½ cents is provided in the form of a cash reimbursement. Another 11 cents of the lunch cost is picked up from State and local sources.

President Johnson proposes chopping $70 million off the Federal school milk and school lunch programs in the fiscal year beginning next July 1. Both Federal cash contributions and the support for supplemental food purchases would be slashed. Moreover, the Agriculture Department is working on a new formula under which so-called well-to-do schools would have to buy virtually all the food without Government financial help. This would help to pay for new poverty-oriented school meal programs, such as giving school breakfasts to needy children in slum areas.

Even before the budget-cutting step was announced, the school lunch program was in trouble. Many school systems were reporting a sizable reduction in the amount of basic commodities, meat and cheese, they were receiving from Uncle Sam. With surplus food stocks dwindling, the local systems had no choice but to purchase more of these items on the local market at going prices.

Thus the price charged for the plate lunches has been rising. A charge of 35 cents per lunch—$1.75 a week—is now common. For parents with three or more children in school the answer frequently is to start packing lunches at home. A vicious spiral ensues as the number of children buying lunches falls and unit costs rise.

Some observers still expect Congress to come to the rescue. However, if it doesn't schools will have to increase lunch prices. It is the only logical thing for them to do.

Tremendous Force for Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the February 7 edition of the Muscatine, Iowa, Journal, entitled "Tremendous Force for Good." The force referred to is the positive influence of the Boy Scouts in developing good citizenship. I would like to commend the Boy Scouts on the fine work they have done and I would like to call this editorial to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives as the observance of Boy Scout Week marks the 56th anniversary of the scouting movement in the United States:

Across the Nation, more than 5 million boys and adult leaders, including a number in Muscatine, join currently in the observance of Boy Scout Week.

The event notes the 56th anniversary of the establishment of Scouting in the United States.

Here in Muscatine, Scouts have elected a group of officals for a theoretical takeover of city government one day this week. They will meet with their actual counterparts and thereby gain a closer knowledge of how a city is administered. An evening city council meeting is also on the week's program.

Thus they are absorbing training in citizenship. For Scouting has as one of its aims the development of citizenship.

More than 93,000 organizations use Cub Scouting, Boy Scouting, and Exploring as part of their youth programs for boys 8 through 17. The national organization charter Scout units annually, under sponsorship of religious groups, schools, PTA's, service clubs, fraternal organizations, and other civic and community organizations.

And they take an oath: "On my honor I will do my best (1) to do my duty to God and to my country and to obey the Scout law. (2) To help other people at all times. (3) To keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

Any boy who makes this oath an important part of his life in his formative years will grow to be a man of which his family, his community and his Nation may take pride.

It is adherence to these principles which has made Scouting the tremendous force for good it has been and continues to be in the lives of millions of boys and creates in inbuilt sense of responsibility and duty that cannot be forgotten.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, this month we again memorialize Abraham Lincoln. In the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, an editorial appeared on February 12, which is most helpful to those people still interested in some of the original basic American philosophies:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Throughout this broad land today the birthday of Abraham Lincoln will be observed in classroom studies, speeches, and by the printed word.

All who comment on the life and deeds of the martyred President, especially in this particular moment of our history, can do no better than recall some of his own words.

Uttered more than a century ago, these words of the Great Emancipator are still amazingly applicable to conditions in our land today:

"'Til lately I have been in favor of unlimited liberty for every man as our Constitution seems to guarantee. But is it not an act of folly to give absolute liberty of conscience to a set of men who are sworn to cut our throats the very day they have their opportunity for doing it?

"Is it right to give the privilege of citizenship to men who are the sworn enemies of our Constitution, our laws, our liberties, and our very lives? Is it not an absurdity to give to a man a thing which he is sworn to hate, curse, and destroy?

"Sooner or later the people of the Republic must put a restriction on the exercise of liberty turned toward the destruction of that from which it came * * *. But this is the problem of another generation."

The problem of which Mr. Lincoln was speaking certainly is with the present generation, what with the poisonous seeds of communism being sown on our university campuses, in our trade unions, and even in our Nation's highest legislative halls.

Another prized utterance by President Lincoln appraised the coveted spot the United States holds in the world:

"We, the American people * * * find ourselves in the peaceful possession of the fairest portions of the earth as regards extent of territory, fertility of soil, and salubrity of climate.

"We find ourselves under the government of a system of political institutions conducing more essentially to the ends of civil and religious liberty than any of which the history of former times tells us. We, when mounting the stage of existence, found ourselves the legal inheritors of these fundamental blessings.

"We toiled not in the acquirement or establishment of them; they are a legacy bequeathed us by a once hardy, brave, and patriotic, but now lamented and departed, race of ancestors."

A warning as to the only way we could someday lose this great Nation was related in other words of wisdom from the humble Abraham Lincoln, born in a log cabin in Kentucky 157 years ago today and who rose to be our 16th President:

"At what point shall we expect the point of danger? Shall we expect some transatlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never.

"All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years.

"If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time, or die by suicide."

If government is kept in the hands of people, if free enterprise is allowed to flourish, if the internal threat of communism is curbed; then, as Abraham Lincoln said, no power on earth can take away the rich legacy bequeathed us by our forefathers.

Job Corps Nun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the January issue of Catholic Digest had an article by Rosemary Donihi entitled "Job Corps Nun." This article is about Sister Francetta Barberis, who is now a consultant to the Director of the Women's Job Corps Centers. As this article points out, Sister Francetta has brought with her valuable experience in working with young people.

For the benefit of my fellow colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD. I am sure that they will agree, after reading this fine article, that the war on poverty has enlisted a top general in the form of Sister Francetta.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOB CORPS NUN—SISTER FRANCETTA IS NO. 2 WOMAN IN A U.S. GOVERNMENT PROJECT

(By Rosemary Donihi)

Sister Francetta Barberis, S.L., on June 1 became consultant to the director of the Women's Job Corps under the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, D.C. She retired from the presidency of Webster College in St. Louis at the same time. She has been a Sister of Loretto for 47 years, and is 65.

She is called Sister in the office though now and then a wag ventures Fran since she wears secular clothing in her new position.

Bennetta Washington is director of the Women's Job Corps and Sister Francetta is, in effect, the No. 2 woman in the voluntary training program for girls from 16 to 21. Most of the girls dropped school after the ninth grade, have sixth-grade level skills, have been out of school for more than 6 months, and come from families living in substandard housing.

The first three residential centers for them were in St. Petersburg, Cleveland, and Los Angeles. Two more are in Charlestown, W. Va., and Omaha. With 1,500 girls registered now, 10,000 are expected before the year is out. "Our job," says Director Washington, "is to turn out a woman equipped to work, marry, and raise a family. It is not just to train the girls as secretaries, beauticians, or dental assistants."

When the St. Petersburg training center became a trouble spot, Sister Francetta was sent there. She talked with the girls, the townspeople, and the people vacationing in the city, to smooth things out. Out of the friendly conversations was born a citizens' boosters club to help make the Job Corps enrollees feel at home.

When she is home from what can become a countrywide circuit, Sister Francetta lives with both telephone and address unlisted, in a pleasantly furnished efficiency apartment in Foggy Bottom, a portion of downtown Washington near the river. The old section has been modernized for Government people like Sister Francetta, who like to walk to work.

Since her profession as a nun she has lived mostly in large religious houses with domestic staffs, but now she does her own cooking and cleaning. Her Sisters of Loretto have no Washington residence, but many of them visit her.

Her workload is constant. She goes early to the office and leaves late, but friends have given her season tickets to the National Symphony and the experimental Arena Stage. She goes to mass at the church of St. Stephen the Worker, the late President Kennedy's White House parish.

Her wardrobe is built around suits and soft-shirt dresses, more often dark than light. For summer she was equipped with three handbags: one white patent leather, one brown, and one black. She is a major Government executive and dresses for it. Her silver-threaded dark hair is medium short and softly permanented. She does it herself. She takes an engaging pleasure in your honest declaration that she looks 15 years younger than she is.

Until her 18th year, Sister Francetta trained to be a professional ballerina, but then chose the convent. "Now," she says, "I am dancing in spirit all the time."

Sister Francetta focused national attention on Webster College during her 7 years as president. Since her arrival there in 1958, it has embarked on a revolutionary new program of teacher training, more than doubled its faculty, increased the number of lay persons on the faculty, and attracted professors of many faiths.

Physically, the college complex has tripled; the attendance has nearly doubled; men have been admitted to full-course schedules in the department of fine arts, music, and theater arts. A $1.5 million center of performing arts has been made possible through gifts and pledges of Sister Francetta's longtime friend, hotelman Conrad N. Hilton. Theater Impact, a semiprofessional summer stock company, has been successfully launched.

In her term of office Sister Francetta was assisted by her young executive vice president, Sister Jacqueline Grennan, who is now president. She was recently appointed to Sargent Shriver's Committee for Project Headstart, which helps preschool children from poverty-stricken areas. Sister Jacqueline is also the only woman member of the President's Advisory Panel in Research and Development in Education.

Their superior general in the Sisters of Loretto is Sister Mary Luke Tobin, the only U.S. nun invited to be an observer at the Vatican Council.

Sister Francetta saved the story of her retirement from Webster as a scoop for the student newspaper. She said that she had long been a firm believer in the professional policy of retirement at age 65 and that the policy seemed pertinent to her. But she added that her order is also a service corps. She had called her old friend U.S. Senator STUART SYMINGTON to tell him of her proposed retirement and her interest in the war on poverty. The Senator told her to send him a letter detailing her history.

In it she said, "I am in excellent physical and mental health and could perform some function in the President's war on poverty. I am tremendously interested in the antipoverty program and the Peace Corps. I am eager to share in some phase. There is work for me within my congregation, but I am convinced that people like me, already dedicated and committed, can perform a service in the larger complex of the needs of the world."

The letter went from Senator SYMINGTON to Sargent Shriver, and the rest is history. The Job Corps suggested that a civilian wardrobe might be more suitable. With conventual approval, she complied.

Public reaction to her appointment has been good. "I have received only the highest respect for what I'm doing, and great understanding. Letters have arrived from all over the country, from strangers and former pupils, with expressions of good will and encouragement."

One Hundredth Birthday of Millville, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago this Saturday, on February 26, 1866, the pretty city of Millville, in Cumberland County, N.J., held its meeting of incorporation and, during that evening, voted itself out of the "township" classification and into the "city" category. This event is being celebrated Saturday in Millville with a centennial parade and civic banquet.

The parade will be complete with bands, marching units, and floats, and promises to be a highlight of Millville's 100th birthday celebration which officially began on January 10, 1966.

On that day, a reenactment of the first town council meeting ever held in Millville was staged in a town meeting during which residents of Millville donned the costumes current 100 years ago and portrayed the roles of the original participants. It was probably the first town meeting ever held in which the participants received curtain calls.

Saturday's parade is the second in a series of events being staged by the Millville Centennial Corp., to mark the end of the city's first century. On July 4, there is scheduled a gigantic community picnic and fireworks display, and on June 30 through July 2, the formal celebration will conclude with a historical pageant.

Mr. Speaker, today Millville is known as "the Holly City of America" to note the fact that the traditional Christmas season decoration is grown there in great profusion and provided to holiday time markets throughout the Nation. Millville now has some 20,000 residents and, although it is a relatively small community by some standards, its citizens are looking forward to growth and progress during their city's second century. This spirit is inherent in the manifesto which the Millville Centennial Corp. issued at the beginning of the 100th birthday celebration.

The manifesto states that Millville intends to create new civic awareness among all its citizens, plans to uncover new civic leaders, stimulate the local economy, honor its heritage, and focus its attention on the future.

I might note that two of Amercia's most famous personages have joined in the centennial celebration. The Millville "Brothers of the Brush," a group of male residents who have grown beards reminiscent of the style of 1866, invited Astronauts Frank Borman and James A. Lovell—whose Gemini V beards became quite widely remarked upon—to accept honorary memberships in Millville's bearded brotherhood, and both accepted.

I cannot help but be proud of the spirit exhibited by Millville's residents—paying honor to yesterday while, at the same time, preparing carefully and systematically for tomorrow. I am proud to help mark the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of this progressive, charming city and look forward to joining with Millville's celebrants Saturday.

Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail Echoes President Johnson's Call for Congressional Reform of Election Spending Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Gazette-Mail of Charleston speaks forthrightly when it says:

> The matter of election spending has been studied to death. The need now is to do something about it, and this is not hindered by a lack of good examples.
>
> In Britain, careful limits and controls on reporting are enforced. In West Germany parties agree beforehand to spending limits and there is careful checking and reporting.

As the paper points out:

> President Johnson recently cast a spotlight on the need for reform of laws governing election spending.

Because this editorial is a timely and lucid summary of the issue, I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to make it a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Feb. 6, 1966]

ELECTION SPENDING LAWS NEED DEGREE OF SANITY

President Johnson recently cast a spotlight on the need for reform of laws governing election spending. In so doing, he echoed the plea of the late President Kennedy and the proposals of the Republican Coordinating Committee. This is a bipartisan project, but regrettably Congress continues to ignore it.

Present laws are unrealistic to the point of being ridiculous. The Corrupt Practices Act sets a maximum spending limit of $5,000 on congressional candidates and $25,000 on senatorial candidates—limits that would assure defeat for any serious candidate who heeded them. Candidates therefore evade the law by proliferating campaign committees and thus there are no effective limits.

President Kennedy contended the need is for full reporting and publication of campaign expenditures, not control over amounts. As an indication of the astronomical expense of campaigns today, it cost John Lindsay and his supporters about $2.5 million to win the recent race for mayor in New York.

Such an expenditure does not necessarily mean there is wrongdoing. It does not in any way imply an election has been "bought." As with everything else, the legitimate costs of organizing, conducting, and giving necessary public exposure to a campaign have gone up, up, up.

Indeed, there is more chance for skulduggery under the present law, when a candidate must contrive ways to cover up necessary expenditures, than there ever would be under a system of full and accurate reporting of what he actually spent.

Besides full reporting, such inducements as tax credits have been proposed to encourage giving by contributors. And there are ways to keep check on reporting and assure its honesty. In Florida's model system, for example, a candidate can have only one treasurer and must do business at only one bank to make checking manageable.

The matter of election spending has been studied to death. The need now is to do something about it, and this is not hindered by a lack of good examples. In Britain, careful limits and controls on reporting are enforced. In West Germany, parties agree beforehand to spending limits and there is careful checking and reporting.

Certainly the United States, which considers itself quite a civilized democracy, should be able to bring some sanity into our election spending laws to assure honesty and full public knowledge about what's going on. Congress should get busy and see that it is done.

Mr. Johnson Believes in Democracy for Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the issue of Vietnam is generating so much heat it is heartening to encounter the light of Mr. Spivack's February 17, 1966, column, "Watch on the Potomac," in the New York Journal American. Mr. Spivack rightly points out that if the President had only to cope with those critics who openly support the Vietcong, there would be no problem.

But when President Johnson is faced with the kind of insidious defeatism which preaches that the Vietnamese, and for that matter all of the people of southeast Asia, do not understand democracy and that it is futile to believe that democracy can live in that part of the world, then his foreign policy burdens are immeasurably increased.

This kind of criticism dangerously feeds on the reactionary belief in racial superiority and isolationism and is often mouthed by alleged liberals who believe that it is better to consign the people of southeast Asia to the "tender mercies" of the Communists than to wage a war for their liberation.

I commend this article to the attention of our colleagues.

Honolulu and the Defeatists

(By Robert G. Spivack)

Washington.—The President's foreign policy burdens are being immeasurably increased—not by "appeasers" in and out of Congress, but by defeatists.

If he had only to cope with those few who openly support the Vietcong there would be no problem. If his critics argued that the way to handle a bully is to yield to him, their public support would be minuscule. Every man, within his own experience, from school days to adulthood, knows that a bully does not stop until he is made to stop.

But when critics, especially those who assume the mantle of foreign policy "experts," argue that democracy "can't win" in southeast Asia, that the Communist tide sweeping that part of the world cannot be turned back, then you have problems.

Nothing can so sap the spirit of an individual, or a nation, as constant repetition of the theme, "It can't be done."

It was to get away from this kind of depressing atmosphere that the President decided to fly to Hawaii to meet with the South Vietnamese leaders, to reaffirm our objectives as they were stated in "The Declaration of Honolulu" and to give hope to the people of Vietnam as well as our troops.

When he returned to the mainland the President said he was "refreshed." There was good reason for it. What he heard in Hawaii was far more encouraging than what he was hearing in Washington. The American and Vietnamese military men agreed with Premier Ky's assertion that, within 7 months, the situation in the field had changed "100 percent." Not only are the non-Communists not losing, the military initiative is now in our hands.

But what greeted the President on his return to Andrews Air Force Base?

First there was a columnist's broad, sweeping assertion that the whole Government has "gone stale." Less than 24 hours after the Hawaiian conferees had agreed to wage a war on "social misery" in Vietnam, there were whining complaints about the lack of "fresh ideas."

Next came a series of recommendations from nonmilitary men that we ought to ease up on the pressure against the Communists, adopting, in effect, a Maginot Line strategy. This was hardly a fresh idea.

But underlying all this criticism there was something else—a kind of racist superiority on the part of those who disclaim racism of any kind, some of whom have, in fact, been active in civil rights activities.

We are now being told that the Vietnamese are so different from Americans that it is impossible for them to have anything resembling a democratic form of government.

This is an insidious kind of defeatism. Although those who talk this way may consider themselves "liberals," the appeal is to the most reactionary instincts, to isolationist sentiment, and to those who feel racially superior.

What the defeatists overlook is the fact that many Orientals, Japanese, Filipinos, and others are building democracy, despite their cultural differences with us. Certainly the President believes it can be done. That's why the conference was held in half-Asian Hawaii—to show the real spirit of Honolulu.

Life of Alfred Sloan Belies Red Claim of Good Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Lawrence, the distinguished columnist and publisher, wrote a most perceptive and penetrating article which appeared in the Washington Star, on the life of Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., a guiding force in the building of the General Motors business empire.

Mr. Lawrence makes the point eloquently that Red China could never have an Alfred Sloan because its totalitarian, communistic economic policies would preclude his development.

It is the basic story of individual initiative compared to the stifling of individual freedom.

Because of the broad general interest of this article to my colleagues and to the Nation, I have unanimous consent that the column be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record.

The article follows:

Life of Sloan Belies Red Claim

(By David Lawrence)

In the realm of communism—whether in the Soviet Union or Red China or in other parts of the world—the constant cry is that capitalism is selfish and inhumane and that social welfare can be achieved in each country only by giving arbitrary power to a small group of men.

But today the people of the Communist world could learn a lesson if they read the obituaries being printed about the life of Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., who died last Thursday at the age of 90. For here was a man who amassed a fortune of more than $300 million, but gave virtually all of it away for the cause of human welfare.

There have been others like Sloan in American history, but the stories of their altruism are too often lost in the maze of other happenings in a busy world.

Sloan was one of the ablest businessmen this country has produced. Men engaged in big business are sometimes pictured as heartless or as materialistic to the extreme. It may come as a surprise to many of the younger generation who lean toward the Communist philosophy to discover that there are far more philanthropists among the successful businessmen of American than there are selfish human beings.

Sloan's case is a significant example of how money is made and how it can be spent. It was his genius in building up General Motors to one of the largest businesses in the world that made it possible not only for him, but for others who invested in that enterprise, to earn large sums as the stock of the company appreciated steadily in value over the years.

In 1937, Sloan created the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, with an initial grant of $10 million, to help studies in science and economics and broadened it later to aid in medical care and research, particularly in cancer. He said at the time he gave away the $10 million:

"Having been connected with industry during my entire life, it seems eminently proper that I should turn back, in part, the proceeds of that activity with the hope of promoting a broader as well as a better understanding of the economic principles and national policies which have characterized American enterprise down through the years."

Sloan was a modest man. He rarely made public speeches or talked about his ventures into the field of philanthropy. He was deeply concerned with the functioning of the free enterprise system and with the right of every individual to improve his lot by his own efforts in cooperation with others.

Sloan was also a great executive. He once said:

"I never give orders. I sell my ideas to my associates if I can. I accept their judgment if they convince me, as they frequently do, that I am wrong. I prefer to appeal to the intelligence of a man rather than attempt to exercise authority over him.

"Get the facts. Recognize the equities of all concerned. Realize the necessity of doing a better job every day. Keep an open mind and work hard. The last is most important of all. There is no shortcut."

Under the American system of free enterprise, individual initiative is encouraged. The same cannot be said of the Communist system. Indeed, the American standard of living is the highest in the world, and so are its philanthropies.

Private contributions for charitable programs of various kinds in the United States totaled $10.6 billion in 1964. No individual really is able to accumulate enough to give any substantial part of that big sum. But the large givers in every city are usually businessmen. Many of Sloan's associates, for instance, have followed his example and have donated much of their earnings to philanthropic projects.

Sloan's life emphasizes the great advantages of the American system of individual freedom, as contrasted with the oppressive and truly selfish system of communism by which a few men achieve power and impose their will on hundreds of millions of their countrymen.

There are many unsung heroes in the commercial world, but the impact of their redistribution of wealth has certainly been felt in America by universities and colleges, churches, hospitals, and other institutions supported by philanthropy.

Chester W. Nimitz: An American Naval Immortal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 4 days before his 81st birthday, Fleet Adm. Chester William Nimitz died. This Nation, and especially the hundreds of thousands of American servicemen who served under him, now sadly join in a farewell tribute to a great U.S. naval figure. He came from a small town in Texas to eventually command and lead to complete victory the greatest naval force ever assembled on this globe. His service to his country can never be forgotten and his attributes as an American officer will stand always as an example of the finest in a great tradition.

Following his graduation as seventh in a class of 114 in the class of 1905 of the Naval Academy, Admiral Nimitz handled a wide variety of assignments in a meritorious manner. His rise in his chosen career was finally capped by a tour of 2 years, 1945–47, as the highest uniformed naval officer in this country. But he will always be remembered as the man who assumed command of the Pacific Fleet in the dark days of December 1941 and who led it to a brilliant victory over Imperial Japan. Combining a great strategic perspective, an eminently successful tactical competence, an ability to get the most from his men, and a resolution to persevere until victory, he led the American naval forces through a series of battles and campaigns to Tokyo Bay in September 1945. He started with a badly hurt fleet and nursed it and built it into the greatest striking force the world has ever seen.

After his outstanding military career he continued his public service in many positions of a private and public character. He always displayed his traits of geniality, humanity, and intelligence in a fashion to do honor to himself and his Nation. He finally retired to his home near San Francisco in 1956. It is with great pride as an American that I extend to his wife and four children my deep respects and sincere condolences on this sad day.

Rent Dole Could Lead to Scandals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, aside from the immorality of the Federal Government taking the hard-earned dollars of working taxpayers to pay the rent for those unwilling or unable to afford better housing, the whole system of handouts opens the door to widespread scandals. There already has been evidence of massive corruption in the poverty programs, but no one seems interested in bringing it to light. Before Congress appropriates money for rent subsidies, we had better make sure that all the loopholes for chiselers and dishonest officials have been closed.

The well-known columnist, Lyle Wilson, had a warning on this subject in the Washington Daily News of February 23, "Beware of Scandal." I include the article as a part of these remarks.

BEWARE OF SCANDAL

(By Lyle Wilson)

Editorials predict that President Johnson's rent supplement plan would invite outrageous scandal. The Miami Herald headed its editorial with these words: A subsidy for scandal. The editorial made these points in support of its prediction:

Original rent guidelines were so loosely drawn that families with annual incomes of $8,100 would have been eligible.

The Federal Housing Administration, which would administer the rent dole, lacks both experience and the staff to prevent chiseling.

There has been no effective congressional action to assure adequately enforced standards of eligibility.

There is another disturbing aspect of the rent dole. tI is that distribution of charity among the voters traditionally has been a vital part of boss rule and corruption in the great cities. William Marcy Tweed was the most notorious of the city bosses. Boss Tweed was Grand Sachem of New York's Tammany Hall. In 1805, 16 years after organization of the Tammany Society, it was incorporated as the charitable institution. Scribner's concise Dictionary of American History relates the sturdy growth of Tammany Hall in part as follows:

"The enfranchisement of propertyless whites (1822), which Tammany had championed, was the source of its gradual growth to power. Until the advent of William M. Tweed as leader (1860), Tammany Hall differed from other urban political organizations only in degree. He made it a smoothly running juggernaut, which has served as a model for city machines. Tweed controlled the mob by catering to its religious and racial groups and by gifts to the poor."

Gifts to the poor. A bucket of coal, a hamper of food, clothing when needed, some folding money on election day. It all added up to corruption. Boss rule and bag government built up a foundation of which a dole or a subsidy or a supplement, all pretty much alike, created and enforced the loyalties upon which political power was based. Tweed happened to be a Democrat. There were equally corrupt Republicans in New York and elsewhere.

Political corruption is not limited to but has been most notable in large American cities. Corruption is likely to flourish where politicians can buy the gratitude of voters with public or private funds or can coerce voters by the power to withhold funds from needy citizens. Poverty fertilizes the field of corruption. Bad administration of public funds invited corruption regardless of the purpose to which the funds are appropriated.

A decent respect for the public welfare requires that President Johnson and the Congress take adequate precautions against the rent dole becoming a subsidy for scandal.

Now, as Then

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker—

> I am under more apprehension on account of our own dissensions, than the effort of the enemy.

The New York Journal-American gives this quote, noting that—

> The deeply concerned words could well have been spoken by President Johnson who has, indeed, expressed similar concern. But they were written by George Washington. They are as applicable today, as then.

The paper feels that the dissension voiced in this country "may convey to Hanoi the tragically mistaken assumption that our Nation prepares to unfurl a white flag."

The words of warning seem appropros, and I suggest that the editorial on the subject be made a part of the RECORD. It is herewith submitted.

NOW, AS THEN

"I am under more apprehension on account of our own dissensions, than the effort of the enemy."

The deeply concerned words could well have been spoken by President Johnson who has, indeed, expressed similar concern. But they were written by George Washington. They are as applicable today, as then, and his birthday makes their recollection appropriate in this time of national stress when our difficulties without are rendered more serious by dissensions within.

The quitters are in full, loud voice. They would have us pull out of Vietnam, willy-nilly, in virtual surrender and world disgrace, in shameful abandonment of pledge and honor.

There are, too, sincere doubters who believe our engagement in Vietnam should never have been started. These, too, are in demanding chorus.

And there are, of course, the outright Communists within our midst, and their duped peacenicks who seek by clamor to frustrate reason.

There are dissensions by many whose stature gives importance to their views and by many of low station whose importance is that their noise may convey to Hanoi the tragically mistaken assumption that our Nation prepares to unfurl a white flag.

But the flag still is and will be, to the day of victory, a banner of meaningful stars and stripes so historically made possible by George Washington and now so historically maintained by President Johnson and the vast majority of the American people.

An Atlanta Boy Meets the Poverty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the Neighborhood Youth Corps has come in for a certain amount of criticism lately because of a few isolated instances of apparent favoritism or poor judgment in the selection of youths enrolled in the program. I believe that the vast majority of such cases were simply instances in which decidedly disadvantaged youth were not quite poor enough—their families perhaps had annual incomes of up to $4,000 or so, rather than the $3,150 figure established as the poverty guideline for a four-person family.

Overall, I think the Neighborhood Youth Corps program is being administered in an excellent fashion, and is achieving the intended results. As an indication of what I mean I insert at this point in the RECORD an article by Marvin Wall which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution on January 21, concerning a disadvantaged young man who, like countless others, has found the door to opportunity through the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The article follows:

An Atlanta Boy Meets the Poverty Program

(By Marvin Wall)

What is the poverty program? The poverty program is Sammy, a 16-year-old Atlantan.

Sammy isn't his real name, but it's close enough.

Sammy, a fatherless white youth, lives with his mother in a public housing project. Sammy's mother is a heart patient. Sammy is a school dropout.

But a few months back Sammy had second thoughts about quitting school. He decided he wanted to get back into school and complete his education.

Now, part of the genius of the poverty program is that it does not operate out of a single, massive office downtown. Its offices and its workers are spread out in the poverty areas of the city.

And from these decentralized offices, the workers fan out into the poverty areas and hold neighborhood meetings and generally let people know that they are there and want to help.

Sammy, hearing about all this, showed up at a neighborhood center near the project in which he lived. It was thus that Sammy and the poverty program got together.

A social worker got Sammy into the Neighborhood Youth Corps which provides work for students between the ages of 16 and 21 in order to help them stay in school.

Sammy was given a part-time job working for the city.

Meanwhile, since there was little food at home, the social worker suggested that Sammy arrange to buy $10 worth of groceries on credit at a nearby grocery store.

A few days later, the social worker happened to notice Sammy after job hours riding a bicycle in the neighborhood. She learned that Sammy had taken on delivery chores for the store in order to work off the grocery bill.

Now Sammy is making plans to go to school in the evening to take the courses he needs. And he'll be able to pay his own tuition.

As time went on, the same worker received an urgent call from the same neighborhood. A woman in the area was without food and needed medical attention.

The social worker went immediately to call on the woman. When she got there, the woman handed her a pink slip of paper on which was written an earnest note.

It turned out to be a message from the boy urging his friend, the social worker, to do something for his neighbor, the needy woman.

And that, in microcosm, is the spirit of the poverty program.

The Collegiate Fringe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that one T. Sgt. Peter Gianutsos, editor, the Advisor, USAF 2d Air Division Tan Son Nhut Airfield, Vietnam, wrote an editorial entitled: "The Collegiate Fringe" which appeared in Glenviews of the Naval Air Station, Glenview, Ill.

This editorial should be must reading for all the self-appointed experts on Vietnam, southeast Asia, Vietniks, appeasers, and others.

The Collegiate Fringe

Time was when a boy went to college to study law, medicine, engineering, or one of the arts, and girls went to get their Mrs. degree. But for too many, it is not that way any more. Today's crop of college cutups are no longer content to swallow goldfish, crowd themselves into telephone booths, or small foreign cars. They—and we refer to the minority that makes the majority of the voice—now insist on dictating government policies, and are ready to parade, demonstrate, and sit-in at the drop of a cause.

The latest gimmick among those intellectual midgets is a campaign to urge all members of the Armed Forces to desert their posts, rather than serve in Vietnam.

As a member of the race that started this democracy kick (quick, Socrates, the hemlock) I have no quarrel with the right of the individual to voice his opinion. However, the hysterical babbling of these bourgeois boors borders on sedition, if not treason. I leave that to the legal eagles in the Justice Department. It is a sad day, indeed, when the words, honor, duty, and country have come to mean little. As a member of the military family, I have spent the better part of my adult life in the Saigons of the world. It never occurred to me to disobey an order, or to question the right of my Government to send me anywhere to protect and preserve its interests.

Like a lot of us here in Vietnam, I have had occasion to be at the base theater during one of the daily memorial services, and I have seen the slow walking and heard somber music and soft prayers for those to whom rotation dates are no longer important. I muttered my own prayer, as well as giving silent thanks that it was not me inside that metal box.

As I stood there, I remembered preachings of these mentally retarded adults, and my compassion for a dead man turned to shame, and then anger that they dared to ask me to prostitute my profession, ask me to bring dishonor to myself, to my service and to my country.

It is difficult enough to understand when the supposed learned citizenry take the rostrum to rant and rave against our Government, and thereby feed the propaganda mills to the north, but to be subjected to the meaningless chatter of these imbecilic sloths, whose idea of bravery is to lead a panty raid on a girls' barracks, is more than human dignity can bear.

It has been suggested that they all be drafted into the service and brought to Vietnam. I could not agree less. To put these morons in a uniform is to insult the memory of those who never came back from Guadalcanal or Pork Chop Hill, or those who did not survive the bombing of the Brinks Hotel or the American Embassy here.

Instead, clean them up, cut their hair, and take away their sweat shirts and sneakers and bring them to Vietnam to live among the people. Let them expound their theories about the good, the kind, the misunderstood Vietcong among the villagers whose homes were destroyed and their meager rice stolen.

Let them talk about war mongering to the widow of a Vietnamese army private, who earns her fish and rice as a prostitute, or with the village woman who lost a hand, one finger at a time, and, finally, the wrist, to these kind, misunderstood Vietcong because she dared to stand up for what she believed was right.

Draft them into the military? Never. Ours is a proud organization, made up of men and women who have ideals and principles, and what's even more important, men and women who have the courage and the will to live up to those beliefs.

They take great pride in themselves, in their uniforms, and in their Nation, qualities that the campus "cuties" have yet to acquire. Until they do, they will never "belong." Their voice will be that of he semieducated, the fool who will leave behind only a legacy of shame, dishonor, and ignorance.

Yeshiva Rambam Honors the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of its chai—18th—anniversary, Yeshiva Rambam recently honored the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush by conferring its scroll of appreciation and esteem.

The Yeshiva Rambam is not a private institution. It is a school that belongs to the community which it serves faithfully. In every congregation in the community are to be found young boys and girls who acquired their knowledge of Judaism in that school. The Flatbush Jewish community feels the impact and carries the imprint of the scope and quality of its teaching. It is a living force that translates and gives meaning to the ancient wisdom of the Old Testament for the use and guidance of modern Jewry.

The Rabbinical Board of Flatbush consists of the spiritual leaders of congregations located in the Flatbush section of Brooklyn. Through the years the rabbinical board has supported the aims and purposes of Yeshiva Rambam. Every aspect of the school's educational program is formulated and supervised by the rabbinical board in collaboration with Yeshiva Rambam.

I look forward to a bright future and continued growth on the part of Yeshiva Rambam and share with them their high esteem and appreciation of the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush and the distinguished spiritual leaders who constitute its members.

My greeting to Rabbi Harczstark, administrator of Yeshiva Rambam, on the occasion of this anniversary and the scroll of appreciation and esteem that Yeshiva Rambam conferred upon the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush follow:

Rabbi Sidney Harcsztark,
Yeshiva Rambam,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Dear Rabbi: It is a privilege and a pleasure to greet the supporters of Yeshiva Rambam on the occasion of its chai anniversary.

Your institution was organized under trying circumstances at a time of great need. It has done a tremendously fine job and filled a great need in our community.

It is only through religious instruction such as your institution provides that we can hope to eradicate crime and juvenile delinquency and promote ethics and morals.

It is well that you use this occasion to honor the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush. Too frequently, our rabbis go unhonored and unsung, yet strive day in and day out to improve our well-being. I join you in extending to them a hearty mazel tov and join in your prayer that the Lord may bless you and them so that your good work may redound to the benefit of mankind.

Sincerely yours,

Abraham J. Multer.

Yeshiva Rambam is proud to confer this scroll of appreciation and esteem upon the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush.

As a token of our high regard and gratitude and in recognition of their contribution to the strengthening of Jewish education in the Flatbush Jewish community.

As distinguished members of the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush they have endeared themselves to their colleagues and the community for meritorious performance and supreme devotion to the teachings of traditional Torah Judaism.

February 2, 1966.

Joseph Greenberg,
Chairman, Board of Governors.
Seymour Reinhard,
President.
Isaac Moinester,
Treasurer.

The Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D.D.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the total amount of good in the world is measured by the quality of superior lives. So long as we have men in the character of our beloved Chaplain, evil can make no headway. We mourn his passing in the ripeness of years, but even more we treasure the memory of his days among us.

Dr. Braskamp has filled two careers with worthy deeds. First, he served his chosen church with distinction through a long period that would encompass an ordinary lifetime. Then he came to us in the House, where he has touched the life of each and every one of us, possibly at times when we were scarcely aware of his influence. The inner glow of security in his own personality shone through and warmed us when we were sick at heart and overwhelmed with doubt and uncertainty.

Greatness and goodness are not means, but ends.
Hath he not always treasures, always friends,
The good, great man? Three treasures, love, and light,
And calm thoughts, regular as infant's breath;
And three firm friends, more sure than day and night,
Himself, his Maker, and the angel Death.

—Coleridge.

Dr. Braskamp's career calls to mind the ancient rabbinic legend of Sandalphon, the angel of prayer, as rehearsed for us by Longfellow. In the legend, Sandalphon stood at the outermost gates of the city celestial listening to the sounds that ascended from the earth beneath:

From the spirits on earth that adore,
From the souls that entreat and implore
In the fervor and passion of prayer;
From the hearts that are broken with losses,
And weary with dragging the crosses
Too heavy for mortals to bear.
And he gathers the prayers as he stands,
And they change into flowers in his hands,
Into garlands of purple and red;
And beneath the great arch of the portal,
Through the streets of the City Immortal
Is wafted the fragrance they shed.

Small Business Program Hits Record High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Ross D. Davis, Executive Administrator and Acting Administrator of the Small Business Administration, yesterday issued a press release which will be of great interest to my colleagues and to Americans generally.

Under unanimous consent I insert the press release in the Record because of its broad general interest.

The press release follows:

"Under President Johnson's leadership, the Small Business Administration has achieved unprecedented highs—400 percent above 1960 levels," SBA Executive Administrator Ross D. Davis said today.

In a letter to House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford, Republican, of Michigan, refuting Republican charges that SBA has been "downgraded and nearly destroyed," Davis said:

"All major programs of this agency are operating at record levels. Even the regular business loan program continues to make important progress with the support of private banks under the guarantee program.

"In point of fact, under President Johnson's guidance and leadership, this agency today has achieved unprecedented highs. This is so, regardless of the form of measurement used."

Davis said the primary programs of the agency in terms of utilization of its financial resources are its lending programs, and it might be helpful to measure SBA's programs in the following terms:

1. In the current fiscal year, SBA's total lending level will be about $718 million. Next year, under President Johnson's budget, that total will be increased to $725 million, more than four times what the agency accomplished in 1960, when its loans totaled little more than $171 million.

2. Last year, we established a new record of about $330 million in regular business loans, compared with $144.3 million in 1960. This year, despite 'curtailment' we expect to exceed that record, raising the total to $354 million. Next year, under President Johnson's budget, the program level for regular business loans will be $426 million—almost four times what we were able to accomplish in 1960.

3. Loans to State and local development companies this year totaled $40 million, almost nine times the $4.6 million of such loans in 1960. Next year under President Johnson's budget, we will increase that amount by 25 percent of $50 million.

4. This year, about $75 million will be loaned by SBA to small business investment companies, and next year, the amount will be about the same. This compares with $18.4 million in such loans in 1960.

5. Since Hurricane Betsy struck Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana last September, SBA in response to that and other needs, made more disaster loans than were made in the entire history of the Agency. In the Betsy disaster-area alone, SBA will make approximately 30,000 loans. This was accomplished at a time when SBA's 68 field offices were operating the business loan program at record levels.

6. In 1965, we added a new program of loans to impoverished businessmen which was incorporated in the Economic Opportunity Act. For the first 6 months of that year, we loaned $2 million. This fiscal year we will increase to approximately $25 million and next year, under President Johnson's budget, the amount will double to $50 million.

7. If the size of SBA is any indication of importance, then we find that under President Johnson's budget, at a time when budgets are very tight, the size of the Agency will be increased significantly to almost 5,000 employees. This can be compared with a little more than 2,000 in 1960. This growth does not suggest plans to downgrade or destroy this agency.

By Their Works You Shall Know Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, last month the Cincinnati Community Action Commission voted to spend $36,000 for public relations in the 12-month period beginning April 1, 1966. I agreed with the seven members of the commission who voted against this proposal that the expenditure of this sum for publicity purposes would be wasteful and would not serve the needs of the poor. Accordingly, I wrote to Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, strongly urging him to disapprove this proposal. At present, it is being reconsidered by a special committee in Cincinnati.

In my opinion, it would be far better to spend the money doing something constructive and tangible to aid the poor. The communications media in Cincinnati have done an excellent job of keeping the public informed about the war on poverty.

Editorials which recently appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer and the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star point out that nothing beats good, effective work to win good, effective publicity, and it should not be necessary to spend $36,000 to enhance the image of Cincinnati's antipoverty program.

These perceptive editorials follow:

[From the Enquirer, Feb. 17, 1966]

THE EXPENSIVE WAR ON POVERTY

It should make Cincinnatians feel no better to know that the projected use of $36,000 to enhance the "image" of the Queen City's antipoverty program has been sanctioned by the administrators of the war on poverty in Washington.

In fact, it should make them feel a whale of a lot worse.

For it means, among other things, that what many Cincinnatians may have dismissed as an ill-advised and isolated quirk is, in reality, a standard operating procedure and that a sizable portion of the funds allocated to alleviating poverty in America is being channeled into campaigns to make the poverty warriors look better, if not good.

It is quite true that an important feature of a campaign like the one launched against poverty is bringing the program itself to the attention of its beneficiaries. But we have already recited in this space the lengths to which the Enquirer has gone in that direction.

We have dispatched a special reporter to the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington to learn firsthand what the war on poverty is all about. We have charted the multitude of antipoverty programs in operation in Cincinnati. We have devoted a major part of a recent issue of the Pictorial Enquirer to the antipoverty program. And we have carried day-to-day reports of the activities within the program's scope.

The other communications media in the Queen City have done nearly as well.

These efforts have been undertaken not to enhance anyone's image; they have been undertaken to inform the public.

There is a world of difference between "news" and "publicity." "News" is what happens. "Publicity" is manufactured news, frequently the illusion of news; it is what someone would like to be news. Those who cannot make news must seek instead to make publicity.

This, we fear, is the situation in which too many of America's poverty warriors find themselves. They are so destitute of achievement that they must buy public attention.

[From the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, Feb. 10, 1966]

CAC and Press Agents

The Community Action Commission, which supervises the war on poverty here, is taking another look at the proposed spending of $36,000 a year for press agents.

Although the CAC board Monday night did not formally rescind the action approving the budget (passed 11 to 7 at a previous meeting), it did authorize the creation of a committee to study it.

It is interesting to note that the 15-page argument for spending the $36,000 had been given directors a week before a decision was taken at the January meeting and did not receive the benefit of an appraisal by the executive committee or any other committee of the CAC.

Whatever the outcome of this reappraisal, we think the CAC staff and board will discover as other Government agencies have discovered, that nothing beats good, effective work to win good, effective publicity.

Carl S. Miller: Tennessee Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the number of casualties of the Vietnam conflict continues to grow, there is a tendency to think in terms of just that—cold, impersonal numbers.

One such "number" was Capt. Carl S. Miller, of Robertson County, Tenn., who was killed in action in the beginning of this month as a helicopter pilot in Vietnam.

Captain Miller believed in what he was doing in that Asian land, and he believed in what the United States is doing. The following editorial from the Robertson County Times is a fitting tribute to a courageous and gallant soldier, not a number, to a man who made the ultimate sacrifice to insure the safety and security of his country.

The editorial follows:

[From the Robertson County (Tenn.) Times, Feb. 3, 1966]

A Salute to Captain Miller

The county mourns with Mrs. Carl S. Miller, Jr., whose husband, Captain Miller, was killed in action last week as a helicopter pilot in Vietnam. At the same time we can all be proud—as his family is proud—of the contribution he has made in the cause of freedom.

Captain Miller grew up in Robertson County before embarking on a military career he realized might someday take him into combat. He had a sense of duty and was willing to make any personal sacrifice for his country—and indirectly for his three boys, who survive.

As his courageous wife so plainly stated it: "Bing didn't have a choice, he was sent to Vietnam. But, if they had given him a choice, that's where he would have wanted to be."

There are those who stand today arrogantly burning draft cards and shouting for our Government to quit the fight against communism. They haven't, for the most part, been outside the country or seen the results of surrender to tyranny.

Captain Miller saw the ugly face of communism and constantly wrote of his conviction that our Government was right to stand and fight. He looked on it as a privilege to join in this fight.

For those of us who cherish our freedom let us salute Capt. Carl S. Miller—a patriotic American we won't soon forget.

Vice Adm. F. L. Ashworth Is Acclaimed as an Example for American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, almost coincident with his 54th birthday last month, announcement was made that Vice Adm. Frederick Lincoln Ashworth had been named commander of the U.S. Navy's mighty 6th Fleet. This event led the Beverly Times, of Beverly, Mass., to acclaim this naval leader's service to our country as an example which today's American youth well might follow. In the hope that it may inspire others, therefore, I am pleased to present the editorial from the Beverly Times of February 1, 1966, as follows:

A Real Hero

It is always an honor to a community when one of its sons or daughters achieves unusual distinction. Such is the case with Beverly and Frederick Lincoln Ashworth, recently named a vice admiral and given command of the U.S. Navy's 6th Fleet, mainstay of our defense in the Mediterranean and Middle East.

Admiral Ashworth whose mother lives in Wenham, which, incidentally, he also lists as his home address, was born in Beverly on January 24, 1912. His career has been adventurous and distinguished. It is a story which makes fascinating reading even in the today's make-believe world of James Bond, the Man From U.N.C.L.E., and the Batman.

But Frederick Ashworth's accomplishments are fact not fiction. And they set a pattern of old-fashioned virtues, such as loyalty, bravery, and patriotism, which are too frequently overlooked or ignored by 20th century youngsters.

In high school, as president of the student council, he began to set the high standards which carried him through life. He graduated from the Naval Academy in 1933 at the age of 21 and as a junior officer served aboard a battleship, but soon transferred to Pensacola for flight training.

On December 7, 1941, when Pearl Harbor was attacked by the Japanese, he was attached to the Bureau of Ordinance in Washington. A few months later orders came through for transfer to an advanced carrier training group and finally in 1942 he took command of his own aerial torpedo squadron.

Operating out of Henderson Field on Guadalcanal, he won his first decoration—the Distinguished Flying Cross. His job was a dirty one. It took leadership and old-fashioned guts. Daylight raids on Japanese shipping in the Solomon Islands. Bombing missions against enemy positions and always the dangers of hostile fighter aircraft.

For canny planning in helping direct several key amphibious operations the Bronze Star was next.

Then came a turning point in his life. He was assigned to a supersecret mission in Santa Fe., N. Mex., with the unromantic title of "Project Y." In reality it was the development and perfection of the atomic bomb.

Admiral Ashworth helped supervise and coordinate field tests of the bomb, and then on August 9, 1945, he flew with the Army B-29 bomber which dropped the second atomic weapon on the Japanese city of Nagasaki. For this he was awarded the Legion of Merit and the Silver Star.

Back to the States after the war, he helped in the basic planning of the Bikini atom bomb test and the first stages of the underwater delivery of nuclear weapons.

In the last 15 years, top commands: the giant aircraft carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, commandant of midshipmen at the Naval Academy, carrier divisions, Deputy Chief of Staff, European Command, and finally, Commander, U.S. 6th Fleet.

You can have your television and movie stars. Such is the stuff of real heroes.

American Bar Association Unanimously Affirms Legality of American Action in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the questions that have been raised concerning U.S. action in Vietnam, I was interested to note that on February 21, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association unanimously adopted a resolution affirming the legality of our participation in that country under international law.

The chairman of the association's section on international and comparative law, which originated the resolution, is Edward D. Re, a distinguished authority in the field, who serves this country as

Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. I am proud to have Dr. Re as a close friend and constituent.

I submit for the Record an article from the February 22 issue of the New York Times in reference to the action of the bar association:

Bar Group Finds U.S. War Policy Legal Under U.N.

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

Chicago, February 21.—The American Bar Association's house of delegates today passed by unanimous voice vote and without debate a resolution affirming the legality of the U.S. participation in Vietnam under international law, the United Nations Charter and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

The resolution was intended as an answer to statements by Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon. During last week's televised hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Morse said that some international lawyers believed that the U.S. position was illegal.

Eberhard P. Deutsch, of New Orleans, chairman of the Standing Committee on Peace and Law Through the United Nations, presented the resoltuion at a midyear meeting at the Palmer House here. All 250 attending members of the policymaking house of delegates voiced support.

Mr. Deutsch said the Senator "perverts and misconstrues" the meaning of the United Nations Charter. He also said he hoped the resolution would strengthen the position of Senators who support the war and "fervently" hoped it would support the fightingmen in Vietnam.

The resolution was prompted by Russell B. Long, Democrat, of Louisiana, who suggested at the hearings that the American Bar Association reply to Mr. Morse's contention.

Mr. Deutsch said he would report passage of the resolution to Senator Long and stood ready to testify before the committee on the action if called to do so. The resolution was sent to J. W. Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the committee.

Mr. Deutsch conceded that the resolution was silent on the question, raised by Mr. Morse, whether President Johnson should have asked for a congressional declaration of war. However, he said that he believed it was implicit in the resolution that the war was legal regardless of a formal declaration.

Edward W. Kuhn, of Memphis, president of the 120,000-member association, said the action "repudiated" Mr. Morse and that his organization would "lobby" for its position. He did not elaborate.

The resolution was reportedly the unanimous product of Mr. Deutsch's standing committee and the section of the international and comparative law, whose chairman is Edward D. Re of New York. If an association delegation should go to Washington, the two chairmen and Max Chopnick of New York, who is on the international law section, would make up the delegation.

The American Bar Association's reaction was unusual in its rapidity. Although the resolution was limited to support of the administration on legal points, it amounted to support of the administration's Vietnam policy generally, a key member of the international law section disclosed.

NO NAMES MENTIONED

The resolution, although clear as to intention and meaning, mentioned neither Mr. Long nor Mr. Morse by name. An accompanying report said that international law professors in 31 universities had expressed their opinion "that the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal, and is not in violation of the charter of the United Nations." This was a reference to a statement by a group of professors sent last month to President Johnson and put into the Congressional Record by Representative J. J. Pickle, Democrat, of Texas.

The reported declared:

"Articles 51 and 52 of the [United Nations] Charter expressly provide that nothing contained therein 'shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense,' nor preclude 'the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters related to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action.' The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization is such an arrangement or agency."

The text of the resolution follows:

"Whereas in recent hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, it has been stated that international lawyers are agreed that the U.S. position in Vietnam is illegal and in violation of the Charter of the United Nations; and

"Whereas articles 51 and 52 of the charter sanction steps for self-defense and collective and regional security arrangements such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization to which the United States is a party;

"Whereas in the course of these hearings it has been suggested that an expression on this subject by the American Bar Association would be appropriate: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the American Bar Association*, That the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of this association be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution immediately to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate."

This Is My Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, during my service in the U.S. Congress, I have tried to keep the people I am honored to represent informed of my activities and record in Congress, as well as the policies of the Federal Government. In my years here, some 16,000 bills have been voted on in the House of Representatives. Along with others of us, my record has been on several occasions misrepresented by falsehood and half-truths from the mouths of selfish special-interest groups and political opponents. I here spread my voting on the issues, that each person may determine for himself that my record has been made in the interest of the people.

I voted for the tax reduction bills, which have encouraged industrial and business expansion and produced more jobs. Three substantial tax reductions have been enacted during my service, and each had my full support.

I consistently vote for an invincible national defense, and oppose every proposal to weaken our Nation through unilateral disarmament. I believe our fighting men should have the best possible equipment in ample supply. I will continue working to that end.

I voted for the bill to prevent and control the pollution of waters, and to provide for the development of our water and land resources.

I voted for the bills relating to community health services, and to provide for the development of programs to help the aging, and to provide for health research facilities.

I opposed the act which causes higher consumer price for coffee.

I voted for increased social security benefits, disability benefits, and increases in old age pensions and other assistance.

I voted to reduce the voluntary retirement age to 62, and for widows, to age 60, and to allow greater earnings before reduction in social security benefits.

I voted for education and training benefits for veterans, and for other GI benefits.

I voted to improve the Railroad Retirement Act.

I voted to provide more educational opportunities for our young people, and to provide loans to students. I have assisted the schools and colleges in our district in their applications for funds and loans amounting to many millions of dollars, and have successfully assisted them in their other problems with the Federal Government.

I have successfully introduced and enacted bills to ban pornography from the mails, and to allow prosecution of purveyors of pornography in the jurisdiction where deliveries are made, and have supported other bills to protect decent people from this obnoxious traffic. I continue to oppose distribution of Communist propaganda through our post offices.

I have introduced and supported bills to strengthen the criminal laws of this country, so that people might be safe on the streets.

I have responded to every request from a community for assistance in its economic development and in its dealings with the Federal Government. This has resulted in a large number of grants and loans for hospitals, water and sewer systems, libraries, housing, airports and airport construction, remodeling of public buildings, new post offices, public facilities, and countless other improvements.

I have aided numerous industries and businesses that are locating in our district, or expanding their operations in our district, in their applications for loans and other assistance from the Federal level. Our growth in this respect has far exceeded the expansion in any other comparable area.

At times, cities and businesses have come to me for help after losing hope of success, and I have succeeded in getting favorable action.

I have helped thousands of individuals, including farmers, businessmen, labor, veterans, housewives, the aged, disabled and dependent persons in presenting their claims and problems to the various departments of the Government. I regard this opportunity of service as a privilege, and among my most treasured possessions are the letters of appreciation which I have received from these people who have contacted me after all other hope of receiving help or consideration had been exhausted.

In fact, an ex-Congressman who lives in our district, and his son, a State senator, not knowing what to do, refer to me problems which they consider hopeless, or too much trouble to bother with, because they know of my success and effectiveness in championing the causes of the people. They know I am eager to attain all that our district and our people are entitled to, and that I will continue to fight after the weak and lazy give up. I am one who does not mind working long hours every day for the cause of right.

I voted against the proposals to loan money to Russia and other Communist countries. I consistently vote against giving assistance or aid to the Communist countries through foreign aid gifts, or otherwise.

I voted for the proposal which would have denied foreign aid gifts to any country which is trading with or aiding North Vietnam in any way. I am strictly against lending aid or comfort to our enemies in any way.

I consistently vote to save many billions of dollars by cuts in foreign aid, in various excessive departmental budgets, and other unnecessary and wasteful spending. All waste and extravagance should be eliminated, and fiscal responsibility practiced.

I actively support amendments to the Trade Agreement Act to protect farmers, cattlemen, labor, and oil, mineral and other industries from imports from low-wage and slave-wage countries, which are so harmful to domestic producers and American labor.

As the result of investigation by a subcommittee of which I am chairman, I prevented the destruction of the homes of thousands of low-income families, most of whom were Negroes. Those people came to me in desperation, and I am humbly proud of their resolutions which have commended our successful effort to save their homes and businesses from despoilers who sought their homes for private profit in the name of urban renewal.

I voted for the bill to eliminate the provisions of the Railway Act, which had been reducing the annuities of the wives of retired employees.

I voted for the bill to regulate and control exports to Communist countries.

I voted for the bills to provide loan insurance and supplementary direct loans to assist students to attend business, trade, and vocational schools; to provide loans for college students; to provide vocational schools to train the unskilled for better jobs; and to provide for needed medical library services.

I voted for a "clean elections" proposal which would have provided penalties for illegal voting.

I voted for the proposal which would have required apportionment of summer jobs in Government, so each district would have its proportionate share.

I voted for the bills to increase the pay for members of the armed services.

I voted for the bill for cost-of-living increases for civil service retirees.

I voted for the bills to build good roads and highways, which have resulted in the hundreds of miles of highways and farm-to-market roads which have been built and are now being constructed in the counties of our district, and which will bring us more and better roads as fast as construction is possible.

I voted against liberalizing our immigration laws, feeling that increased immigration will take jobs away from our citizenry, and increase our welfare costs.

I voted for cost of living increases in disability compensation. It had not been raised since 1933.

I voted for the resolution in opposition to the intervention of international communism in the Western Hemisphere. I oppose treasonable inroads of communism in our country and in our hemisphere.

I voted for authority to make or insure loans to nonprofit groups to establish water systems and sewer systems for rural areas.

I introduced a bill to restore the right to have voluntary prayer and Bible reading in school. I believe the Supreme Court, in forbidding this time-honored custom, violates the constitutional guarantee that there should be no law which interferes with religious freedom.

I vote against any bill which would destroy the freedom we enjoy in America. I do not believe American citizens are ready or willing to surrender their liberty to a dictatorial centralized government.

As chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I conducted an investigation which resulted in revoking a license which had been granted to a society of homosexuals to solicit charitable funds to promote their society. I do not believe any branch of government should lend its sanction to such an abomination.

I vote for Congress to control the purse strings, and against back-door raids on the Public Treasury.

I voted for the minimum wage bill, and to adjust the salaries of civil service and postal employees.

I voted against recognizing Red China, and for preserving our treaty rights in the Panama Canal Zone and in Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba.

I voted for control of drugs, and to tighten our internal security laws.

During my congressional service, more money has come into our district from Washington, by millions of dollars, than has gone from our district in Federal taxes. In this way and others I have exerted my efforts to develop our district.

It was upon my request that Congress appropriate the money for the survey for the development of the Trinity River Basin, which subsequently resulted in the authorization of that project, and appropriations to carry it on. I actively supported similar survey and development of the Sabine, Neches, and Angelina River basins. I was instrumental in obtaining approval of the projects for the Attoyac and San Jacinto Rivers.

I worked effectively to obtain funds for the construction of Rayburn Dam at McGee Bend on the Angelina River, and to secure congressional approval for the Toledo Bend Dam. The enhancement of the economy of the areas involved is already apparent to the extent that some who opposed these developments now seek to claim credit for them. We have now built the base, and our strides forward will rapidly accelerate.

I introduced bills to set aside part of Federal income tax revenues to each State to aid education without Federal control, and to provide additional income tax exemptions for students and their parents, to be known as the Education Incentive Act.

As a member of the powerful Judiciary Committee, it has been my privilege to give unceasing support to the right to own private property, the free enterprise system, to the preservation of liberty and individual freedom, and the other God-given rights and privileges of American citizenship.

I oppose deficit spending, and vote against the annual increase in the national debt. Fiscal responsibility demands that the Government live within its income. A day of accounting must come, and the longer it is delayed, the harder it will be to face.

I supported the bill to provide protection for union members and the public from exploitation, racketeering and embezzlement, and to give rank and file members a proper voice in union affairs, and to guarantee honest elections of officers.

I voted for the accelerated public works appropriation, which has brought many millions of dollars to our district.

I voted for the bill to promote the coordination and development of outdoor recreation, and to bring tourists to our district.

I voted for the bill to assist the States in providing additional research facilities at experimental stations.

I vote to retain legislative authority in Congress, and continually and consistently oppose the surrender of these powers to the Executive, as being dangerous to the people. I support local control of local affairs, and oppose all attempts to impose Federal domination.

I support separation of church and state.

I believe in local control of our schools, and oppose Federal control over education.

I support and vote for bills to guarantee local and States rights, as well as individual rights, from being usurped by the Supreme Court. The Constitution does not give legislative authority to the Court.

I support REA, in order that farm homes may have electricity and telephones.

I support FHA and other such loan programs, so that more people will be able to own their homes.

I voted for the use of farm surplus foods to assist needy Americans. I believe we should take care of our own, instead of giving away everything we have to foreign nations. Charity begins at home.

I vote against proposals to impose bureaucratic controls over individuals and localities. Such controls destroy the God-given freedoms which have made us a great nation.

I vote for the school lunch program and the milk program for children, in order that our young people may have proper nourishment.

I voted for legislation to preserve small business institutions and free competitive enterprise, and for the bills to take the Government out of competition with private business.

I support the bills to require uniform procurement practices in the Armed Forces, to eliminate duplication, waste, and exhorbitant prices.

I vote for the antitrust laws, to preserve competition and to secure equal opportunities for all persons to compete in trade or business.

I was a leader in the fight which restored the tidelands to Texas, after the Supreme Court had attempted to deprive us of the property we had dedicated to our schools.

I voted for the bill which would have protected State laws from the whims of the members of the Supreme Court.

I vote to keep intact the Texas national forests. Proceeds from timber sales help support school districts and county governments, making tax rates lower for individuals.

I voted to increase personal and dependency exemptions for income tax purposes, and introduced a bill to raise the exemption from $600 to $1,000. Increased cost of living would justify this action on the part of Congress.

I voted to outlaw the Communist Party, and to prohibit Communists from serving in representative capacities.

I supported the proposal to grant aid for the construction of nursing homes and health services for the aged and the chronically ill.

I supported the program to provide more trained teachers for deaf children.

I support the programs for conservation of soil, water, and other resources, and for the flood control.

I voted for legislation to increase the salaries of the teachers under our jurisdiction, and was chairman of the House conference in a joint conference committee with the Senate which successfully accomplished this increase.

I voted for the bill to provide legal assistance to indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts.

I voted to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of social security benefits, and to provide social security benefits for the disabled.

I vote for the people and against the alien philosophies which are adverse to the interests of America, by whatever name their adherents may call themselves.

I voted to guarantee the right of trial by jury in Federal courts.

The above list could be multiplied, but may be summed up by saying that I supported a realistic foreign policy, based on America's interests, rather than trying to "buy" friends. I vote for economy in Government, curbs on inflation, and for military procurement by competitive bid to save billions for the taxpayers. I oppose unwise, wasteful spending, high taxes, and the huge public debt which mortgages our children's future.

I support the right to own property, even if it is merely the clothes I wear. The disciples of the socialistic alien thought, who say I vote wrong, and who are trying to purge me from Congress, would deny to any of us the right to own our property, little though it may be.

This is my record. The socialists do not like it, but I do not believe Americans are yet ready to accept socialism as a way of life for freedom-loving people.

By regular visits to every county in our district, I make myself available for the personal services I can render individual citizens in their problems and contacts with the Federal Government and its agencies. Through regular questionnaires, letters, and personal contacts, I am able to ascertain the wishes of the people of our district in regard to pending legislation and national issues, in order to be a true representative of the people, rather than the rubberstamp of out-of-State pressure groups.

A Clear Voice in the Stormy Sea of American Maritime Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 23, 1966, I had the privilege and honor of introducing my distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Honorable Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat, of Maryland, at a luncheon held in his honor by the Propeller Club, Port of Washington. The remarks of Chairman Garmatz on this occasion represent a clear voice in the presently stormy sea of controversy surrounding American maritime policy. It is a call to return to reality and get on with the task of promoting the American maritime industry.

I submit to my colleagues the full text of the remarks of Chairman Garmatz, which are both timely and perceptive in view of the present plight of the American maritime industry.

Remarks of Hon. Edward A. Garmatz

Mr. Clark, members of the Propeller Club, Port of Washington, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to appear before the Propeller Club of the Port of Washington.

The Propeller Club was founded to preserve the maritime heritage of our Nation and it is a symbol of our maritime industry and the American merchant marine. I am proud to say that I appear before you as a member—for I have enjoyed membership in the Propeller Club.

It is something more than simply a very genuine pleasure for me to address you today.

The broadly based objectives of the Propeller Club of the United States to promote, further, and support an American merchant marine adequate to meet the requirements of national security and economic welfare of the United States apply to all of the 50 member ports within and without the United States and to the 15 student ports. They are the objectives sought to be fostered by the more than 10,000 dedicated individuals who make up our national membership.

Interest in the furtherance of these objectives is at a high level in all of the constituent ports.

And I wish to compliment the national and local leadership that is presently exerting itself to make the Propeller Club on effective force in the vital maritime affairs of our country.

But there is something special about this club—not that there is any greater interest or dedication to our objectives than there is elsewhere.

The something special is due to the unique concentration of representatives here in Washington of virtually every element that goes to make up the great complex of American maritime policy and all of its contributing components.

Just a quick look at a roster of the membership of the port of Washington bears this out.

From the Government you have many members from most of the executive departments, including, of course, the numerous bureaus and agencies within such departments.

You have vice presidents and other high officials of most of the leading shipping and shipbuilding compaies.

The major maritime trade associations are well represented.

Maritime labor is widely represented.

There are naval architects, steamship agents, leading manufacturers' representatives, and lawyers galore. You have beauteous lady members, Madeleine Carroll, and Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan.

So, it is a special privilege, and I believe very fitting, that I should appear before you today to make what is virtually my maiden speech since election to the chairmanship of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I am greatly pleased to see so many members of the committee here today.

I am looking forward to the coming years, and I am here to give you my pledge that I will do all in my power to carry out our national maritime policy and vigorously foster the objectives of the Propeller Club of the United States.

Although I have seen written reports that I am slanted in one way or another, I can promise you that my efforts will be directed in behalf of the overall good for the American merchant marine.

In my 18 years in Congress I have never witnessed a period when our national maritime policy has been the subject of so much uncertainty and confusion. Notwithstanding a clear statutory statement of policy, with a full set of implementing guidelines, we seem to be not only without a propeller, but apparently without rudder and helmsman as well.

At a time when the Soviet Union is expanding the size of its merchant fleet at a faster rate than any other nation of the world, the American merchant marine is experiencing a record decline.

I am concerned about the confusion and uncertainty that exists and I am concerned about the steady decline of this country as a maritime power.

It seems to me extremely shortsighted for this country to allow such a situation to exist and continue.

Our maritime industry should be a major and vibrant part of our economy; it is essential not only to our national defense—as the Vietnam conflict has once again proved—but to our commerce. If properly promoted, the merchant marine could by itself overcome our adverse balance of international payments.

Let us look at a few facts.

It is indeed ironic that the present budget calls for only 13 new vessels during the fiscal year 1967. In 1964, when 100 new merchant vessels were delivered to the Soviet Union, only 16 new vessels were delivered for United States registry.

A little over a year ago, the Soviet Union had 464 merchant vessels under contract in shipyards, including 111 tankers. As of the same date, the United States had only 39 new vessels under contract, including 1 tanker.

At the present time, the United States—the major power of the world and by far the world's major trading nation—ranks 12th in new vessel construction.

We rank behind such countries as Argentina, Brazil, Finland, and Peru.

For a nation whose growth and greatness have come from seapower, can these facts be other than alarming?

I have always considered that our basic maritime policy is sound.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, we have developed the world's most efficient and most modern liner fleet—even though inadequate in numbers. The detailed provisions of this act, however, have not been adequate to promote strong bulk carrier and tanker segments of our merchant marine.

Succeeding Administrations have failed to seek the necessary implementing legislation or administer that which has been provided.

I would not attempt to contend that any statute, in the face of changing time should remain unaltered for 30 years.

And we can have a more realistic program for assisting American-flag bulk carriers and tankers, without at the same time destroying that part of the act which has been successful. Some new legislation may be needed. Let us have it and we will act on it.

At a time when we should be considering a positive program for broadening the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to extend its benefits to all segments of the American merchant marine, we are floundering on the sea of uncertainty.

At a time when our domestic shipbuilding program should be at its peak, the present budget proposes a program that is the all-time low.

I am tired of reading analyses of the Interagency Maritime Task Force Report, or of the Report of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee. The business of our committee is legislation, and without a legislative program to consider, we are left to theorize like everyone else.

I am confident that President Johnson aims to dispel the atmosphere of despair that now prevails in our maritime program, as he has done in other areas. The picture is not entirely bleak.

Our country has the world's only nuclear-powered merchant vessel, the NS *Savannah*.

We are on the verge of a technological breakthrough in the field of nuclear propelled commercial vessels, and the time is ripe for us to being the second phase of our nuclear ship program.

The United States has the world's best, the most modern, and most productive liner fleet—but we need more such vessels in private ownership to serve our complex society and the uncertain but demanding needs of war.

With assistance in vessel research similar to that of the American aircraft industry, I am convinced that our domestic shipyards could become competitive with foreign shipbuilders.

Lastly, but most importantly, most segments of maritime labor have tried to be reasonable and realistic in accepting reduced manning requirements resulting from automation.

There is virtually no industry in this country that is not subsidized either directly or indirectly through some protective measures. The American merchant marine is not unique in the assistance that it requires. Our economy has been able to flourish with the highest standard of living in the world as the greatest trading Nation because our industries with governmental assistance have been able to become the most productive industries in the world.

Recent technological developments in ship design, propulsion equipment, shipbuilding, and cargo handling signify that a major technological breakthrough is imminent. Increased productivity is now possible in the maritime industry as never before.

Automation programs are reducing the impact of the differential between higher American-flag labor costs and foreign costs.

We are at a critical time when we must move forward with a program to promote all segments of our American merchant marine and our domestic shipyards so that these industries can achieve maximum productivity in our economy. There appears to be every hope that with such a realistic and positive program, subsidy cost to the Government will eventually be reduced, rather than increased.

Our committee is most anxious to cooperate with the administration in any constructive new maritime program that will be presented.

Unfortunately, perhaps, too much emphasis has been placed on focusing on the revolutionary proposals in the Interagency Maritime Task Force report, rather than recognizing that in principle very few people disagree on what should be the main ingredients of a sound maritime program. For example, everyone agrees that:

1. We must build more vessels for operation under the American flag;

2. We must develop a realistic program for assisting American-flag bulk carriers and tankers;

3. Government interference with the steamship industry should be minimized and management should in most cases be free to exercise its own prudent business. judgment;

4. Subsidies should be to the greatest possible extent direct rather than indirect; and

5. Our subsidy program should contain an element of incentive.

These principles form the basis for developing a sound new and expanded maritime program.

I do not agree with the proposal that we should permit vessels under this program to be built abroad. Such a step would, in my opinion, be inconsistent with the best interests of our country and our economy, and would have an extremely detrimental effect on our international balance of payments.

I am hopeful that the Administration will not recommend such a proposal as a part of the new program.

Similarly, I do not agree with those who would seek to abandon our cargo preference laws.

Such proposals emanate from theoreticians who have no real interest in the American Merchant Marine. Foreign-flag merchant marines have too many built-in and hidden nationalistic advantages and too many preferences of their own for us to consider it realistic at this time to repeal our cargo preference provisions.

On the other hand, as new efficient bulk carrier vessels are constructed for American-flag operation, and—if they are paid a direct operating subsidy—the differential in rates for the carriage of cargo in American-flag bulk carriers as opposed to foreign-flag bulk carriers should be largely eliminated.

Again, I am hopeful that the Administration will not recommend that we abandon our cargo preference statutes.

I also do not agree with those who would contend that we should completely do away with the essential trade route program.

It seems to me that this program is sound and that it has worked well. Perhaps some modifications could be made so as to allow the operators increased flexibility—but I believe that there must be the assurance that adequate American-flag service will be available on each essential trade route to meet our goals and commitments around the world and build our national economy in all areas of the country.

Insofar as passenger vessels are concerned, I am convinced that they are necessary as a part of our American Merchant Marine for national defense reasons and for economic and social reasons as well.

More and more people of the world are beginning to travel. The great percentage of these people prefer to travel by surface transportation. There is a great untapped market that is available for ocean transportation services.

I believe that this country must take steps to encourage the construction of several large capacity, low-fare superliners that will place ocean transportation within the economic means of the major part of our great society.

In short, I am enthusiastic that we can build upon the framework of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and develop a new, far-reaching program to promote all segments of the American Merchant Marine. I am most certainly optimistic.

The progress of our Nation has been one of steady development and evolution—we cannot destroy what we already have, but must use what is good to plan and create our programs for the future. This is the essence of the Great Society, and I am confident that its logic will soon be applied to the maritime industry.

Yesterday was George Washington's birthday. He was a man of great wisdom. He knew that history is eloquent in demonstrating that any nation which takes the easy way of permitting its commerce to be carried by foreign-flag ships—which rents the service and space it is too lasy or too shortsighted to provide, is embarked on a policy of dependency that has ended every time with the nation in question becoming a second-rate power.

Washington knew this truth and warned against its neglect. In closing, I would like to quote the words of George Washington:

"We should not overlook the tendency of war to abridge the means, and thereby at least enhance the price, of transporting productions to their proper markets. I recommend it to your (Congress') serious reflections how far and in what mode it may be expedient to guard against embarrassments from these contingencies by such encouragement to our own navigation as will render our commerce and agriculture less dependent on foreign bottoms which may fail us in the very moments most interesting to both these great objects * * *. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure.'

Thank you.

A Tribute to Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our late beloved friend and Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

Reverend Braskamp was a great and good man, Mr. Speaker, a man who devoted his life to the Christian ministry. As Chaplain of the House, Reverend

Braskamp in his daily prayers—memorable, devout, searching prayers—recorded the stream of human events.

His memorial prayer for the late President John F. Kennedy was pure eloquence. His prayer of hope for his successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson, was an inspiring message of encouragement to our new leader.

From a small house in Alton, Iowa, Dr. Braskamp made his way ultimately to Washington and to this House. He was a wonderful man—a great American, a fine human being, a gentleman, and a living inspiration to us all. We shall miss him greatly.

I extend to his family an expression of deepest sympathy in their loss and bereavement. A great and good man has gone to his reward.

Address by L. Eldon James

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, it is important that the American people have every opportunity to know who is responsible for the U.S. presence in Vietnam.

Observations on our Nation's response to the challenge of Vietnam were made recently by the Honorable L. Eldon James, national commander of the American Legion, before the AFL–CIO convention in San Francisco.

Commander James' observations on the struggle in Vietnam would be of interest, I believe, to my colleagues and, under unanimous consent, I insert his remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

Commander James' remarks follow:

An Address by L. Eldon James, National Commander, the American Legion, Before AFL–CIO Convention in San Francisco, Calif., December 10, 1965

Mr. President, distinguished guests, delegates to this Sixth Constitutional Convention of the AFL–CIO.

Ten years ago this past Sunday, through forward thinking and progressive action, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations merged to form a stanch and mighty force of Americans devoted to the cause of American labor—and even more—to the cause of acquiring and preserving for all Americans the blessings that should flow to those who live under our democratic and free society.

You took unto yourselves a great obligation. In these short 10 years you have faced many crisis. You have been confronted by many issues. You have turned your back on no crisis. You have faced each issue squarely.

We of the American Legion have our obligations too. We face the issues before us. We meet the crises that confront us. Like you, we do not turn our back, we will continue to face them squarely. In this respect I believe our two organizations have much in common. Your great president, Mr. George Meany, has honored our national convention on many occasions—and today I am honored by the opportunity of being here with you as you consider the pressing issues before you.

At least a dozen issues before this convention are vital enough to command your undivided attention. But, one above all cries out this day for the attention not only of this convention but of all loyal Americans. President Johnson spoke of it to you yesterday. It is on your heart and mine this morning.

Some may call it the issue of war or peace in Vietnam. Thoughtful people who will accept the lessons of history must call it the issue of freedom or slavery—not just out there in Vietnam but actually throughout the entire world.

When your president, George Meany, spoke to the national convention of the American Legion in Portland, Oreg., just this past August, he made it clear that American labor is fully alert to the threat and the importance of the struggle.

We know the aggressor in South Vietnam, and George Meany put the finger right on the guilty party when he said to our convention, and I quote: "The first fact of the matter is that it is the North Vietnam Communists—backed by Peiping and Moscow—who have been infiltrating, subverting, attacking and invading South Vietnam. The South Vietnamese authorities and people—backed by the United States—have never invaded North Vietnam."

President Meany factually outlined the history of conflict in Vietnam from the 1954 Geneva accords, a history which is an open book—open to all who would absorb the knowledge that it reveals. He arrived at this conclusion, and again I quote:

"Effective educators, sincere students, and honest pacifists can serve the cause of peace only by supporting, as we of the AFL–CIO do, the President's persistent efforts to bring an end to the war in Vietnam—through meaningful negotiations, if possible, and through military strength to halt aggression, whenever necessary. Let the opponents of our Government policy direct their advertisements and appeals to the dictators in Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow to stop North Vietnamese military infiltration and invasion of South Vietnam. The moment that these acts of Communist aggression cease, peace in Vietnam will not be far off."

Just a couple of hours after Mr. Meany spoke to our Convention, I was elected to the office of national commander. Since then, I have been privileged to travel to Vietnam and to see for myself the truth he so eloquently expressed. During 6 days in Vietnam, I visited 7 of its 43 provinces.

Six short but full days can make no one an expert. But I gained some impressions and some deep feelings. I believe I gained the right to make some valid observations. I want to pass some of them on to you today.

Before we talk about these observations, and thinking back to Mr. Meany's reference to meaningful negotiations and the use of military strength, wherever necessary, let me pose some questions concerning our present military posture in Vietnam.

Those who would advise our Government on how to stop the war are very generous and free with that advice.

To them I ask this question—why do you not direct your advice to Hanoi and Peiping?

And one more question to them.

Where would they be today if they were living under a Communist regime and under it protested as they do here in our beloved and free land?

We must not just love our land, we must protect that for which it stands.

There is much talk that humanitarian considerations prevent us from striking certain areas in North Vietnam and surrounding territory even though to do so might well minimize the risks to which our forces in Vietnam are exposed even though it would be humanitarian to our men. Is it not true that humanitarianism, like charity, should begin at home?

Should we not look at it this way, when Hanoi has at its disposal vast manpower resources, and its leaders have a staggering disregard for human life? Is it not time that we gave serious consideration to the neutralization of the port of Haiphong, the major seaport supplying the forces of aggression? Is it not time that we denied the Vietcong access to the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the major land route for reinforcement and supply to the aggressors? Should we merely react to every new move of the Communists? This puts us in the position of fighting this war on the enemy's terms.

How long then can we afford to overlook the utilization of our technological potential and our great firepower superiority when their use can reduce the exposure of our forces to mounting casualties? Have we reached the point where the effective use of this potential and superiority demands overriding priority? I firmly believe the answer is—we have.

Now permit me to pass on to you a little of the feeling and a few observations I gathered from those short 6 days out there in Vietnam.

First, the military defeat of the Vietcong, while tremendously important, is not the total answer to victory in Vietnam. The murders, the atrocities, the barbaric destruction perpetrated by the Vietcong in the South Vietnamese hamlets and villages are things beyond the comprehension of civilized people.

The South Vietnamese will need our help for many years after the military victory is achieved and after peace is restored. They are receiving such assistance now through the civic action program of the American military forces.

Virtually under the guns of the Vietcong, and while still providing armed protection for the South Vietnamese, Americans are helping to rebuild villages, hamlets, homes, schools—yes—even the broken lives of families and individuals.

This is the great untold story of Vietnam. It is not being brought home forcefully to the American people. The story is there. It is dramatic. I believe it is newsworthy. I believe Americans want to read and hear about it. I believe there is an obligation upon those who know it to see that the story is told.

It is indisputable that winning the people is as important as winning the military war. It is conceivable that a military victory could be achieved—yet it would be meaningless without the loyalty of the people. The devastation wrought by the Vietcong has been so unbelievably thorough that it will take years to build the confidence of the people and to restore economic, political, and social stability in South Vietnam. We dare not wait until the land is cleared of the Vietcong terrorists to do this job.

American military and civilian personnel in Vietnam recognize this need. They are attempting to build—not destroy—their way across South Vietnam. Your boys and mine, when they are not fighting, are using their own resources to help the people out there. They need our help. They need it now. They need all that you and I can do.

As of the first of this month, the American Legion has moved to support this great work with the establishment of the American Legion Vietnam fund. We are asking all of our members and all members of the American Legion Auxiliary to contribute a dollar or whatever they can to this cash fund. Every cent contributed will go to purchase food, clothing, medicine, and other materials and supplies necessary to this great rehabilitation effort. It will be delivered to our men out there to use in helping the South Vietnamese people. The Vietcong control through fear. We must lead and win through compassionate help in the American tradition.

My second observation involves the people of Vietnam and their attitude toward the U.S. presence there. I believe that these people dearly want freedom and liberty. They want the opportunity to determine for themselves the type of government under which they will live. They not only welcome us, but they want very much for us to be there and to help them. They desperately want release from the constant reprisal of the Vietcong aggressors.

We talked with the elevator boys and the people who run the shops and sell flowers on the streets. The look in their eyes, the expressions on their faces and the warmth of their handclasp told us something of their feeling.

The third observation is about the enemy. They are vicious, fanatical, and criminal. Time and time again, South Vietnamese Government forces and American troops entering hamlets and villages recaptured from or deserted by the Vietcong find civilian leaders and teachers murdered in cold blood.

When we hear criticism about civilian casualties—and we hear more of this than about the great, untold humanitarian story in Vietnam—let us remember the main reason for those casualties. All too often the reason goes untold. The VC does not hesitate to use innocent women and children as hostages and as shields in a retreat. They have used them forcibly as elements of combat to remove their casualties and to conceal their combat losses. This is hardly what some idealistic, star-gazing Americans should consider reasonable work for innocent women and children.

These tactics by the VC result in civilian casualties. It is important that the American people know these things. It is important that they know that the major responsibility for those casualties lies with the Vietcong.

Friday, October 15, was a day of special significance to men and women of American labor. In Vietnam it was to have been a Vietcong inspired "Hate America Day." Special emphasis was in Saigon.

It was to be a day of great chaos, of fiery demonstrations by the Vietnamese people to show how much they hate America, and of massive work stoppages in protest of the American presence in Vietnam.

We were in Saigon on that day. There was not the slightest ripple of anti-American sentiment. There was no work stoppage. The fiery demonstration fizzled like a wet firecracker and never did go off.

That, incidentally, was the Friday preceding the weekend of loud and overly publicized demonstrations by a small minority of misinformed malcontents here at home.

That October 15, 1965, should be of special interest to you as representatives of American labor because it was supposed to have been a day when the working men and women of South Vietnam spoke out against America. The great heartbeat of South Vietnam—the laboring people of that war-ravaged land—did not buy this Red-inspired nonsense. They rejected it just as stanchly as do you of the AFL–CIO here in America.

On my return to the United States, I was distressed to learn of the wave of student protest demonstrations against American policy in Vietnam. I believe we have good cause for concern about the timing of these events here that did materialize to a degree and the planned demonstration that failed so completely in Vietnam. We have reason to raise the question: Was it coincidence, or was it the result of well-coordinated planning? If the latter is true, its pretty disgusting and it should serve as a warning.

Many of our educators are wisely, even if somewhat belatedly, showing concern about the nonstudent participation and leadership in these demonstrations. They should be concerned since FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has publicly warned that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is supporting these protest movements. Let us hope that educators will join hands with the vast majority of loyal students who are now actively supporting our country's effort—supporting in so many tangible ways.

Finally, all Americans should be tremendously proud of the manner in which our men and women in uniform and civilian personnel are working to bring political, economic, and social stability to South Vietnam. I wish all of our people could see for themselves the magnificent work that is being done there by our countrymen. I wish they could see for themselves the genuine affection of the Vietnamese for the Americans. I wish they could sense the desire of the Vietnamese for freedom. If this could be done, I am confident that the minority protests here at home would cease or at best would be just a tiny ripple on the vast ocean of American patriotism and loyalty.

The very least that we on the home front can do for our men and women in Vietnam is to let them know—and to let the world know—that we are solidly behind them. This is a part of the obligation of all patriotic Americans today and in the months ahead.

American labor and American business have a special charge from our Government to do all in their power to protect the job rights of men who have been called to service. I know that obligation will be honored and fulfilled.

All Americans and all peace-loving peoples everywhere have yet another obligation in this struggle. That is to see that the Red government of China, the real aggressor in Vietnam, does not gain admission to the United Nations.

We have seen a steady erosion of resistance to Red China's admission. On November 18 of this year the General Assembly of the United Nations voted 47 to 47, with 20 abstentions, on the issue of admitting Red China. Article 4 of the U.N. Charter states that "membership is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations of the charter and which, in the judgment of the organization, are willing and able to carry out those obligations."

The Peiping government is not peace loving. It supports aggression in Vietnam. It stands condemned by the U.N. itself as the aggressor in Korea. It is guilty of aggression against Tibet, against Burma, and against India—and Red China supports programs of subversion in Africa and Latin America.

Red China's record as an aggressor is written in blood from Korea to Vietnam. It would be an affront to our fighting men in Vietnam should we fail to state clearly and often the case against the admission of Red China. We must call upon our Government to continue to resist the seating of Red China in the U.N. and to remind the United Nations organization that it has collective responsibility to honor its own charter provision restricting membership to peace-loving nations.

We have made a solemn commitment to the defense of freedom in Vietnam. It is also a vital commitment to preserve our own freedom. We must honor that commitment or dishonor ourselves and shatter the hopes of not only the Vietnamese people but also of all who seek freedom around the world. America's past dictates that her future can take but one course—the course of honor and really the course of self-preservation.

The long struggle for freedom in Vietnam again underscores the fact that freedom is not free. He who is inclined to think that it is, thinks eventual slavery for himself and for future generations.

With that idea in mind, I am reminded of the beautiful thought behind the lyrics of a popular song of some years ago: "The Best Things in Life Are Free." The lyricist dwells on the incomparable works of nature, sunbeams, moon and starlight, flowers and raindrops—the God-given gifts to all mankind.

We believe that human freedom also is a God-given gift, but one which man must nurture carefully or it will wither and die. If we would make life worth the living, that we might enjoy to the fullest measure those things that are free, we must resolve to defend with all our strength and courage, the greatest of all our blessings—the blessing of human liberty—the right of man to toil and sweat and yet to preserve for himself and his loved ones the right to enjoy the full measure of the fruits of his labors.

You men and women of the AFL–CIO have long been pioneers in the struggle against the threat to our way of life that the Communists pose. No one knows this better than we of the American Legion—we who stand shoulder to shoulder with you in this fight.

This is no academic exercise we—you and I—are engaged in.

Your organization and mine must see that the American people face the realities of this hour.

Aaron J. Racusin, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee for Government Procurement, House Committee on Small Business, I have watched very closely the small business programs of the executive agencies. Since the Defense portion of the national budget continues to overshadow all others, I have given particular attention to the services which are charged with the procurement of our defense needs.

For many years I have been impressed by the energetic efforts of one individual who continues to give impetus to the Air Force small business program. Mr. Aaron J. Racusin, in a large measure, deserves the credit for the success of a dynamic program of the Department of the Air Force. Such success can be attributed to the fact that he is an intelligent and extremely well-informed individual of unusual ability. Of greater importance, however, has been his tenacity of purpose as reflected in the manner in which he has dedicated himself to insuring that the small business community throughout the Nation gets a fair share of the Air Force procurement dollar.

Mr. Racusin, originally a native of New York City, obtained his bachelor's degree at College of the City of New York and a law degree at St. Lawrence University—Brooklyn Law School. He practiced law in New York City before serving in the Army Air Force. After discharge he served as an attorney in the procurement division, Air Materiel Command, at Wright-Patterson, Ohio. Thereafter, he served with the director of procurement at Air Force headquarters and later as Deputy for Procurement Management in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

I join with Mr. Racusin's many friends in extending best wishes to him on his new appointment as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management.

The Kuwait National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, February 25 marks the date on which the people of Kuwait will observe their annual National Day. The House will not be in session tomorrow, the actual date of this observance, and I am therefore taking occasion today to extend warm felicitations to His Highness Shaikh Sabah al Salim al Sabah, the Amir of Kuwait; and to the Kuwaiti Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Talat al-Ghoussein.

The celebrations this year will lay emphasis on Kuwait's entering her fifth year as an independent state. All of Kuwait's many friends agree that her accomplishments after only 5 brief years of independence rival, and in some cases even surpass, those of many older members of the international community.

Little is known about Kuwait's early history, but during its modern period one of its most significant acts was the signing of the 1899 agreement with Great Britain. That document gave Kuwait a large degree of internal self-government with British guarantees of her political integrity and guidance in foreign affairs. This relationship ended on June 19, 1961, when Kuwait became a fully independent and sovereign nation. Even the quiet manner of achieving her independence is testimony of the high quality of political leadership found in Kuwait.

Her tremendous supply of oil, the backbone of the economy, has given Kuwait's citizens a per capita income in excess of $3,000 per year. Crude oil production averaged more than 2.3 million barrels daily in 1964, an increase of 10 percent over 1963. The positive benefits of this national wealth have not been monopolized by a few groups or individuals, but have been shared domestically and through foreign aid. The social services such as free health, education, and public works programs make similar programs in the "advanced" nations blush. Every indication points to the prospect that this trend will continue at an even greater pace in the future.

As I mentioned earlier, Kuwait has not neglected her responsibilities to assist those countries less fortunate than herself. Through the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development—KFAED—she has offered project development loans totaling in excess of $105 million through 1964. In addition, other loans totaling more than $225 million by the end of 1964 were extended to other Arab States.

Under the guidance of His Highness Sabah al-Salim al Sabah Kuwait has played a very active role in international affairs, and has been a dependable participant in such organizations as the United Nations and the Arab League.

I am certain that I echo the sentiments of the entire Congress when I offer congratulations and best wishes to the progressive and hard-working people and Government of Kuwait as they celebrate their national holiday. May their dynamic example of a state truly dedicated to the enrichment and fulfillment of its people serve as an inspiration to other nations who are trying to build their own national destinies.

Fino Introduces GOP Demonstration Cities Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation designed to focus attention on part two of the administration's plan to socialize American residential patterns—the "Federal coordinator" called for in the administration's "demonstration cities" legislation.

My bill, in many ways similar to the "demonstration cities" legislation introduced by the administration, contains similar program and financial provisions, but deletes the section calling for a Federal coordinator and substitutes a Federal information officer. The bill also deletes language requiring cities to have a plan for social renovation before they can qualify for Federal aid. The bill adds a provision stating the sense of Congress that the program is not to detract in any way from the powers of local government to control and administer existing Federal grant-in-aid programs.

This legislation—substituting a Federal information officer for a Federal coordinator—to my mind removes the Federal fishhook from the self-improvement carrot the President is offering to the cities of our Nation. I believe in billions for rebuilding our cities, but I do not believe in spending a cent for the undermining of local government.

I do not believe that Federal aid programs should be the vehicle of social experiments. My bill cuts the "social experiment" angle out of the program. I believe in creative federalism and I support that part of the administration bill encompassed in my bill. I am 100 percent opposed, however, to encroaching centralism as represented by the Federal coordinator, who I call a commissar for he would be nothing less. My bill is a good bill. It is truly dedicated to rebuilding our cities in accordance with the timeless American tradition of local self-government. The Fino bill takes the encroaching centralism out of the program and leaves the creative federalism. I believe that this is the way to do the job.

David Russ of Kingsport, Tenn., Writes "Democracy: What It Means to Me"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. The winners of the 50 State contests will come to Washington next month to participate in the national contest.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD, the speech written by David Russ of my hometown of Kingsport, who is the winning contestant from the State of Tennessee.

I commend David for this outstanding expression of the true meaning of democracy, and I wish him every success in the national contest.

The speech follows:

DEMCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By David Russ)

Once upon a time a little boy named Melvin heard the word "democracy" from his second grade teacher. He liked it. It sort of had a strong sound to it. He used it to impress his friends, who had no more idea than he what it meant.

While Melvin was still in grade school another teacher explained the word "democracy" as meaning "government by the people." To help the class understand this, class elections were held and no one told Melvin for whom to vote. (He voted for himself.)

Melvin's next experience in democracy came after he learned about the constitutional guarantees of "freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech." Melvin was especially excited by the idea of freedom of speech and tried it out on his parents. That was a mistake. His parents taught him quickly that only as he showed increasing responsibility would he earn increasing freedoms.

Democratic experiences came faster after that: as a Boy Scout he not only learned reverence for the flag, but also traveled to his national shrines—Valley Forge—Independence Hall—the Statue of Liberty—and experienced patriotic pride in the heritage that was his.

As a history student Melvin came to realize the magnitude of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and the wisdom of those who framed these documents. He was thankful for the dedication of men such as Jefferson, Washington, Madison, and Franklin. He was proud, too, of the fact that among his own forebears were those who had fought his country's battles from the Revolution to the Second World War, as well as others who had fled Europe's problems as late as the turn of the century to find new opportunities in the United States.

Melvin's view of democracy could not always be a backward glance because democracy surrounded him. In school and church, the organizational structure of clubs, student government, and congregational meetings followed a democratic pattern. More important was the wide latitude which was his to choose friends, activities, and beliefs. The increasing responsibility about making more and more of his own decisions was both gratifying and frightening to Melvin.

Melvin also grew concerned about current events. Remembering his earlier lessons he thought that those rebellious ones who burned their draft cards had somehow missed the point in their interpretation of democracy. He debated the actions of those who marched in protest of the Government's policies in domestic and foreign affairs. He wondered what he would do if he were in a position of leadership in the Nation.

And thus it was that Melvin, like Ulysses, became a part of all that he had met. Melvin's story is my story and, like Melvin, I have formed my understanding of the meaning of democracy, realizing that the years and experiences to come will add new dimension to these beliefs.

I believe with Lincoln that democracy is government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

I believe that true democracy recognizes the worth of the individual by guaranteeing him certain freedoms as set forth in the U.S. Constitution.

I believe that our form of democracy evolved from the thoughts, experience, and prayers of men through the centuries and will complete its evolution only through the efforts of men today and in the future.

I believe that democracy is more than a form of national government. It pervades all of life for those who live within its framework.

I believe that this democratic form of government places more demands upon the individual than any other form of government because in granting freedoms it exacts compensating responsibilities—or, as John D. Rockefeller, Jr., put it, "every right implies a responsibility; every opportunity, an obligation; every possession, a duty."

I believe that I cannot separate myself from the processes of democracy and blame others for its imperfections. I believe that I must participate actively in our democratic government, and that I must prepare myself now for that participation.

This is what democracy means to me.

House Loses Rev. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this House has sustained a great loss this week with the passing of our beloved Chaplain, the Rev. Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

In his quiet way, Dr. Braskamp was a constant source of spiritual comfort to all Members of this House, both those who shared his denominational preference and those who were members of other faiths. All of us, in different ways, have profited by knowing this kindly and gracious man. His passing leaves a great void in this House, but he shall never be forgotten by those of us to whom he gave so generously of himself.

For more than a half century, Dr. Braskamp did God's work and the world is a better place for his presence. To all Members of the House his loss comes as a personal one. Each of us has lost a good friend.

Mrs. Daniels joins with me in extending our condolences to his son, Bernard, Jr., and to his daughter, Mrs. Norman E. Tucker, and to the other members of his family.

The Meaning of Democracy to 16-Year-Old Elizabeth G. Rasche, of Fairbanks, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the heartwarming words of 16-year-old Elizabeth G. Rasche, a senior in the Lathrop High School, of Fairbanks, Alaska, describing what democracy means to her. She is Alaska's winner of the Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary, and I want to share her speech with you. It follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

Democracy: a skinny, 17-year-old in fatigues and combat boots, fighting his first war from behind his first submachinegun; a teacher explaining the War of 1812 or judicial review or an eloquent American poet, urging her students to express their own feelings without hesitance, without fear; a college girl guiding an illiterate child's groping mind through his first reading lesson and returning the wonder in his face. Democracy: an ideal emblazoned in the souls of a new generation; a generation dedicated to preserving it as a living, glowing reality.

I'm 16 years old, and I'm part of this generation. I live in a world of hostility, a world where men submerge their very humanity in primitive brutality, a world in which the freedom I love seems sometimes a tenuous thing; and often I cry out in frustration, "What can I do?"

The answer is stereotyped: I can absorb the essence of democracy in my history, government and literature classes. I can take part in activities which contribute to my intellectual, emotional, and moral development. I can keep informed of current affairs, and build myself into a wise, capable citizen. This is my duty; it constitutes my role as an American high school student. But like so many students, I grow impatient with the taking; I long to give.

I'm thankful for the small ways I have been able to give in my community. Throughout 7 years of Girl Scouting I was encouraged to "help other people at all times" in ways as diverse as making Christmas favors for the aged and aiding in a full-scale polio vaccination program. I've worked with young children as a library aid and Red Cross volunteer. I've come to understand other cultures better through the foreign visitors my family and I have entertained in our home. Just last summer, as a hostess for one of our local civic organizations, I welcomed people from every State and many foreign countries to my city. Greeting them at the airport, answering their questions, and making them feel at home, I felt a deeper kinship not only with my countrymen, but with all mankind.

Presently school absorbs most of my time, but school itself exemplifies democracy. I'm proud to be a member of our vibrant student council, which is patterned after the U.S. Congress and encompasses such programs as student exchange, flood relief, and aid to UNICEF. I'm in many other activities as well. In some, I'm a leader; in others I'm a follower, and this is the way it should be. I round out my week by teaching a Sunday school class of exurberant fourth graders, convinced that America is, and must remain, "one nation under God."

But is all this enough? My answer is an emphasic "No." I believe in my generation and in what we're doing, but I believe there's more, much more we could be doing to sustain democracy. I'd like to see a teen corps of unpaid volunteers fighting poverty and sickness and illiteracy throughout the Nation; this might be an extension of Project Headstart. I'd like to see youth chapters of both political parties in every American town.

I'd like to see some of our teen centers turned into centers for democratic action. I'd like to hear the familiar complaint "There's nothing to do" answered with worthwhile service projects: helping out at the polls, landscaping, making intelligent high school broadcasts. These are only a few of the innumerable ways we can and should be preserving the democratic ideal.

The older generation, which emerged strong and resilient from war and depression, has set a noble precedent for us. If we too are to be strong and resilient, if we too are to perpetuate democracy, we can't sit back and simply enjoy our education, with the idea of using it in a few months, a few years, a few decades. We can and must begin right now to put it to work. We are the new generation. Today is ours.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, it has been 26 years since the illegal seizure of the Baltic nations. In an era when the United Nations is expandnig its membership yearly, many people have never learned of Lithuania's history and its tragic fate. Indeed, a sizable percentage of member states was not even in existence when Lithuania fell to Soviet perfidy.

On February 16, we observed the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Lithuanian Americans have led the fight to inform the world of their homeland and of their homeland's loss of freedom. Lithuania is not a make-believe nation. It has a rich and honorable history going back to the 13th century. The takeover of this small nation stands as a clear example of the expansionist tactics of the Soviet Union and of its indifference to the principles of freedom, democracy, and self-determination.

The United States has refused to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into Russia. We thus reiterate our support for the principle of self-determination and for the moral and political implications of this principle.

I congratulate the Lithuanian-American organizations in the United States for their long and tenacious fight in behalf of this cause.

Survey Shows Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post, an outstanding newspaper of the West, has conducted its 10th annual consumer analysis survey of the metropolitan area. I am pleased to report that the metropolitan area is really prospering. Under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the Record an outstanding article by Willard Haselbush, Denver Post business editor, under date of Sunday, February 20, 1966, which is as follows:

> The Denver metropolitan area is teeming with persons who are well-housed, well-paid, well-educated and enjoy, as a routine way of life, ownership of savings accounts, stocks, bonds, appliances, and luxury items.
>
> The "war on poverty" doesn't involve some 90 percent of the area's families because 49 percent make from $8,000 to more than $15,000 a year and only 10 percent of all families in greater Denver report annual incomes of $3,000 or less.
>
> The 10th annual consumer analysis survey of the metropolitan area released Sunday by the Denver Post underlines continuing prosperity in the Mile High City and its suburbs.
>
> The survey, conducted by experts following a proven cross-section procedure used by leading newspapers across America, involved interviews with 3,870 families—1.3 percent of the population—chosen not at random but by address, age bracket, income and other factors.
>
> It showed that Denverites are earning more, spending more and saving more than ever before.
>
> It revealed that 92 percent of all families, regardless of income, own one or more automobiles and that 30 percent of the vehicles were bought in the last 12 months—both new and used.
>
> It showed that 77 percent of all metropolitan-area dwellers own their homes. That includes 51 percent of families earning less than $5,000 a year who own and do not rent their living quarters.
>
> The gain in 1965 among families making $8,000-plus a year was 4 percent, the survey showed.
>
> It also showed that 8 percent of the metropolitan area's families gross more than $15,000 a year, 22 percent are in the $10,000 to $15,000 income bracket and 19 percent make between $8,000 and $9,999 a year.
>
> That adds up to 23,900 families, in an area with a population of just more than a million persons, who are in the $15,000-plus annual income bracket.
>
> Other highlights uncovered by the annual survey showed that 19 percent of all heads of households in the area have college degrees, another 17 percent have completed up to 3 years of college and 32 percent have high school diplomas, but no college training.
>
> Only 14 percent, said the mathematical projection, dropped out of grade school and never went back to school.
>
> Forty-seven percent of the Denver area household heads are managers, officials, professional men, proprietors or craftsmen, and 12 percent are retired The retirement total of family heads in the area, the survey showed, is 35,900, far ahead of the 29,900 who have clerical jobs Only 3 percent of the area's population falls in the laborer category. That's 9,000 against the 41,900 who didn't finish grade school and the 56,800 who have college degrees.
>
> The Denver Post's 1966 consumer analysis in book form now is being distributed to advertisers and advertising agencies by the newspaper's advertising department and its representatives, Moloney, Regan & Schmitt, Inc.
>
> A composite picture of continuing and rising prosperity in the Denver area emerged from the person-to-person survey which began last September.
>
> It showed that 75 percent of all families in the area have charge accounts, that 84 percent own insurance policies, 31 percent have stocks and/or bonds and 79 percent have savings accounts. Of these, 57 percent reported bank savings, 39 percent have money in savings and loan institutions and 38 percent own shares in company credit unions.
>
> The scientific projection of those polled showed that 29 percent of all Denver-area families have savings bonds and 33 percent hold mutual fund shares.
>
> Other highlights:
>
> Twenty-nine percent of the Denver-area households—a total of 86,700—consist of two persons and 14 percent—41,900—have six or more members.
>
> Denver has more children than adults. The survey showed that 4 percent are under 2 years old, 13 percent between 2 and 5, 21 percent between 6 and 11, and 20 percent between 12 and 17.
>
> Only 11 percent of the area's husbands are over 65 and 36 percent are between 35 and 50.
>
> A total of 104,700 housewives are jobholders. That's 35 percent of the total, an increase of 3 percent over a year ago. By income groups, 23 percent of the fulltime, housewife jobholders reported a total family income of $15,000 or more a year.
>
> Downtown Denver remains the favorite shopping area for 27 percent of the population, the projection showed. That compares with 21 percent who shop regularly at Cherry Creek, 17 percent at Lakeside, 14 percent at University Hills and 12 percent at Westland.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Washington as a freshman Member of the House, one of the things I found most heartening was the high quality spiritual guidance given the Members of the House of Representatives by their Chaplain, the late Reverend Bernard Braskamp. Perhaps I responded more warmly to him because he was a fellow Iowan and because he also rose from modest beginnings and found, through education, a means to serve others. I only know that I found his daily message a source of wisdom and inspiration and one which helped me view the daily round of quorum calls, rollcalls, and speeches as part of the continuing march of our national history.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say how fortunate the House of Representatives has been in being served by so illustrious a Chaplain as Dr. Braskamp, and I join all Members, both old and new, in offering my sympathy to his family and to all who have lost his valued guidance. Dr. Braskamp, however, had lived life to the full and in a manner worthy of his calling. There can be no finer eulogy to him than to paraphrase a line from one of the last prayers he offered for us. Surely, for him, that prayer, uttered just a few weeks ago, was fully answered for he, indeed, had "removed from him everything that holds us back from a complete surrender to Thy ways and Thy will."

Mr. Speaker, there can be no higher praise than to acknowledge that in Dr. Braskamp, we knew a man who preached to us, not only with his words, but also with his life.

Nation's Best Minds Advise President Johnson on Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in a recent letter made this historic statement in a personal message:

> Whatever else history may say, it must record that everything this Government is trying to do is the result of the collected wisdom and judgment of the best minds in the country. And I alone will take responsibility for all final decisions.

This statement first appeared publicly in my newsletter, Capitol Comments, on February 14, 1966, in which it was pointed out that the Vietnam conflict apparently is entering a significant new phase of reconstruction and pacification.

Under unanimous consent I insert this issue of Capitol Comments in the Appendix of the Record, believing it to be of interest to my colleagues and to Americans generally.

The newsletter follows:

> VIETNAMESE CONFLICT ENTERS NEW STAGE
>
> (By Joe L. Evins)
>
> This week in Washington was marked by major and significant developments in the continuing Vietnamese crisis. The conflict seemingly is moving into a new stage. This became apparent with the recent meeting of President Johnson and other high American officials with officials of the South Vietnamese Government during the week in Honolulu, Hawaii.
>
> Following this meeting a joint declaration was issued in which the goals of the two nations were announced. A concerted effort will be made to build a democratic nation, beginning at the grassroots level.
>
> According to the announcement, as areas are liberated from the Vietcong, American and Vietnamese teams will move in to launch basic programs, in education, in economic reform, in agriculture, and in health to create stable and self-governing communities.
>
> It is most significant that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Agriculture attended the sessions at Honolulu and then moved on to South Vietnam to begin immediate work on these programs to build free, self-governing, democratic communities.
>
> It is also significant that President Johnson dispatched Vice President HUMPHREY to visit South Vietnam to continue the momentum for this positive program of reconstruc-

tion and pacification gained at the session in Hawaii.

The Governments of the United States and South Vietnam agreed on these main points at Honolulu:

To resist aggression.

To work for the social improvement of the people.

To strive for self-government.

To promote free, democratic elections.

To attack hunger, ignorance and disease.

To continue the quest for peace.

President Johnson is continuing his firm, reasoned direction of the conflict and there are strong indications that our American forces are inflicting sustained, substantial and telling losses on the Vietcong and on invading Communists.

In response to a letter which your Representative sent to President Johnson concerning the Vietnamese conflict, the President said in reply:

"Whatever else history may say, it must record that everything this government is trying to do is the result of the collected wisdom and judgment of the best minds in the country. And I alone will take responsibility for all final decisions."

The President has an awesome, lonely and grave responsibility in safeguarding the interests of freedom and halting the onrush of communism in southeast Asia, and at the same time, avoiding the missteps that would trigger a nuclear war.

The President is moving in the direction of achieving an honorable peace without a general war. There could be no greater responsibility placed upon the shoulders of any man—and the President needs our support in this critical time.

David Dammann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to a young man in Atlanta who is in the frontlines of the war against poverty.

David Dammann is a Job Corps recruiter who has interviewed some 1,000 young residents of Atlanta's most deprived neighborhoods, and has persuaded 250 of them to take advantage of the opportunity to help themselves by joining the Job Corps.

Mr. Dammann, a graduate of Duke University, is the subject of a column by Hugh Parks which appeared in the Atlanta Journal on February 1. I insert this column at this point in the RECORD:

HE'LL CHANGE YOUR MIND

You may have several sincere reservations about the Job Corps but at least two have rubbed off by the time you have finished talking with Dave Dammann:

1. He is determined to see it work, although he is underpaid.

2. If they get enough like him it will work.

Dave, based in Atlanta, is the Job Corps top recruiter in the United States.

He pulls on an old sweater or an old coat, climbs into an old Rambler, sees that the protective placard which says Job Corps lies on the seat beside him and sets out, night and day, to some of Atlanta's most dangerous neighborhoods.

He wears the sagging sweater or coat because he found when he wore a neat business suit he was tagged immediately as a detective and kids he wanted to talk to would scatter at sight. The placard is to place on his windshield to protect his car from being stripped while he's away from it.

He ignores whatever derisive calls, or worse, that are flung in his direction and heads confidently toward a corner gang, calling out, "Hey, fellows, don't run, I'm not the law, I want to talk to you a moment." Or, "Good doctor," to the leader, "I've got a good deal here."

In Buttermilk Bottom, Cabbage Town and Blue Heaven, he has become a familiar figure, this rambling 24-year-old graduate of Duke.

Does he ever have any qualms about being alone? Especially at night?

"I was brought up in a Queens neighborhood," he replied, "which for 2 years straight had the highest juvenile delinquency rate in New York City, including Harlem. I have been stabbed before."

CAUSES CAMP DIRECTOR TO COMPLAIN

When he was growing up, the neighborhood was primarily a mixture of European immigrants: German (he is of German descent), Greeks and Italians. Now Puerto Ricans and Negroes are moving in.

"Of the 300 kids in our block," he went on, "my 2 brothers and I are the only ones to go to college. This was because our parents and our grandfather, who is a teacher, inspired us to want a higher education. I learned that all you need is guidance—proper guidance. We had that."

Since he joined the Job Corps here less than a year ago, Dave has signed 250 boys out of the 1,000 he interviewed. About two-thirds are Negro.

He follows up their progress at the various camps which they attend from 8 months to 2 years, depending on what work they are capable of learning and are interested in. His persistent letters to directors of the 82 camps, asking about his recruits, so annoyed one that he complained to Washington.

He can talk the language of the slum kid (not all are from slums) and will threaten to bap one aside the head if he doesn't go all out in his new opportunity. Some aspire to high goals, most are realistic, and two Negro boys with a fourth grade education had their ambitions centered on learning enough so they could pass the Air Force's written examination. And they passed.

Such a gifted athlete that he was All New York State in soccer when he was in high school, easy-walking Dave came south to Duke to study to be a teacher but decided upon graduation—and this from a guy who is working for Washington—"that there is too much bureaucracy in the schools."

He is married to the former Carrell Ann Larmore, daughter of Jesse Larmore, chief of adult probation for Fulton County. She is studying for her Ph. D. in psychology at Emory and it is good that she has been granted a financial "assistantship" because Dave's salary is $6,050 a year.

Pearl Harbor Shipyard Supervisors Conduct Vietnam Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I count myself among the more fortunate Congressmen in that I represent an educated and well-informed electorate. Many of our citizens have demonstrated a keen awareness of the issues with which this Nation is beset. One such citizen is Mr. Jerome A. Cook, of Aiea, Hawaii, who is a vice president of the National Association of Supervisors, Department of Defense.

Mr. Cook, in making plans to come to Washington in March for a meeting of the national association, conducted an opinion poll of the Pearl Harbor shipyard supervisors so that he would have their views on some of the critical issues that confront our government. On the issue of the war in Vietnam, Mr. Cook's poll showed strong support for the administration's policy among the members of the association in Hawaii.

The results of Mr. Cook's poll, in which 165 supervisors participated, are as follows:

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. The United States should use all its military might to end the war in Vietnam at the risk of war with Red China	112	30	11
2. Are you willing to pay more taxes to support the war?	110	30	13
3. We should at least bomb all of North Vietnam, including Hanoi and seaports	118	22	12
4. The United States should recognize the Vietcong at the negotiating table as legitimate parties to peace talks	68	74	14
5. The United States should withdraw completely from Vietnam as it is too unimportant to risk a world war	13	131	7

Room 307, Gilman Hall—Some Reminiscences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in California, on February 21 a group of distinguished Americans participated in the dedication of room 307, Gilman Hall, at the University of California at Berkeley as a national historic landmark.

History was made in this room in the thirties through the research work conducted by renowned nuclear scientist Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, and his associates. From the efforts of these esteemed scientists came plutonium with all its awesome implications for both peace and war.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of my fellow Californian, the Honorable Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, who participated in the dedication of this historic room 307:

ROOM 307, GILMAN HALL—SOME REMINISCENCES

I am happy to participate with Art Wahl and Ed McMillan in this 25th anniversary of the discovery of plutonium and I especially appreciate the fact that Stew Udall is officiating in this dedication of room 307, Gilman Hall as a national historic landmark.

I imagine it is typical of our time—because of the speed of change, the sheer number of significant events which pile up in the quickly passing years—that each of us today lives through a little more history in our lifetime.

At least this seems to be the case. It is an exciting time to be alive, to be working, to be trying to make some contribution to the scheme of things—and occasionally to have some small success in the effort.

It is also a time when time itself is something of luxury—particularly time to reminisce. But since today is a special occasion, I hope you'll afford me a little of that luxury.

Having a room in which you and your colleagues worked rather routinely, and certainly unceremoniously, designated as a national historic landmark is an unusual experience, to say the least. Those of you who remember room 307 Gilman Hall as it was in those early days (and remained for many years) will agree that a less significant or historical-looking room hardly existed on the campus of the University of California.

Fortunately the room is still here. It has been enlarged somewhat and it contains more complicated equipment. The simple small sink, down which some of our precious plutonium was inevitably lost in the course of our experiments 25 years ago, has been replaced by another sink. The little cubbyhole with its low slanting ceiling directly under Gilman Hall's roof, where we kept our electroscope and various samples, is still an appendage to the room. And it still opens through glass doors to the little outdoor patio where, because of the shortage of laboratory space and fume hoods, we were forced to carry on some of our experiments which gave off noxious fumes.

I recall that our counting equipment was two doors down the hall, in room 303. The first plutonium had its alpha radiation measured in that room and therefore room 303 shares a place in history with room 307. Joe Kennedy and I had our desks in room 303, and later in the year 1941 one whole wall was taken up with a chart of isotopes to which additions and changes were frequently made.

Had Art Wahl, Joe Kennedy, Ed McMillan, or I had the slightest idea that today's event would transpire, we might have looked for other more auspicious quarters. I don't think we would have gotten them. Space was at a premium and we were lucky to have even these rooms to work in. Fortunately, we were more interested in getting results in our work than in our surroundings or any significance they might have in the future.

But in recalling the story of plutonium I should go back further—perhaps to 1936 when, as a graduate student, I spoke in the college of chemistry weekly seminar as was required of each of us once a year. Since the fall of 1934, when I began my graduate work at Berkeley, I had been reading first the exciting papers by Fermi, Segre, and coworkers from Rome and then the equally fascinating papers by Hahn, Meitner, and Strassmann from Berlin. They were studying the interesting radioactivities which were produced when uranium was bombarded with neutrons and which they attributed to isotopes of transuranium elements.

I remember how I devoured those early papers and how I considered myself something of a minor expert on those "transuranium elements." In fact, they were the subject of my talk at that seminar in 1936, an hour-long talk in which I described those "new" elements and their chemical properties in great detail. I need not remind you, I am sure, that in January of 1939 word reached us that Hahn and Strassmann in Germany had identified those "transuranium" isotopes as barium and lanthanium, and other fission products of uranium, and thus established that they were not new elements at all.

During the 2 years following my seminar talk in 1936 and before the discovery of fission, my interest in the neutron-induced radioactivities in uranium continued unabated and, in fact, increased. I read and reread every article that was published on the subject. I was puzzled by the situation, both intrigued by the concept of the transuranium interpretation of the experimental results and disturbed by the apparent inconsistencies in this interpretation. I can remember discussing the problem with Joe Kennedy by the hour—often in the postmidnight, small hours of the morning at the old Varsity Coffee Shop on the corner of Telegraph and Bancroft Avenues where we would often go for a cup of coffee and a bite to eat after an evening spent in the laboratory.

I first learned of the correct interpretation of these experiments, that neutrons split uranium into two large pieces in the fission reaction, at the weekly Monday night seminar in nuclear physics conducted by Prof. E. O. Lawrence in Le Conte Hall. On this exciting night in January 1939, we heard the news from Germany of Hahn and Strassmann's beautiful chemical experiments. I recall that the fission interpretation was greeted at first with some skepticism by a number of those present in that room, but as a chemist, with a particular appreciation for Hahn and Strassmann's experiments, I felt that this interpretation just had to be accepted. I can remember walking the streets of Berkeley for hours after this seminar in a combined state of exhilaration, in appreciation of the beauty of the work, and disgust at my inability to arrive at this interpretation despite my years of contemplation on the subject.

Now, with those radioactivities identified as fission products, there were no longer any transuranium elements left. However, in later investigations by Ed McMillan at Berkeley and others elsewhere, one of the radioactivities behaved differently from the others. It didn't undergo recoil. It didn't separate from thin layers of uranium when uranium was bombarded with slow neutrons. This was the beta radioactivity with a half-life of about 2.3 days. Along toward the spring of 1940, Ed began to come to the conclusion that the 2.3-day activity might actually be due to the daughter of the 23-minute uranium 239 and thus might indeed be an isotope of element 93 with the mass number 239 (93–239). Phil Abelson joined him in this work in the spring of 1940 and together they were able to chemically separate and identify and thus discover element 93.

Immediately thereafter, during the summer and fall of 1940, Ed McMillan started looking for the daughter product of the 2.3-day activity which obviously would be the isotope of element 94 with mass number 239 (94–239). Not finding anything he could positively identify as such, he began to bombard uranium with deuterons in the 60-inch cyclotron in the hope that he might find a shorter lived isotope—one of a higher intensity of radioactivity that would be easier to identify as an isotope of element 94. Before he could finish this project, he was called away to work on radar at MIT.

During this time my interest in the transuranium elements continued. Since Ed McMillan and I lived only a few rooms apart in the Faculty Club, we saw each other quite often and, as I recall, much of our conversation, whether in the laboratory, at meals, in the hallway, or even going in and out of the shower, had something to do with element 93 and the search for element 94. I must say, therefore, that his sudden departure for MIT came as something of a surprise to me—especially since I didn't even know when he had left.

In the meantime I had asked Arthur Wahl, one of my two graduate students, to begin studying the tracer chemical properties of element 93 with the idea that this might be a good subject for his thesis. My other coworker was Joe Kennedy, who was a fellow instructor at the university and, as I have indicated, was also very interested in the general transuranium problem.

When I learned that Ed McMillan had gone, I wrote to him asking whether it might not be a good idea if we carried on the work he had started, especially the deuteron bombardment of uranium. He readily assented, writing that it was a good idea that this work be continued.

Our first deuteron bombardment of uranium was conducted on December 14, 1940. What we bombarded was a form of uranium oxide, U_3O_8, which was literally plastered onto a copper backing plate. From this bombarded material Art Wahl isolated a chemical fraction of element 93. The radioactivity of this fraction was measured and studied. We observed that it had different characteristics than the radiation from a sample of pure 93–239. The beta particles which in this case were due to a mixture of 93–239 and the new isotope of element 93 with mass number 238 (93–238) had a somewhat higher energy than those from pure 93–239 and there was more gamma radiation. But the composite half-life was about the same, namely, 2 days.

However, the sample also differed in another very important way from a sample of pure 93–239. Into this sample there grew an alpha particle emitting radioactivity. A proportional counter was used to count the alpha particles to the exclusion of the beta particles. This work led us to the conclusion that we had a daughter of the new isotope 93–238—a daughter with a half-life of about 50 years and with the atomic number 94. This is much shorter lived than the now known half-life of 94–239, which is 24,000 years. The shorter half-life means a higher intensity of alpha particle emission which explains why it was so much easier to identify what proved to be the isotope of element 94 with the mass number 238 (94–238). (Later it was proved that the true half-life of what we had, i.e., 94–238, is about 90 years.)

On January 28, 1941, we sent a short note to Washington describing our initial studies on element 94, which also served for later publication in the Physical Review under the names of McMillan, Wahl, Kennedy, and Seaborg. We didn't consider, however, that we had sufficient proof at that time to say we had discovered a new element and felt that we had to have chemical proof in order to be positive. So, during the rest of January and into February, we attempted to identify this alpha activity chemically.

Our attempts proved unsuccesful for some time. We did not find it possible to oxidize the isotope that was responsible for this alpha radioactivity. Then I recall that we asked Prof. Wendell Latimer, whose office was on the first floor of Gilman Hall, to suggest the strongest oxidizing agent that he knew for use in aqueous solution. At his suggestion we used peroxydisulfate with argentic ion as catalyst.

On the stormy night of February 23, 1941, in an experiment that ran well into the next morning, Art Wahl performed the oxidation which gave us proof that what we had made was chemically different than all other known elements. That experiment, and hence the first chemical identification of element 94, took place in room 307 of Gilman Hall, the room that is being dedicated as a national historic landmark today, 25 years later.

The communication to Washington describing this oxidation experiment, which was critical to the discovery of element 94, was sent on March 7, 1941, and this served for later publication in the Physical Review under the authorship of Kennedy, Wahl, and Seaborg.

Almost concurrent with this work was the search for, and the demonstration of the fission of, the isotope of major importance—that is, 94–239, the radioactive decay daughter of 93–239. Emilio Segre played a major role in this work together with Kennedy, Wahl, and me. The importance of element 94 stems from its fission properties and its capability of production in large quantities. This, of course, is a story of more than room 307 Gilman Hall. It involves, in addition, the 60-inch cyclotron, the Old Chemistry Building, the Crocker Laboratory, and the 37-inch cyclotron, all of which have by now been removed from the Berkeley campus. The 0.5 microgram sample, upon which the fission of 94–239 was first demonstrated, was produced by transmutation of uranium with neutrons from the 60-inch cyclotron, was chemically isolated in rooms in Old Chemistry Building, Crocker Laboratory and in room 307 Gilman, and the fission counting was done using the neutrons from the 37-inch cyclotron.

How element 94 eventually got its name, plutonium, is an interesting story and one worth telling on this occasion. The work was carried on under self-imposed secrecy in view of its potential implications for national security. Following the discovery in February 1941 and well into 1942, we continued, as I have in my talk thus far, to use only the name "element 94" among ourselves and the other few people who knew of the element's existence. But we needed a code name to be used for the times when we might be overheard in the halls of Gilman Hall discussing our work.

Someone had suggested "silver" as a code name for element 93, and we decided to use "copper" for element 94. This proved to be just fine until, for some reason which I can't recall now, it became necessary to use real copper in our work. To get around this dilemma we continued to call element 94 "copper," but then had on occasion to refer to the real thing as "honest-to-God copper."

The first time a true name for element 94 seemed necessary was in writing the report that we mailed to the Uranium Committee in Washington in March of 1942. I can remember very clearly the debates within our small group as to what that name might be. It eventually became obvious to us that we should follow the lead of Ed McMillan who had named element 93 neptunium, because Neptune is the next planet after Uranus which had served as the basis for naming uranium 150 years earlier. Thus we should name element 94 after Pluto, the next planet beyond Neptune.

But, and this is a little known story, it seemed to us that perhaps one way of using the base Pluto was to name the element "plutium." We debated the question of whether the name should be "plutium," or "plutonium," the sound of which we liked much better. We finally decided to take the name that sounded better and therefore suggested "plutonium." I think we made a wise choice, and I believe that it is also semantically correct.

There was also a matter of the need for a symbol. Here, too, a great deal of debate was engendered because, while the symbol might have been "Pl," we liked the sound of "Pu"—for the reason you might suspect. We decided on "Pu," and, I might add, we expected a much greater reaction after it was declassified than we ever received.

In thinking back to the early days of the discovery and in reading some of the early reports and correspondence, other events and thoughts come to mind which make one realize how times have changed. I recall reading the Uranium Committee report which Phil Abelson wrote concerning the importance of our experiments. In it he said:

"Obviously, the results of these experiments will have a large bearing in the determination of the value of uranium power. It is probable that the cost of isotope separation will be great. The decision to spend perhaps a million dollars on a separation plant may well hinge on the results of these experiments."

A million dollars? The amount seemed astronomical to us at the time. We had no idea that our work would play a major role in a program that would eventually cost more than $2 billion within a few years.

Only a short time after that Uranium Committee report, I recall I wrote to Lyman Briggs, at E. O. Lawrence's suggestion, requesting a contract for some further work that might be done on the measurement of fission cross sections in the uranium and transuranium regions. Among the items listed on my proposal was a request for a chemist Ph. D. assistant at the tempting annual salary of $3,000. Another item on that request was the use of the 60-inch cyclotron at a cost of $25 per hour.

But perhaps far more dramatic than these personal recollections, and certainly far more important, was the development of plutonium starting with that first identification in 307 Gilman Hall. No other element has seen a similar growth. Our first experiments were done with tracer amounts as small as a picogram—a million millionth of a gram. Within 5 years our country was producing plutonium in kilogram amounts. The intervening 20 years have seen the production of somewhere between megagram and gigagram amounts—an escalation of a billion billionfold.

What is the significance of the growth of plutonium? What bearing will this element have on our future? As is true with all the power of science and technology at our command today, what will come of plutonium depends on how we (all mankind) choose to use it. I will not dwell on its destructive potential. This is well known by most of us here today and most people around the world—so much so that to many the symbol of the nuclear age is unfortunately one of horror.

Perhaps fear of such massive destruction will be the deciding factor that will bring men to choose reason rather than conflict in settling their differences. In this case, perhaps it will also be the power of plutonium—but used constructively and beneficially—that will help men achieve some of the things essential to world stability, a more widely shared abundance, and a lasting peace.

For a few concluding thoughts; let me expand on this theme.

Essential to the growing industrialization of the world in the years ahead is going to be an abundance of economic power—primarily in the form of electricity. It is clear now that nuclear power will eventually play a major role in generating electricity. We are beginning to see the evolution of that role here in the United States and in several countries abroad. Plutonium 239, the fissionable fuel which can be produced from the abundant but nonfissionable isotope uranium 238, holds the key to almost unlimited nuclear power. Today we are developing the technology of the breeder reactor, the nuclear power system of the future, which will be able to produce vast amounts of electric power while at the same time producing more nuclear fuel than it consumes.

Today's nuclear power reactors are essentially limited to the small amount of uranium 235 (less than 1 percent) present in uranium, but the breeder reactors of the future will utilize all of the uranium; the abundant nonfissionable uranium 238 (constituting more than 99 percent of uranium) will be burned indirectly as nuclear fuel through its conversion to intermediate fissionable plutonium 239 in the course of operation of such breeders.

This technology will provide the world with enough electrical power for centuries to come, even at rates of consumption far greater than today's. Such abundant and economic energy, constructively and wisely used, will provide much more than merely the electricity to run the conveniences and gadgetry of an industrial and mechanized society. It will aid in providing the basic necessities of life to many areas of the world. Through large-scale desalting plants it will help provide water to arid regions. It will help provide the vast amount of energy that will be needed to produce the large quantities of chemical fertilizer essential to increased food production. It will help in the extraction and processing of the earth's mineral resources—particularly as we need more energy to utilize more of the world's lower grade ores. And it will help us to explore and make use of the tremendous untapped wealth of resources in the oceans of the world—resources of which we are only beginning to be aware and which many feel will play a most vital role in man's future.

In addition to these direct uses of nuclear energy which plutonium can provide, we have seen, and will be experiencing in greater number, other benefits of the atom through radioisotopes—those of plutonium and those created through its use in nuclear reactors. Radioisotopes derived from many sources have already proved to be a most valuable humanitarian, scientific, and technological tool in their service in medcine, agriculture, industry and various types of research. Their use in all these fields continues to grow with new applications constantly being discovered and put to use.

A particularly intriguing idea, now under study by the National Heart Institute, is the possibility of developing an artificial heart for implantation within the body to replace a damaged or failing human heart. And such a lifesaving and lifegiving device may be powered by plutonium, in this case plutonium 238, the first form of plutonium to be discovered.

Already plutonium has begun to play a role in our space program. The first use of nuclear power in space was that of a plutonium 238 thermoelectric generator to power a navigational satellite. That unit has been in orbit since 1961 and its signal is still coming through loud and clear after 500 million miles of travel. Since then three other plutonium-powered units have joined it.

I think we can look forward to the development of plutonium as a source of auxiliary electric power for manned and unmanned missions and eventually to supply power on the moon and planets. A plutonium fueled unit is already under development to power for a full year the experimental package that the Apollo astronauts will leave on the moon.

In conclusion, let me leave you with this thought: the advent of plutonium, with its potential for war or peace, its possible use for the devastation of this planet or the lifting of all men to new standards of living, sharply brings into focus the major dilemma of our day. Can man, who now holds his destiny in his own hands, act with enough wisdom, patience and understanding to choose the right path? I believe he can. I believe he will. I know that the years ahead will add strength to this conviction, and I hope that they will give cause to those who pass by room 307 to stop now and then, recall what took place there, and perhaps recognize the event as one of the small but rewarding moments in a history leading us all to a better and brighter tomorrow.

John F. Kennedy Junior High Dedicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure and privilege to deliver the

Dedication Day address on February 20, 1966, for the John F. Kennedy Junior High School, Randolph, Mass.

I would like to especially commend Mrs. David Good, for her excellent portrait of our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy. Mrs. Good's art career began and continued through her high school years at the Academy of the Assumption. She received her B.S. in art educaton in 1962 having attended the Massachusetts College of Art and has devoted much of her time to substitute teaching in the Randolph High School, attending painting courses and serving on art juries in local contests.

Mr. and Mrs. Good, both natives of Randolph, and their five children reside at 535 South Main Street, Randolph. An exhibition of Mrs. Good's paintings will be on display during March at the Brockton Public Library, Brockton, Massachusetts.

Following is an account of the ceremonies which appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger, of February 21, 1966, along with the text of my address and the dedication program.

[From the Randolph (Mass.) Patriot Ledger, Feb. 21, 1966]

FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTY ATTEND CEREMONIES: JOHN F. KENNEDY JUNIOR HIGH DEDICATED

RANDOLPH.—The new John F. Kennedy Junior High School was dedicated yesterday in ceremonies highlighted by tributes to the late President's interest in education and concern for the country's youth.

LATE PRESIDENT PRAISED

Senator JAMES R. MCINTYRE, mayor of Quincy, and U.S. Representative JAMES A. BURKE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, both praised the late President and spoke on his interest in education.

Congressman BURKE said Kennedy's vigor appealed to the youth of America and, in turn, youth had a "manifold responsibility to a past Congressman, Senator, and President."

Senator MCINTYRE was introduced by Raymond P. McGerrigle, school committeeman and chairman of the dedication committee.

More than 550 persons attended the ceremonies.

A portrait of President Kennedy was presented to the school by Mrs. David Good. The portrait will be hung in the school's library. A new American flag was also given to James L. Topham, Kennedy School principal, by Mrs. Dorothy Tolson, president of the Amvets Post Auxiliary.

OTHER SPEAKERS

Others speaking at the dedication included Dr. John Collins, headmaster at Newman Preparatory School, Boston; Norman Silk, chairman of the Randolph selectmen, and William J. Doherty, chairman of the school planning and building committee.

Participating in the ceremonies were the color guard of the Randolph Veterans' Council, the Kennedy Junior High School Band, under the direction of Leonard Rapoza; Deborah Christian, Paul Maloof, Edward Tedesco, architect; Rev. J. Sidney Kearns, pastor of St. Mary's School; Charles Green, school committeeman; Richard Coburn, finance committee chairman, and Rev. Arthur Bowler, minister of the First Congregational Church.

Prior to the ceremonies, the school was open for inspection by residents. The split-level building houses 28 regular classrooms, 11 specialized classrooms, a cafetorium with stage and kitchen, library, gymnasium, guidance rooms, and a teachers' room. The outdoor site encompasses a football field, baseball diamond, tennis courts, and areas for physical education.

DEDICATION: JOHN F. KENNEDY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, RANDOLPH, MASS., FEBRUARY 20, 1966, 3:30 P.M.

PROGRAM

Flag raising, color guard: veterans council—American Legion, DAV, VFW, AMVETS.

Invocation: Rev. Father John S. Kearns.

"The Star-Spangled Banner": John F. Kennedy Junior High School Band, Leonard Rapoza, director of music.

Salute and Pledge of Allegiance: Deborah Christian, Paul Maloof.

Greetings and introduction of guests: Raymond P. McGerrigle, chairman.

Presentation of keys—Acceptance: Mr. Edward Tedesco to Mr. William J. Doherty and Mr. Charles Green.

Presentation of portrait of President John F. Kennedy: Mrs. David Good.

Acceptance of portrait: Mr. Peter J. Davin, chairman, school committee.

Acceptance of American flag: Mr. James L. Topham, principal.

Introduction of speaker: Thomas L. Warren, superintendent of schools.

Remarks: Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, Congressman, 11th Massachusetts District.

Benediction: Rev. Arthur Bowler.

March—Military escort: Bennett, John F. Kennedy Junior High School Band.

DEDICATION COMMITTEE

Raymond P. McGerrigle, chairman; William J. Doherty, Daniel Hayes, Thomas L. Warren, William J. Lynch, Henry Lesser.

PLANNING

The school planning and building committee and the school committee presented to the town meeting members on March 4, 1963, the proposal to build a new junior high school in the center of Randolph.

This special town meeting of March 4, 1963, authorized the school planning and building committee and the school committee to apply for Federal funds under Public Law 560 of the 83d Congress for the purchasing of preliminary and final plans for a new junior high school.

This procedure was followed, and the town was able to borrow, interest free, the sum of $68,371 for architects' fees.

The economical, yet educationally functional building, is the result of many, many hours of thoughtful planning by the members of the school planning and building comittee, the school committee, and the administrators. It was opened for classes on Monday, November 22, 1965, coincidentally on the second anniversary of the assassination of the President.

FACILITIES

An egress walkway to the southeast from the school property to Alfred Terrace was constructed together with a steel fence along the entire east boundary to protect the property of homeowners.

Studies are now being made into the possibility of providing a second egress road to alleviate the traffic congestion.

A permanent sewer system was made from the school to the trunkline on Pleasant Street through an egress obtained through the Lind property.

The split level building, designed to follow the natural contours of the site contains the following: 28 regular classrooms, 11 specialized classrooms, shops or laboratories, a cafetorium with stage and kitchen, a library, a gymnasium, guidance rooms, and a teachers' room. Maintenance-free materials have been used and, wherever necessary, acoustic materials have been amply provided. A variety of color has been used throughout in order to provide a pleasant atmosphere for work.

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL PLANNING AND BUILDING COMMITTEE

Chairman: William J. Doherty; secretary, James J. Tantillo; George Beatty, John A. Dellea, Daniel Hayes, Kenneth J. Bradbury, Eugene Solon, Henry Lesser, Walter Winston, Harvey Teed, Raymond P. McGerrigle.

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Chairman, Peter J. Davin; secretary, Mrs. Marie Helm Cormey; Charles E. Green, Jr., Mrs. Patricia M. McDermott; Raymond P. McGerrigle.

Architect: Edward J. Tedesco Associates, AIA.

General contractor: Tocci Bros. Construction Co., Inc.

Clerk of the works: Bruce Dunbar.

Principal: John F. Kennedy Junior High School, Mr. James L. Topham.

Dedication committee: Raymond P. McGerrigle, chairman; William J. Doherty, Thomas L. Warren, Henry Lesser, William J. Lynch, Daniel Hayes.

EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANTS

Thomas L. Warren, superintendent of schools; William J. Lynch, assistant superintendent of schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The school planning and building committee wishes to express its thanks to the town meeting members, the board of selectmen, the school committee, and the superintendent of schools and the assistant superintendent of schools—and gratefully acknowledges its appreciation to all who have so generously contributed assistance.

The Randolph School Committee wishes in the name of the school system personnel and the pupils to thank the townspeople and the members of the school building and planning committee for their cooperative efforts in providing this excellent and much-needed schoolbuilding.

"Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."—John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States—1961–63.

The sculptor: Bert Kilgore, the sculptor who executed the bas relief of John F. Kennedy for Edward Tedesco Associates, is a native of Wakefield, Mass., and presently resides in Woburn. Although he has worked in various parts of the country, most of his sculpture has been for New England architects.

Mr. Kilgore received his formal art training in the School of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston. His works are to be found in many parts of New England.

His sculpture is architectural and he considers the portrait at the John F. Kennedy Junior High School to be an ideal example of collaboration between the arts of architecture and sculpture. The depth of the carving and recession of the marble panels into the brick wall indicate that this work was not an afterthought on the part of the architect, but raher a preconceived idea carried through to completion.

PORTRAIT OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mrs. David Good, painter and donor of the excellent portrait of our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy, is a resident of Randolph, and graduate of the Massachusetts College of Art.

Her painting of the late President has been called one of the finest for the way in which it has caught the firmness, yet the youth, humor, and courage of the man.

SITE

The site of the school is most ideal, being centrally located on a sloping eminence overlooking to the north, the St. Mary's Parochial School complex and to the east, the town of Holbrook.

Access to the school is from Mill Street with a road named in honor of Mr. William

Hurley, a veteran of World War I and a long-time resident of the immediate area.

The 16-acre site was purchased by the town of Randolph from Mr. Lind for $43,600 and has been extensively landscaped with a football field, baseball diamond, tennis courts, and areas for physical education.

STATISTICS

Acreage: 16.87 acres.
Building area, 86,910 square feet.
Student capacity: 1,000 students.
Parking capacity: 185 cars.
Building cost per square foot: $15.60.

Expenditures:

General contract including site development	$1,560,400
Planning and supervision	112,320
Clerk of the works	12,450
Furnishings and equipment	133,123
Miscellaneous	14,301
Unexpended	4,406
Total appropriation	1,837,000

State: 50 percent.

DEDICATION AT RANDOLPH JOHN F. KENNEDY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL BY HON. JAMES A. BURKE

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, faculty members, and friends, I am delighted to have been invited to speak at the dedication of this beautiful junior high school, named in memory of our late and beloved President John F. Kennedy. This dedication ceremony has particular significance to me because I had the honor of serving in the U.S. Congress under his direction as President. John F. Kennedy always had an intense interest in education. As a Congressman from Massachusetts, in one of his early educational proposals, John Kennedy said: "I am aware that Massachusetts is not an island unto itself, and its progress, its peace, its prosperity, and ultimately its survival depend upon the wisdom and enlightenment of the public school graduates in every part of the country." Let us not forget that much of the educational legislation passed during the last session of Congress was originally initiated by John F. Kennedy.

His youthful vigor appealed greatly to the younger generation and they immediately began to identify themselves with the President. President Kennedy encouraged their confidence by choosing the youth of America to represent our country abroad under the auspices of the Peace Corps. He realized that the future of our country was in their hands and emphasized to American youth the importance of staying in school and completing their education. We, of Massachusetts can be justly proud of our schools and the remembrance that one of our native sons was elected to Congress, went on to become a great Senator, and a dearly beloved President of the United States. These attainments should be emphasized to the students of John F. Kennedy Junior High School, since they too can become the future leaders of America. John F. Kennedy was so proud to be the President of a democratic society because he believed that only in a democracy did the future leadership depend so much on educational preparation.

Our Government has made education free and available to every American, beginning with the elementary school and continuing through high school. Junior high school is an important transition, the transition to greater maturity and learning. It is with the introduction of junior high school that the student begins to sort out his knowledge and attains a greater proficiency in subject matter.

Those of you who will be studying and teaching at this beautiful John F. Kennedy Junior High School have a manifold responsibility, a responsibility to a past Congressman, Senator, President, and educator. It is up to all of you not to allow specialization of subject matter to consume the student as well as the teacher. Having broad interests is most important in keeping our democratic way of life alive.

Unfortunately, President Kennedy did not live to see many of his educational ideals enacted into legislation, but let all of us here cherish his name and be inspired by his educational beliefs. In a message to Congress, President Kennedy referred to education as a "keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." Today, let us remember the name of John F. Kennedy as a keystone in the structure of this school. I know that I share with all of you the hope that this school will endure and flourish with all of the beauty and greatness inherent in its fine name.

Is Appeasement of the Aggressors Going To Be the Reward for Our Heroes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, February 21, 1966, on page A–3 of the Washington Evening Star, appeared two stores of American heroism in Vietnam. Nearly 200,000 brave young Americans are fighting tyranny and aggression in Vietnam. They are fighting, not only to protect the right of the South Vietnamese to be free, but they are also fighting to prevent the spread of Communist aggression until it enslaves our own land.

American heroes are dying in Vietnam to protect the right of those who are doing their best to cause our defeat at the hands of the leaders of the Communist conspiracy. Certainly all Americans respect the right of free discussion and we will preserve the right of dissent. But where do we draw the line between legitimate debate and honest dissent and treason?

Is sending blood, funds, and propaganda to the enemy that is killing Americans, dissent or treason? Does free debate include the right to fly the flag above our own and to falsely accuse our own country of crimes against humanity?

I hope many Americans, including Members of Congress, read the articles in Monday's Star. And if they did, what will they tell these brave boys on that day when we all must make a reckoning of how we lived and how we died? What are those Members of the other body who are so sure America is wrong and the enemy is right, willing to say to the loved ones of these brave heroes? Or is peace so sweet and fear so great that our country has reached the point where we are ready to abandon all honor, all respect, all freedom in the hope that we may be permitted to live?

Throughout the proud history of America our people have stood for freedom. Every generation has produced those who prefer death to slavery. Have we lost the courage of those who have gone before?

I do not believe the American people have, but I am afraid there are those in positions of leadership who, for whatever reason, seem to be willing to abandon principle for expediency, freedom for slavery, honor for peace. Let us rededicate ourselves to the principles upon which this Nation was founded and for which countless thousands have bled and died and for which Americans are suffering and dying today in Vietnam.

It may be a small measure of tribute, but I would like to include the stores of American heroes, Stephen Laier and James McKeown, in the hope that their sacrifice will remind all Americans of national purposes which seem to be forgotten. Stephen Laier and James McKeown will be remembered by history and their memory will be enshrined forever in the hearts of men who dream of freedom. Who remembers today the name of the screaming beatnik who took part in yesterday's anti-American demonstration?

The news stories from the Star follow:

A HERO'S 15 DAYS: COURAGE TO GATES OF DEATH

(By Peter Arnett)

SAIGON.—A young infantryman named Stephen Laier has shown in 15 pain-filled days that in some men the only limit to courage is death.

The courage of Laier, 18 years old, 6 feet tall, and weighing 225 pounds, almost defies comprehension by men who have never been wounded in battle.

From the moment he lost both his legs to a bursting Vietcong mine early in February, to the time 15 days later when life finally ebbed from his body, Laier fought for survival with a tenacity that brought tears to the eyes of those who knew his wounds were mortal. The doctors did everything to save him.

Big, blond Laier, from Fort Wayne, Ind., suffered his terrible wounds February 4 as an ambush patrol from his company of the 1st Battalion, 16th Regiment, 1st Division, chased a sniper and got hit by hidden mines wired to detonate simultaneously.

LOSES BOTH LEGS AT ONCE

Three of the men were killed instantly, the remaining 11 wounded. Laier, close by the mines when they burst, lost his legs on the spot.

With wounds this terrible, most men slip into shock and die.

Laier, the radioman for the patrol told doctors later he knew he was the only man alive capable of operating his radio equipment.

He tied rough tourniquets around the stumps of his legs and groped for his radio in the undergrowth. The blast had upset the calibration of his radio.

In the gathering dusk, Laier retuned the set, a difficult job for a whole man. Then he began calling to his company headquarters at nearby Lai Khe.

AID TAKES 35 MINUTES

Laier then attempted to call down medical helicopters, but they could not land because of the darkness. A patrol from his company arrived on foot, guided by him.

By this time 35 minutes had gone by.

His company commander, Capt. Edward Yaugo, from Warren, Ohio, asked Laier, "Is there anything we can do for you?"

Laier replied, "Yes, you can get me some morphine."

Dr. Kris Keggi, from El Paso, Tex., remembers Laier being brought into the 3d Surgical Hospital at Bien Hoa that night.

"Medically, he was dead then," Keggi said. "We probed his veins. There was no blood in them. He was literally down to his last drop of blood."

TREMENDOUS WILL TO LIVE

Keggi and his aides pumped 6 pints of blood into the youth and he came around.

Fifteen days later a total of 60 pints of blood had been given him, literally replacing his normal blood supply six times.

"His will to live was tremendous," Dr. Keggi said.

Laier developed a multiplicity of complications, necessitating further operations on his legs.

"We fought against amputating his legs at the hips," Keggi said. "We hated to do that. This man had been a football player, and he told us that he wanted to get out, wear tin legs, and walk again."

At no time did Laier complain about his misfortune.

NURSE HELPS WITH LETTERS

"Maybe it was because his grandfather had lost his legs because of diabetes. He didn't seem afraid to face life," said Capt. Marguerite Giroux, from Malone, N.Y., the operating room nurse.

Nurse Giroux helped Laier write letters home, to his mother and his girl friend.

"He was so brave, that he didn't even want to tell his girl friend that he was so sick. He said she would not have to worry about him," Nurse Giroux said.

To help sustain him in his quiet desperate fight for life, Laier, a Roman Catholic, asked for a priest. As many as five Catholic chaplains at a time came to visit him. Nurse Giroux said he prayed constantly.

GENERAL GIVES BRONZE STAR

Laier's commanding officer, Maj. Gen. Jonathan Seaman, visited Laier several times. Seaman was so impressed with the young radioman that he wrote a friend, "This is one of the bravest men I have seen in 30 years as a soldier."

Seaman presented Laier a Bronze Star with "V" for valor, and told him. "This is the highest award in my power to present you. I wish I could present you with a higher one."

Laier told his commanding general: "I want to stay in the Army when I get my new legs."

Death did not come as a merciful blessing for the terribly wounded infantryman. He tried hard not to die.

HE DIVED ON THE GRENADE: GI GIVES LIFE FOR BUDDIES

(By John T. Wheeler)

CU CHI, Vietnam.—"When he spotted the grenade, he lunged on top of it without hesitation. He hollered, 'Move out you people,' and then it went off."

Spec. 4 James McKeown, of Willingbro, N.J., was telling about Spec. 4 Daniel Fernandez, 21, of Los Lunas, N. Mex., whose ultimate act of bravery saved the lives of four of his buddies.

But the blast of the Vietcong grenade ended his life.

His officers are recommending him for the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Last Friday, Fernandez was in a reinforced squad lying in ambush outside the 25th Division's 2d Brigade perimeter, 25 miles west of Saigon. The Americans were hit by a much larger Vietcong force using a .50-caliber machinegun, a light machinegun, automatic weapons, and plenty of grenades.

"The grenade hit Dan on the foot as he was crawling," McKeown said today. "When it went off, it tore into his groin, abdomen, and right leg."

Pvt. David R. Masingale, of Fresno, Calif., a medic, told Fernandez while they were waiting for a medical evacuation helicopter, "Hang on, buddy."

Fernandes replied, "I'm going to hang on." But he added: "I never believed it would hurt so much."

Just before the helicopter took off, Fernandez asked Sgt. Ruben Perkins, of Nashville, Tenn., "Who's going to take care of you now?"

"We had been working together ever since we joined the unit," Perkins said. "He called me 'Sergeant Rock' and I called him 'Old Dan.' He was real young, but real grownup in his attitude.

Fernandez, whose father, Jose, lives at Los Lunas, already had served one stint in Vietnam, a 90-day volunteer tour as a door gunner on armed helicopters. He earned the Air Medal and a Purple Heart during that tour.

He returned to Vietnam last month with the 1st Platoon, C Company, of the 5th Mechanized Infantry's 1st Battalion.

He was still volunteering.

"He was in the same spot the night before and volunteered to go out on patrol again even though he hadn't had any sleep for 48 hours," 2d Lt. Joseph D'Orso of Norwalk, Conn., said. "He was always volunteering."

Masingale, one of those saved by Fernandez' lunge atop the grenade, said his friend "had a girl back home he planned to marry when he got back. He also wanted to get a new truck for his father's ranch."

Dan Fernandez was hit by a rifle bullet after the grenade exploded. He lived to get back to the brigade hospital. Doctors fought for 2 hours to save him, but the internal bleeding was heavy.

The Vietcong paid a price, too. Seventeen of them were killed and five others were believed killed and carried away by comrades.

Invitation to Freeloaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as I scanned the editorial page of the Waukegan News-Sun, of Thursday, February 10, 1966, the aforementioned caption caught my eye.

The Waukegan News-Sun is a daily published in the principal city of Lake County, most populous of the counties which comprise the 12th Illinois District. It wields a decided influence as an opinionmaker.

In this editorial, "Invitation to Freeloaders," is summed up the opinions of a considerable number of my constituents and, I venture to say, of my colleagues and their constituents. I recommend it to those who have not given serious thought to the reasons why H.R. 8282 should be defeated.

INVITATION TO FREELOADERS

When a depression-haunted Congress enacted legislation about 30 years ago requiring every State to set up basic unemployment compensation laws, the objectives were simple and clearcut.

To qualify, unemployed workers had to be willing and able to work. Benefits from the program, separately governed by each State, were to go to legitimate wage earners who had clearly lost jobs through no fault of their own.

The program has since become an accepted part of American life—but policing has posed persistent problems. Through the years, thousands of unscrupulous claimants—loafers, schemers, parasites, and moonlighters—have bilked millions of undeserved dollars from the States.

And now before Congress is a bill, H.R. 8282, which threatens to open the door wider than ever before to freeloaders, while at the same time, taking away the States right to govern the program as they see fit.

The bill is being pushed hard by labor, personified by George Meany and Walter Reuther. Another ardent supporter, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, has given his stamp of approval.

What does this bill plan to do? First, it will allow Washington to set the standards for distribution of unemployment benefits in all States—a State prerogative until now.

Second, benefits will be doubled and tripled. And the terms of these benefits could run as long as 1 year.

In Lake County, an unemployed, unmarried worker can draw a maximum $42 per week for 26 weeks under unemployment compensation. Once in awhile, he may receive an emergency 13-week extension, based on an overall increase in unemployment in Illinois.

Under H.R. 8282, by 1971, this same Lake County worker could draw $100 or more each week for a minimum of 26 weeks, not a maximum as under the present law. Furthermore, the bill would relax the number of safeguards already imposed by the States. Workers who voluntarily quit jobs for any reason, including just plain laziness, could still receive compensation. The same would be true of employees who had been dismissed for outright misconduct.

The question that is always asked is: "Who pays for this tremendous increase in unemployment compensation?" Initially, the answer is the employer who would be saddled with an estimated 60-percent increase in payroll taxes. Ultimately, unless the employers could somehow absorb the higher cost, the increase would be passed on to the buying public.

From a narrow, individual point of view, the liberalized benefits may be tempting. But measured in terms of the broad public interest, exorbitant benefits without proper safeguards against abuse would badly distort the true spirit of unemployment compensation.

Instead of deterring unemployment, or in the altruistic sense, allowing wage earners a small stipend during a rough period, the bill would make a mockery of personal incentive while diminishing the rights of States and forcing employers and consumers to foot the huge bill.

H.R. 8282 should be defeated.

Dr. Bernard Braskamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected death of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, was a great shock. He was a man of wisdom, and good counsel who daily reminded this House that everything we do here, no matter how vital and enduring it may seem at the moment, shall all pass away but that the Kingdom of the Lord shall endure forever.

For 16 years Chaplain Braskamp ministered to this House, invoking devine blessings on our efforts. Although he was a stanch Presbyterian, he served God; and his ministry applied alike to all who serve and have served in this House.

We will miss this good and wise man who so honorably served the Lord in this

Hall of public servants. I join my colleagues in extending condolences to his family and assure them that their father and brother has won an enduring place in the annals of Congress.

No Hasty Judgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachasetts. Mr. Speaker, it has apparently become fashionable in certain quarters of late to raise a shrill cry against the war on poverty. Various instances of local maladministration and questionable judgment have been denounced, often with partisan fanfare, as if to prove the entire, vast national effort a scandalous waste of money. Those who are the first to seize upon isolated local misadventures are invariably the last to concede the tremendous amount of good being achieved in a virtually endless panorama of antipoverty projects and programs from one corner of our Nation to another.

In this light I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial entitled "No Hasty Judgment" which appeared in the Pilot, the official organ of the archdiocese of Boston, on January 22.

As the editorial puts it:

> The miracle of the poverty program is that so much has been done so well, so quickly. Without the opportunity of long-range planning, without any appreciable experience in the field, with continuing lack of trained personnel, this effort has reached out into the most difficult and complex social area in American life and it has made its force felt.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the Pilot for contributing to informed discussion of the war against poverty, and I would like to have the editorial inserted at this point in the Record:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Pilot, Jan. 22, 1966]

NO HASTY JUDGMENT

Poverty is not a pretty word, but it is even less attractive as a fact of life. For the first time in our national history, with the possible exception of the depression years, a realistic attempt is being made to face the fact that millions of Americans live a submarginal existence because of poverty.

It is now becoming fashionable to attack the poverty program by calling it confused, corrupt, or just a plain waste of money. A sensitive observer, and a knowledgeable one, could not agree with this estimation at all. The miracle of the poverty program is that so much has been done so well, so quickly. Without the opportunity of long-range planning, without any appreciable experience in the field, with continuing lack of trained personnel, this effort has reached out into the most difficult and complex social area in American life and it has made its force felt.

Against this background it was encouraging this week to read of the support of the program offered formally by the organized religious groups of America. The Council of Churches, the Synagogue Council, and the National Catholic Welfare Conference have joined hands to bring the special resources of their numerous agencies, and immense membership, to the aid of the Federal Government in its war on want. Here, as in the race question, some will suggest that the churches keep to their sanctuaries and leave the social problems to the experts. Poverty, however, like race, is a moral problem which touches both the individual and the family in more than just a physical way. Most experts are pleased to have the religious agencies as allies in a struggle which must be carried forward on every front to be successful.

Americans, generally, have been pleased to be blind even to the existence of the poor; they have left them to the welfare programs and decided they had done all that was required of them. The poverty programs that aid the poor are also going to have low visibility for most citizens; most people won't see the results, but still won't refrain from judging them. Meanwhile, irresponsible publicity will magnify every irregularity, and the public will be deceived. This whole national effort is going to demand originality and imagination, as well as boldness and industry, of all who are part of it; those outside it can at least show patience and sympathy, until realistic evaluation is possible and its success tested.

Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the Record an excellent resolution by the Michigan Bear Hunters Association, Inc., in opposition to restrictive firearms legislation so oppressive to the rights of our legitimate sportsmen, hunters, and target shooters:

RESOLUTION BY THE MICHIGAN BEAR HUNTERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Whereas S. 1592 now pends in committee in the U.S. Senate, there having been extensive hearings during the last year; and

Whereas this association is convinced that the avowed purpose of this bill, namely, reduction of crime and juvenile delinquency, will not be accomplished either in whole or in part thereby; and

Whereas should said bill become law, it would create untold and completely unnecessary hardship and nuisance to the law-abiding sportsman; and

Whereas said bill is founded upon the policy of making all firearms, including sporting rifles and shotguns, generally unavailable in the mistaken belief that this will curb crime; and

Whereas the amendments to S. 1592 proposed by its proponents, cannot in the collective opinion of this association, correct the very erroneous philosophy of the bill, which is to make firearms generally unavailable; and

Whereas this association insists that the rights of the law-abiding citizen to have and to lawfully use sporting weapons must not be denied or diluted; and

Whereas this association would favor legislation to amend the Federal Firearm Act designed to make it a Federal offense of the seller to ship a gun under any circumstances that will violate the State laws of the buyer; and

Whereas this association is in complete agreement with the National Rifle Association in respect to firearms legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

1. That this association is unalterably opposed to passage of S. 1592 in any form and regardless of proposed amendments;
2. That this association support the views and recommendations of the National Rifle Association, believing as it does, that such are sound and proper; and
3. That copies of this resolution be furnished to Senators Hart and McNamara, and all Michigan Representatives in the House.

Attest:

PAUL BURNETT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Supervisor Fred Haight: A Great Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, a very close friend and former colleague of mine, who served the people of Del Norte County for many years, has recently departed from our midst. While many of the Members of Congress were not privileged to know this gentleman, I am, under leave to extend my remarks, taking this opportunity to include comments that I have made that portray the character of one of the great humanitarians and public servants in and for the county of Del Norte, Calif. Mr. Fred Haight literally gave his life to the people of Del Norte County:

SUPERVISOR FRED HAIGHT: A GREAT HUMANITARIAN

Our friend, Fred Haight, has been called to the great beyond. In learning of a friend's passing, one immediately recalls the many events and activities that took place as a result of one's association with that person. I am certain many people in Del Norte County are doing just this very thing.

While Fred Haight was principally known as the supervisor from Smith River and as chairman of the board of supervisors for our beloved Del Norte County, he was affectionately known as "Uncle Fred" to his many friends who knew and loved him. His many deeds, that were most often carried out without fanfare or publicity, will be remembered well into the future. He was in his glory when he was doing things for people—be it his constitutents, his community church, his many friends, and in particular, young people and children.

It was my privilege to serve with Fred Haight on the board of supervisors for many years. We agreed on many issues and we also disagreed, but with each passing year of service, I became better acquainted with "Uncle Fred's" manner of serving his people.

On the lighter side, a mutual interest in sports, particularly baseball, provided a strong bond between us. For many years, prior to my time, Fred Haight was an outstanding catcher in Del Norte baseball circles. During my pitching days in Crescent City, my former teammates and the faithful Crescent City merchant baseball fans will recall Fred's attendance at every home game. I will always remember that familiar face—typical of a former catcher—sitting behind homeplate watching to see if my curve would break or if I would throw the pitch that he thought should be thrown.

His genuine interest in road development, agriculture, aviation, county buildings and, in particular, the hospital and humanitarian programs, brought much in the way of social progress to his community and county.

These are but a few of the fond memories that many of us will retain always. I know all of Del Norte County will agree in saying respectfully to Fred Haight's family, "We thank you for sharing this very warm, congenial, and lovable 'country gentleman' with us." He certainly gave his full measure of devotion to the many causes he believed in.

Human Investment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared recently in one of the leading newspapers of Illinois' 22d Congressional District, the Decatur Herald. It refers favorably to a "human resources development program" which has won the endorsement of Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz.

The program described in the editorial is good as far as it goes. But it should not be confused with the proposed Human Investment Act which I and a number of my Republican colleagues of the House and Senate have introduced in the 89th Congress and which offers a more fundamental approach to the structural unemployment problem as it exists today.

As Roscoe Drummond pointed out in his column a few weeks ago, the job situation has turned upside down to what it was a few years ago.

> For the first time since the industrial revolution—

He wrote—

> there are more jobs in the United States looking for workers than there are workers to fill them.

More than 3 million jobs are said to be open. Fewer than 3 million workers are trying to qualify for the jobs. Most of them simply do not have the required skills.

The Republican approach is to provide private enterprise with the incentive to shoulder the expense of converting these skill-lacking "human resources" into productive workers who will draw their checks at the paymaster's window instead of at the local welfare office. We propose that the 7 percent tax credit for new investment in plant and equipment—one of the first enactments of the Kennedy administration—be extended to include investment in training programs for the unskilled.

Private enterprise has created the jobs necessary to deal a knockout blow to unemployment. Now it should be encouraged to train qualified workers to take the jobs.

The following editorial refers to the great expense involved in Government retraining programs. I, too, believe some of these programs have been worthwhile. But the Republican proposal offers to do the job better at considerably less cost to the taxpayer. It would require no vast Government bureaucracy to administer it. Perhaps that is the reason that it has not aroused more enthusiasm from an administration which often seems to show more interest in hiring people to look after the poor than in helping the poor to look after themselves.

WAY TO HELP NARROW AMERICA'S SKILLED LABOR GAP

Despite the demands of a booming economy and the growing manpower needs of the military, America continues to have an unemployment problem.

This was the conclusion reached by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz in a speech in Chicago last November. The secretary also offered a solution.

Mr. Wirtz declared that there are about 1 million individuals who will not be able to find work because they are not equipped for the kinds of jobs available or they are unaware of openings.

He then suggested a "human resources development program" which is now being conducted in Chicago on an experimental basis.

Most manpower programs begin with the needs of certain employers and attempt to find workers.

The human resources program works from the opposite end. It finds the unemployed individuals and then tries to find a job for him.

This is an exhausing and tedious task. The hard-core unemployed are often the invisible members of society. Most schools make no effort to keep up the files of students who drop out before completion of their studies. Dropouts of course constitute a major portion of this segment of hard-core unemployment.

So, using primarily State and local funds the experiment must begin with a house-to-house survey of neighborhoods seeking out the unemployed.

The program is also expensive. One expert has estimated that it costs roughly twice as much to prepare and place a "human resources" participant than the average $1,800 per worker spent in other manpower programs.

One of the reasons for this great expense is that it often takes more than a year of retraining to equip these individuals. However, in view of the $2,500 a year it would cost to support this individual on welfare, the expense is a sound social investment.

The experimental program is now being expanded to St. Louis and there plans to begin similar experiments in Houston, Los Angeles, and Rochester, N.Y., in the near future.

One of the chief earmarks of a mass, urban society is the lack of identity for the individual. Social problems are, after all, but the result of individual problems.

The human resources program has offered these forgotten individuals a chance for inclusion in the benefits of an affluent economy.

The program can be undertaken only through local initiative and with local talent and resources. In a day when the pervasiveness of the Federal Government is so often cited, this experiment offers a direct challenge to State and local leaders to share in the assistance of their less fortunate neighbors.

Dynamic Leadership for RBA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently I read where my good friend "Matt" Kane has been elected as president of the Washington Restaurant Beverage Association. Matt is a fine and able person, a hard worker and a great citizen. The association is fortunate in having such a man as its president.

An article follows:

DYNAMIC LEADERSHIP FOR RBA

Restauranteur Matthew J. "Matt" Kane, who was elected to the presidency of the Washington Restaurant Beverage Association last month, takes to the office a record of boundless energy and exceptional accomplishment.

Born and reared in Chicago, Matt saw active combat duty as a submariner during World War II. Returning to civilian life he threw himself whole-heartedly into veteran affairs and proceeded to win just about every honor his VFW pals could bestow upon him, from commander of his post to prominent positions in departmental and national matters. Matt won the highest recognition in local VFW history as the first and only department commander in the District of Columbia to head a national encampment and parade and was presented a car in February 1954 for being the Nation's No. 1 commander in a huge membership drive.

From the very start of his business career, Matt has been a successful operator and his whole life has been involved in dealing directly with the public. First it was Kane's Guest Houses which he operated for 12 years prior to opening Matt Kane's "News Room" at 1118 13th Street on January 5, 1960. This proved so successful that 6 months later he opened his well-known "Bit-of-Ireland" restaurant at the same address.

To say that Matt has taken an active part in RBA is putting it mildly. He has been vice president of the association for the past 2 years, has inaugurated such events as the RBA Redskins Night, the Police and Firemen Widows' Fund, headed RBA's Christmas party, was treasurer of the Jimmy Lake testimonial and served on various other committees.

In the best sense of the word, Matt is known as a "big-hearted Irishman who loves people." He is past chairman of the local VFW Damon Runyon Cancer Fund and inaugurated that organizations' annual Christmas Basket Fund for the needy. But perhaps his most outstanding accomplishment as an organizer lies in the field of membership promotion at which he has been preeminently successful.

Another facet in the intensely busy life of this dynamic personality is his keen interest in sports. He is exceptionally well known in all sports circles and is the assistant boxing coach for the Navy Quartermasters Corps.

A "true son of the Old Sod," Matt has made his Bit-of-Ireland as authentically Irish as it is humanly possible to do so—even to the extent of importing a bit of actual soil from Erin for his customers and friends to trod upon reverently.

Matt carries to his new office the rare gift of making "instant friends" with everyone he meets and, like his immediate predecessor, Sanford Bomstein, now serving as chairman of the board of directors of RBA, has developed a vast circle of stanch friends in every walk of life. In view of RBA's present leadership, one would not have to go very far out on the limb to predict a year of unprecedented success and accomplishment for the association in 1966.

Hoffa Reaches for Still More Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times has accurately pointed out that "with friends like Jimmy Hoffa, the American labor movement does not need any enemies."

Mr. Hoffa's proposal leading to the threat of general strikes is not in the best interests of the public or the American workingman. The Hoffa scheme can only lead to the imposition of restrictive laws upon organized labor and a stifling of the great contributions which the unions have made to strengthening our economy and bringing a measure of equality and justice to the collective bargaining table.

The Times editorial of February 8 follows:

HOFFA REACHES FOR STILL MORE POWER

With friends like Jimmy Hoffa, the American labor movement doesn't need any enemies.

The president of the Teamsters Union, who has managed thus far to stay a step ahead of Federal efforts to clap him in jail, delivered himself of some rather fantastic proposals over the weekend.

First, Hoffa announced a campaign to enroll professional athletes from baseball, football, and other sports in a giant union under the Teamsters' wing.

Nothing could undermine public confidence in the cleanliness of sports faster than allowing a man with Hoffa's record of unsavory connections to gain a position of influence.

Fortunately, both team owners and players appear cool to the Teamster plans.

One day after inviting himself into professional sports, Hoffa made an even more extraordinary proposal.

In a Detroit address, he suggested that unions should join in fixing a common expiration date for all labor contracts in each city, and for unions in allied industries across the Nation.

There is nothing unusual about union contracts within a given industry having a common expiration date. This is the pattern where industrywide bargaining exists.

But Hoffa's proposal goes much further, since it is aimed at giving organized labor the power to stage massive walkouts, cutting across union and industry lines.

The Teamster boss says he wants to follow the example of foreign countries "where you find whole cities shut down" by general strikes.

There is no reason to believe that responsible union leaders will rise to the Hoffa bait. In fact, they are probably considerably embarassed by it, since it comes on the eve of a key Senate vote on labor-backed efforts to outlaw State right-to-work statutes.

The outcry resulting from the transit strike which paralyzed New York is evidence enough that the American people would not tolerate the kind of massive union power envisioned by Hoffa.

Any serious move in that direction almost certainly would result in restrictive legislation or application to unions of the antitrust laws.

Vietnam Clarification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial which appeared in the Long Island Press of February 23, 1966, entitled "Vietnam Clarification."

I wholeheartedly agree with the point taken in the editorial, on the need for clarification, and commend the article to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

VIETNAM CLARIFICATION

There is a great hue and cry over how to achieve our aims in Vietnam. Some say we've had enough debate and let's get on with the job. But should we stop the debate when we still don't know what the "job" is really all about? Hardly.

It is in this area that Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY is doing the Nation a service. His controversial statement about a coalition in Vietnam with the Vietcong is forcing some hard, cold looks at where we're going and how we will get there in Vietnam.

Only debate can bring some measure of clarity into these cloudy issues. On Saturday, for instance, Senator KENNEDY did not specify free elections as a precondition for including Communists in any postwar government in Saigon. Yesterday, he made it clear he meant that this precondition must be met.

Over the weekend Vice President HUMPHREY, Under Secretary of State George Ball, and Presidential Assistant McGeorge Bundy blasted Senator KENNEDY. But yesterday, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, another of the President's top advisers, took a position close to the Senator's.

If Senator KENNEDY means representation for the Communists through free elections, General Taylor said, "I'd have no trouble with it * * *. If he means negotiating them into a coalition government, I'd not be for it."

What the Senator is now saying makes more sense than his original statement. He is now calling for clarification of this serious confusion in the administration's policy.

He pointed out a glaring contradiction. On one hand, the United States claims it will talk with Vietcong and Hanoi without any preconditions whatsoever. On the other, there are indications that these are preconditions, including the one that none of the dissident elements "which undoubtedly will include the Communists will be represented in the government."

"You can't have it both ways," he said, "and in my judgment this is important for us to be clarified."

Regardless of how one might feel about Senator KENNEDY'S views, he has served the purpose of forcing discussion. What he is saying, in essence, is that if we are fighting a limited war, we must expect a limited peace and must begin to think, therefore, in terms of those limitations. If not, if we are to fight a total war aiming for unconditional surrender, then we must face up to all its bloody consequences.

Youth Concert Thrilling Event

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the performance of the orchestra from the Interlochen Arts Academy, Monday evening in the State Department Auditorium, here in our Nation's Capital, made me proud to be from the State of Michigan and to be a member of the Michigan congressional delegation which sponsored the concert.

As a measure of the effect on the audience, a former member of a famous string quartet with the London Symphony Orchestra was exuberantly collecting autographs.

Mr. Speaker, the United States could do no better than to have this group of talented, disciplined, delightful young people tour the countries of the world with their outstanding gift of music.

Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, who taught music for 20 years at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor—which is in my district—and who is professor emeritus from that great institution of learning, is to be congratulated for holding onto his long-time dream of a great arts academy until it became a reality. Thor Johnson, who coaxed, bewitched, or developed a group of high school music students into a single instrument of surpassing beauty, is to be applauded. My deep appreciation also goes to each member of the orchestra behind whose performance were many hours of concentrated practice and single-minded devotion to the mastery of an art that speaks in a universal language to peoples of every land.

I take special pleasure in the fact that the following members of the orchestra are from the Second Congressional District of Michigan: Roberta VanMeter, Plymouth—violin; Norman Fischer, Plymouth—violoncello; Michael Ferguson, Ypsilanti—bassoon and contra-bassoon; Gary Breeding, Milan—french horn; Edward Kalousdian, Ann Arbor—tuba; Peter Bonisteel, Ann Arbor—percussion.

In the Washington newspapers which covered the concert, the string section was referred to as a disciplined, many-splendored thing, and the programing was considered to be "comparable to that of any symphony orchestra in the world."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD the reviews of the Interlochen Orchestra's concert written by Cecilia H. Porter for the Washington Post and Wendell Margrave for the Evening Star, both published on February 22:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 22, 1966]

YOUTH CONCERT THRILLING EVENT

(By Wendell Margrave)

Those fortunate enough to attend the concert last night at the Department of State Auditorium of the Interlochen Arts Academy Orchestra had the inspiring experience of hearing a fine orchestra concert, comparable in programing to that of any symphony orchestra in the world, played by 102 young people of high school age.

The school they represent, an outgrowth of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, is a college preparatory school for students gifted in the arts. The orchestra rehearses 2 hours a day, 6 days a week for a 32-week season and is at present on a tour which takes them today to the University of Maryland, tomorrow to Carnegie Hall, then to three performances in Canada.

The orchestra members are mostly from the Middle West, but all sections of the country are represented, and there are members from Taiwan, Finland, and Japan. Three are from the Washington area; violinist, Nancy Cole from Silver Spring, clarinetist, Jonathan Lautman from Takoma Park, and Eugene Sittenfeld, percussionist, from Bethesda.

It was a thrilling performance. It is a student orchestra, to be sure, with not quite the routined confidence and mature sound of a professional group, but wonderfully competent, wonderfully accurate, wonderfully unified. The Kodaly Concerto for Orchestra and the Shostakovich First Symphony gave opportunity for much excellent solo work by individuals, notably Violinist Victoria Matosich, Cellist Jane Schroeder, a remarkable young bass player named David Currie, Miriam Jakes, a blonde oboist with the embouchure a bit to the right but with a sweet sound and a musician's way of phrasing, and the spectacular and dedicated tympanist, Tsutomu Yamashita from Kyoto.

The best single section in the orchestra is the brasses, for they have the incisive attack and golden tone that is America's own peculiar contribution to brass playing. This rests as much on the example of the great jazz players as it does on the symphony tradition; and it gives a particularly vital thrust to the sound of the orchestra. The conducting was in the experiencing hands of Thor Johnson, who for years conducted the Cincinnati Orchestra. Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, founder of the music camp and of the academy, who is everywhere a symbol of this kind of enterprise, conducted the "Roman Carnival." At the close of the program, the concert-master led the orchestra in the excerpt from Hanson's "Romantic Symphony" that is the Interlochen theme.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 22, 1966]

INTERLOCHEN STUDENTS PERFORM LIKE ADULTS

(By Cecelia H. Porter)

Nearly 90 red-coated teenagers massed on the stage of the State Department's West Auditorium last night to present an adult evening of music.

The players form the permanent orchestra of the Interlochen Arts Academy, a recent prep school expansion of the famed summertime National Music Camp in northern Michigan.

For this first appearance on a seven-concert tour of the east coast and Ontario, Thor Johnson, the director of the school, conducted three-fourths of the program. The founder of the summer camp, Joseph Maddy, took the baton for Berlioz' Roman Carnival Overture.

The program, which also included Mozart's "Linz" Symphony, Kodaly's infrequently heard Concerto for Orchestra, and Shostakovich's First Symphony, showed a wise selection calculated to challenge all the players with at least one major responsibility for the 2 hours.

It is practically a norm for the conservatory orchestra to fall short in one or more sections. With high school groups, you note the enthusiasm, then quickly assemble the "but's" and "however's."

Yet few excuses are necessary for this orchestra, in which even the string section is a disciplined, many-splendored thing.

The five continuous movements of the Kodaly concerto, composed in the midst of World War II, proved to be the apex of the concert. The solo violas and cellos, responding smoothly to an equally eloquent wind assembly, transformed the largo into a sumptuous, impassioned affair intensified with unbelievable nobility in the later tutti reaffirmation in Bachian motivic work.

The command shown in this movement, as in the first with its incisive brass punctuations, and in the two allegros, stunningly managed even in improvisational solos, could hardly be matched by good adult performers.

The certainty evident through all levels of the string section most obviously characterized the reading of the "Linz." The reading of the adagio indicated an unusual maturity in maintaining a slow tempo without sacrificing the metrical pulse.

The muscians languished tastefully over the protracted dissonances and solo episodes. Yet they never sank into that ominous quicksand of increasingly sluggish paces that drags performers into the mire of a new "Farewell Symphony."

There was a wonderful pliancy in exchanges between sections and individuals in the Berlioz. Maddy drew forth a controlled rather than a weeping sentimental cantilena.

Coming from the pen of a 19-year-old, the Shostakovich symphony impressed its Russian hearers immediately and impressed the audience last night. All the elements—skilled pizzicato, light wind tonguing, luxuriant tutti mixtures—were there for a total suavity and grace that were outstanding.

Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my distinguished colleague from Iowa, and the leadership of the House of Representatives in the comments and remarks that have been made here on this sad occasion.

All of us are deeply grieved by the loss sustained through the passing of this good servant of the Lord.

In Dr. Braskamp I found, as a native Iowan and a fellow Presbyterian, a welcome handclasp and a friendship that was stimulating.

During the 14 months I knew him I came to look forward to his incisive choices of Scripture that prefaced the opening prayer each day. Dr. Braskamp distinguished himself as a churchman in this area long before he came to serve as Chaplain of the House of Representatives. I am certain that his 16 years of service to this body will stand as an eloquent monument to a gifted and dedicated spirit.

More Flags for Vietnam: Nations Supporting the U.S. Effort in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the United States is not the only country assisting South Vietnam in its struggle against conquest by its northern neighbor. Although we wish more substantial assistance were being provided by more nations, we should not overlook the valuable military, economic, or sometimes political and moral support which has been rendered by other nations. We should not forget which nations are willing to stand up and be counted on our side.

Three nations have made the supreme commitment of sending troops, and risking the lives of their sons for the cause of freedom just as the United States and the Republic of Vietnam must do. These nations are Australia, which has sent one reinforced battalion of 1,500 men; New Zealand, which has sent one artillery battery of 300 men; and the Republic of Korea, which has sent a reinforced division of 17,000 men and supporting forces totaling 3,750 men. Other military assistance has been provided by Malaysia, which has supplied training to Vietnamese for counterinsurgency operations and some armored vehicles; the Philippines and Nationalist China, which have sent psychological warfare as well as medical personnel; and Thailand, which has military air detachments in Vietnam and supplies training for South Vietnamese Air Force personnel.

In addition to these countries which are sending military assistance, more than 30 nations are supplying or have agreed to supply some sort of nonmilitary assistance. In most cases this support signifies an affirmation of their support for the struggle against agression. Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Israel, Laos, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Spain, Turkey, and Uruguay have sent medicines and flood-relief aid. Canada has provided educational assistance, medicines, flour, and aluminum warehouses. Western Germany has provided assistance for agricultural development, physicians, technicians, and ambulances. Iran has sent petroleum products and Ireland has provided financial support. Japan has sent economic assistance, technicians, medical supplies, radios, and ambulances, although it holds the Japanese Constitution prohibits sending troops. Laos has provided refugee relief. The United Kingdom has provided financial assistance, and Venezuela is sending rice. Even traditionally neutral Switzerland has provided 30 microscopes.

In total, 31 nations have supplied some sort of tangible assistance. Eight more have agreed to provide assistance of some kind.

There is another kind of support which has been provided which I would like to mention, and that is political and moral support. For many years the United Kingdom, as a cochairman of the Geneva Conference of 1954, has supported the basic policies of the United States when the other cochairman, the Soviet Union, sought to issue messages condemning United States or South Vietnamese policy. Similarly Canada, as a member of the International Control Commission, has repeatedly helped protect the free world interests against unfair charges by the Communist side. Other nations have voiced support in important resolutions in international or regional organizations such as the United Nations or SEATO.

All of these contributions have been welcome and appreciated. Nevertheless, in view of the magnitude and importance of the task in South Vietnam, we have every right to ask for more.

Over 1,300 Southeastern Louisiana College Students at Hammond, La., Support President Johnson's Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a resolution signed by over 1,300 students at Southeastern Louisiana College in my hometown of Hammond, La., supporting this country's policy in Vietnam. I have forwarded this resolution to President Lyndon B. Johnson to show the President and the entire country how these many young people are patriotically supporting the United States in its struggle in South Vietnam.

The students at Southeastern strongly support their President's policy. In addition to this resolution they sent a similar resolution with a large number of signatures to our troops in Vietnam before Christmas. I feel that these young people represent the finest tradition of our American heritage. I am sure that the sentiments expressed in the resolution represent the views of an overwhelming majority of our citizens throughout the country.

The following is the resolution sponsored by the Southeastern Louisiana College student government and signed by the hundreds of students at that institution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the United States of America is involved in a military conflict in Vietnam; and

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson is Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces; and

Whereas the American foreign policy is being applied to its best effect in Vietnam: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the student government of Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond, La., representing the entire student body, go on record as being in full support of our Federal Government's policy in Vietnam; be it further

Resolved, That this body honor the men in Vietnam by rising for a moment in silent prayer; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be recorded in the official minutes of the student government senate and that a copy be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The following is a letter which I received from James J. Brady, president of the student government at Southeastern:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: On behalf of the student body of Southeastern Louisiana College, I am forwarding to you a copy of the resolution supporting our President's and Government's position in Vietnam.

As you can see this resolution is accompanied by a list of over 1,300 names of students on our campus who support this position. These names were collected by various members of the student body at different places on the campus.

This petition is not the neatest nor the most attractive that might be composed, but the sincerity of the students whose names appear on this roll reflect the true greatness of our republic.

I, therefore, ask that you make known our position concerning Vietnam to the President and to the other members of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. BRADY,
President, Student Government.

And finally I include the letter which I sent to the President along with the resolution:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with great pride that I forward to you a petition signed by 1,300 students of Southeastern Louisiana College, located in my hometown of Hammond, La., expressing the support of these young people for our Nation's policy in Vietnam.

The letter transmitting this petition, from Student Government President James J. Brady, reflects the hope of our country through the courageous attitude of this student body.

I am very pleased and happy to submit this petition to you.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened with the passing of our beloved Chaplain. His voice is now silenced but he is still to be heard. He is saying to us now what he has many times said in his counsel to us, individually and collectively. Whatever the loss, whatever the problem, however dark and formidable things may appear, whatever our grief and whatever our hardship: "Be of good cheer."

In our grief of losing Dr. Braskamp we need but remind ourselves of his sustaining words of encouragement: "be of good cheer." "God's will be done."

The words he lived by come from Joshua:

Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed; for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest.

In his prayers, as he opened each session for 16 years, he would inspire us and encourage us in the tasks before us. In more ways than we will ever know he gave us courage and renewed our strength.

To his bereaved family I offer my sincerest sympathy.

More Have Died on U.S. Highways Than in All the Nation's Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the carnage which occurs daily on our roads and highways becomes increasingly serious with the passage of time. Fortunately, a greater degree of attention is being paid to the problem than has been paid in the past. A number of bills on the subject have been introduced, including my bill, H.R. 12549, to create a National Traffic Safety Agency to lead in accident loss prevention through research and application of its findings.

Because of its relevance, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Sacramento Bee, Sunday, February 13, 1966, entitled "More Have Died on U.S. Highways Than in All the Nation's Wars," which I think points out the magnitude of the problem quite graphically and indicates how much more substantial the difficulty will become unless action is taken on a number of fronts to alleviate and solve it.

The editorial follows:

MORE HAVE DIED ON U.S. HIGHWAYS THAN IN ALL THE NATION'S WARS

In the Revolutionary War, 4,435 Americans died in battle. In the War of 1812, another 2,260 were killed. In the Mexican War, 1,733 lost their lives. The Civil War claimed 141,414 Union soldiers dead in battle and 74,545 Confederate dead. Another 385 were killed in the Spanish-American war. World War I claimed 53,513 Americans killed in action, World War II 292,131, and the Korean war, 33,629. As of early this month, 1,035 had died in Vietnam. This totals 605,080 in American battle dead.

An appalling sacrifice, but to a cause: Freedom.

Last year, 49,000 Americans lost their lives on American highways and this says nothing of the 3.5 million maimed and injured and the billions lost in property damage.

Over the last quarter of a century, dating only to 1941, a total of 1.5 million have died on the highways, more than twice as many as have been killed in all of the Nation's wars dating back 190 years.

Yet murder-by-motor continues. This year, traffic statisticians expect more than 50,000 will die, and again this says nothing of the injured. Despite improvement in road engineering, deaths the next 10 years will go up, year by year. Indeed, it may be as President Lyndon B. Johnson said in an address before the American Trial Lawyers Association in New York City: "It is a fact that if we continue on our present suicidal rate, half of all Americans will 1 day suffer death or serious injury on our highways."

The causes?

They are several.

The first, and perhaps the predominant factor, is the human factor.

The traveling public has become so used to death on the highways, so familiar with the casualty listing, it has come to accept the carnage as just one of those things, and therein lies the greatest danger. Slogans have failed to encourage safety. Laws specifically written to inspire responsibility at the wheel have been inadequate. The hazards have been taken out of travel, insofar as possible, through straightening out curves, easing access and egress, etc. Still the slaughter continues.

Second, more and more cars are being produced, bought and fed into already congested arterial and freeway routings. In the early 1920's American producers were turning out 1.9 million cars each year. By 1930 production had risen to 2.7 million. By 1940, to 3.7 million. By 1960, to 6.6 million. Last year, production in the United States totaled more than 7.7 million and producers have predicted a 10 million production year by 1970.

Third, the automobile industry has made some progress, yes, in making motoring safer; but U.S. Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, for one, thinks it has not done enough. He emphasized that General Motors Corp., the largest producer of cars in the world, made a profit of $2.1 billion in 1965, yet spent only $5 million on research—a sum he termed grossly inadequate.

Meantime, what will be essential to the eventual solution is much, much tighter regulation—driving is not a right but a privilege—and sustained experimentation to produce both safer cars and safer roads. And it will take public education, by the ton. All of this will be for naught, however, if the man at the wheel cannot be reached and convinced. If he cannot, very possibly he eventually will be able to be reached—at the morgue.

Lithuania Deserves a Better Fate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States know Independence Day as a happy occasion, a holiday filled with picnics and parades. By contrast, there are less fortunate peoples for whom the anniversary of independence evokes only a poignant memory. Such a nation is Lithuania.

Forty-eight years ago this month, Lithuania gained independence after more than 120 years under first Russian then German domination. That fragile state of freedom lasted but a few years. The country suffered as a battleground during World War II, was for 3 years under German occupation, and in 1944 was occupied by the Soviet Union, which to this day exercises oppressive dominion over the 3 million inhabitants of Lithuania.

The United States properly refuses to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. And we citizens who so cherish our own freedom hope the days will be short until that same freedom can be enjoyed again on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea. We join Erwin Cahman, of the Christian Science Monitor, in declaring, "The Baltic peoples—an ancient, culturally rich folk with proud national traditions—deserve a better fate, and one day may achieve it."

Citizens Honor Hamburg Township Fire Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken of individual initiative and its importance in our democratic system of Government on the floor of the House before.

Today, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members the work of the Hamburg Township Fire Department in Livingston County, Mich., which I am privileged to represent in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, in order to provide fire protection for the area, a group of civic-minded men in Hamburg Township founded a volunteer fire department, and equipped it with their personal funds and additional sums they were able to raise. I believe that the members of the Hamburg Township Fire Department deserve to be honored for contributing time and money to the safety and welfare of their community.

I join with the citizens of Hamburg Township who paid tribute to their extraordinary fire department recently at a dinner in its honor.

I am pleased to include an article on the department, published in the Brighton Argus, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HAMBURG TOWNSHIP DINES FIREMEN

HAMBURG.—Tribute to the volunteers who man the only privately owned fire department in the Nation, will be paid by the residents of Hamburg Township, January 29, when the firemen will be guests at a dinner at the Lakelands Golf Club.

Although all the equipment is owned by all the members of the volunteer fire department, the organization is a nonprofit organization—in fact it depends on financial assistance from private sources and many of the firemen themselves have expended sizable sums of their own on equipment.

The 6:30 o'clock dinner at the golf club to be given by the residents of Hamburg Township celebrates the 20th anniversary of the volunteer fire department's incorporation.

Twenty years ago Hamburg had no fire protection. It had no lifesaving equipment. Today, because of the untiring efforts of a group of civic-minded volunteers it has both. Not only do these men maintain and operate firefighting and resuscitating equipment, but they also finance it.

This organization has grown from a group of stout-hearted, green volunteers with two war-surplus, gasoline-powered pumps—one on the creek bank, the other mounted on a two-wheel trailer—to a group of stout-hearted, trained volunteers who now own three radio-equipped mobile units and a large-volume electric pump at the creek which could supply the entire village of Hamburg with water, if need be.

At the present time they are awaiting delivery of a new American-Marsh 1,000-gallon tank truck with both a high and low pressure pump.

Lincoln Day Oration of the Honorable F. Bradford Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] delivered the annual Lincoln Day oration before the Middlesex Club of Boston. In his eloquent address, Congressman MORSE invoked the principles which inspired President Lincoln and the Republican Party to national leadership a century ago, and challenged all Republicans to carry forth the battle for freedom in our own era.

In calling for a "new birth of freedom" in these tangled and troubled times, Mr. MORSE declared:

> We must recall that the keystone of freedom is responsibility—and that the highest responsibility of a free political party is to govern—for the people.

Toward this goal, he called upon all Republicans to pursue Lincoln's vision of a party of the people, a great party of diverse men and women "joined together not because they share a common dogma, but because they share common goals."

Mr. MORSE's concise and compelling address merits the attention of all Americans, and I would include it in the RECORD at this point:

LINCOLN DAY ORATION OF CONGRESSMAN F. BRADFORD MORSE BEFORE THE MIDDLESEX CLUB, BOSTON, FEBRUARY 12, 1966

"Of strange, discordant, even hostile elements we gathered from the four winds and fought the battle through—under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud and pampered enemy."

So said Lincoln in speaking of a Republican Party which was not then 3 years old.

His words described the explosive emergence of a new force, made of shredded remnants of political failure, born to meet the troubled conscience of a troubled people, destined to preserve the integrity of a nation determined to destroy itself.

"Did we brave all then to falter now? Now when that same enemy is wavering, dissevered and belligerent."

These words, too, are golden with age, for though they challenge us today, Lincoln used them to chide Republicans a century ago.

For Lincoln knew, as we must learn, that unity begets strength, that discord breeds disaster.

Lincoln knew, as we must learn, that his party—our party—would deny its essential character and insure its own destruction were it to impose upon itself a discipline of ideological conformity.

Lincoln knew, as we must learn, that in the rich soil of intellectual competition and honest dissent do free men grow and free institutions flourish.

Yet, Lincoln knew, as we know, that a house divided cannot stand.

Lincoln knew, as we know, that a party partitioned cannot prevail.

Lincoln knew, as we have learned, that the Republican Party must never become narrow and exclusive—that it must include mechanics and merchants, laborers and lawyers, teachers and tailors, farmers and financiers, men and women from great cities and small, whether their roots be in Europe, Asia, Africa or Latin America, joined together not because they share a common dogma, but because they share common goals. "* * * of strange, discordant and even hostile elements we (gather) from the four winds."

Can we pledge less than to form and fight the battle through for the goals we share—for the people, for the commonwealth, for the Nation?

The road will not be easy. But we believe, as Lincoln told us, that the Republican Party "is the best hope of the Nation and the world." He warned our party that "their work is before them and from which they may not guiltlessly turn away."

Tonight we gather to pay tribute to our noblest son. Yet, as we honor his memory, we must respect his wisdom. As we salute his achievements, we must recall his ideals. As we invoke his spirit, we must heed his counsel. We must make Lincoln's dream our reality. For today, as a century ago, only a new birth of freedom can insure that a government for the people shall prosper.

We must free ourselves from ancient prejudices which have shackled our past.

We must free ourselves from archaic cliches which constrict the present.

We must free ourselves from discredited notions which can but stifle our future.

We must recall that the keystone of freedom is responsibility—and that the highest responsibility of a free political party is to govern—for the people.

We must, as Lincoln did, divine the aspirations of the people we seek to serve, and develop programs within basic Republic precepts to meet these aspirations.

Lincoln believed in the equality of all men before the law. And we can believe no less.

Lincoln believed in providing for all Americans an opportunity to achieve their highest potential. And we can believe no less.

Lincoln believed that government must seek to meet those needs of the people which they cannot themselves meet. And we, in this vastly more complex 20th century, can believe no less.

For if we honor Lincoln, yet fail to respect him, if we salute, but fail to recall, if we invoke but fail to heed, we desecrate his majestic memory. We dare not, we must not, we cannot.

We must fulfill our pledge to the greatest Republican statesman to provide government for the people.

As we go forward with our task, we echo the words of the poet Vachel Lindsay:

> "He cannot sleep upon his hillside now.
> He is among us—as in times before!"

And we may not guiltlessly turn away.

Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing of our beloved Chaplain. Dr. Bernard Braskamp, who labored in the service of the Master for over half a century, climaxed his ministry with almost two decades of service to the House of Representatives.

For these many years he has opened our daily deliberations with appeals for divine guidance, inspired us to nobler efforts as we struggled with the problems of war and peace, and lightened our labors with spiritual comfort.

For some time Dr. Braskamp had prefaced his daily devotions with passages from the Bible. I believe that these recitations from the Scriptures have led the members of his congressional flock to read further from the Word of God.

Like Apollos, one of the fellow servants of the Apostle Paul, Dr. Braskamp was an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, instructed in the way of the Lord, and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord.

Mrs. Collier and I extend our sympathies to the family. We know that they will be comforted and sustained with the knowledge that the ministry of their father and brother has borne much fruit.

In the words of the Master:

> Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, Estonia was one of the smallest countries to regain its independence toward the end of the First World War. The country, on the northeastern shores of the Baltic with just over a million inhabitants, had been made part of the Russian empire early in the 18th century, and its people grudgingly endured the oppressive czarist regime of two centuries. In 1917 when the czarist autocracy was overthrown by the Russian revolution, all national groups once subjected to the czarist regime felt free, regained their liberty and proclaimed their national independence. The Estonians did this on February 24, 1918, and founded the Estonian Republic.

In this newly established small, democratic Republic the sturdy, patriotic, and thrifty Estonians, did wonders in the course of their free existence during the new two decades. Besides rebuilding their war-torn and ravaged country, they made tremendous advances in every phase of their national activity. They were perfectly happy in their beloved homeland. But their happiness was short lived. When the Second World War broke out Estonia's independence was threatened. In 1940 the country was overrun by the Red army, occupied, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Thus ended the freedom of the Estonian people, and since then they have been living under totalitarian dictatorship. With the establishment of the Communist regime there since the end of the war, the unhappy Estonians have been locked up in their country, and are deprived of their freedom. There they endure the abominable yoke of their Communist taskmasters and pray for their eventual liberation. On the 48th anniversary of their independence day we wish them fortitude and patience in their struggle for their freedom and independence.

The New Museum of Art at Ponce, P.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last December the new art museum at Ponce, P.R., was officially opened. The structure, both functionally and architecturally, is an impressive achievement.

For many years I have been enthusiastic about the growing public appreciation for all art endeavors. Art is no longer the monopolistic preserve of the wealthy. Through public support, and through private charitable and philanthropic commitments, art is reaching the mass public, and it has been an exciting thing to watch.

One such philanthropic institution, the Luis A. Ferre Foundation in Puerto Rico, has encouraged this trend significantly. The new museum at Ponce, funded by the foundation, is a most recent example, and I wish to bring it to the attention of my colleagues in Congress. Mr. Luis A. Ferre, an industrialist and philanthropist, continues to devote his considerable energies and talent to the service of Puerto Rico and the Commonwealth residents.

The new museum is a distinctly Puerto Rican venture, reflective of native history, skill, and cultural past.

Recently, the Saturday Review published an article on the museum, and I would like to include it in the Appendix of the Record for all Members to read:

A Museum Grows in Puerto Rico

(By Susan Webb Rich)

The twin cultural influences of Europe and America, as they are shaping the newly emerging Puerto Rican identity, are impressively revealed in the new Museo de Arte de Ponce, the island's first major art museum. A cleanly distinctive structure designed by Edward Durell Stone, it opened in late December not in the capital city of San Juan but in Ponce, on the southern coast, the hometown of its donor, Don Luis Ferré, an industrialist, politician, and philanthropist who has long taken a keen interest in his island's culture.

As an art museum, El Museo, is simple and uncluttered. With its gardens, its small amphitheater, its patios surrounded by high white walls, its pools and fountains and plantings, and the sense of detachment from the outside world achieved through an absence of conventional windows, the museum provides room for relaxation, a sense of privacy, and views to charm the eye. Natural light, suggesting fixed kaleidoscopic patterns, streams through skylights and narrow grillwork placed where the hexagonal walls of each of the seven hexagonal galleries on the second level meet. Señor Ferré claims that his hexagonal plan and its overhead lighting create an illumination that "has no corners," and it is certainly true that no area is in shadow and that there is no blinding sheen on the canvases. The viewer never needs to stoop or sidestep.

As a symbol of the twofold influence of Europe and the United States, the architecture of the museum is imaginative. The Spanish influence is obvious in what Señor Ferré calls a monumental balcony, where frangi pani bloom in hexagonal pots surrounding the entire second level. The enclosed gardens on the ground level and the pools and fountains in the two lower-level galleries flanking the entrance loggia suggest Spanish courtyards or Italian cortilies.

The "Granadino," or Garden of Spain designed by the Spanish architect Fernando Chuéca Goitía, celebrates the island's first colonizers. Walks patterned in black and white pebbles form a pomegranate motif, symbolic of Granada, the Spanish city that presented the museum with an 18th century marble fountain. Pomegranate and orange trees line the garden. Dominating all is a bust of Isabella of Castille, a contemporary work produced in a competition in Spain organized by Señor Chuéca. A small open-air amphitheater for concerts and plays opens to the left of the museum. Here the American theme is stated by a bronze bust of Lincoln done by O'Connor.

With these two influences clear to the visitor, the museum further suggests the emergence of a distinct Puerto Rican identity. Galleries for contemporary Puerto Rican art and sculpture are found on the first level, as is the Puerto Rican Garden. This is larger than either the Spanish Garden or the Amphitheater of Lincoln, and it is the most symbolic. In the center of this white, walled area planted with flowers and young kumquat trees, is what Señor Ferré has called "The Pool of Identity." The pool is long and black; two simple square fountains, especially aerated, feed into this pool, making a vast polkadotting of white bubbles on the black surface of the water. Viewed from the balcony, the pool suggests the Oriental rock gardens of contemplation in reverse, for here white bubbles float on black water, while in the Oriental gardens black rocks stand out from a sea of white pebbles. There is serenity and assurance in this Puerto Rican garden, with its pool symbolic of the new Puerto Rican identity fed by the two fountains of American and European culture.

The financing of the new museum, a 5-year endeavor that cost about $5 million (including the value of the collection), has been achieved by the Luis A. Ferré Foundation. This foundation is a philanthropic organization established 11 years ago for the cultural development of Puerto Rico through fellowships and educational programs. The Ferré family has permanently set aside for the activities of this foundation its stock dividends from the Puerto Rican Cement Co. Future foundation plans include a school of architecture and of sculpture.

Although the museum's collection contains some big names (a small Rubens, works of Cranach, Jordaens, Dürer, Van Dyck, Reynolds, Gainsborough, Constable, Inness, Jacob Epstein, Murillo, and Riberas, plus a Velasques donated by the Kress Foundation), its real strength lies in its abundance of secondary works from the past five centuries. According to Dr. Federico Zeri of Rome, an art critic and currently a visiting art professor at Columbia, the collection includes "an extraordinary selection from English, French, and Spanish schools totally overlooked in the United States."

Señor Ferré's concern with Puerto Rican culture is threefold. He fears that in its present economic boom the island is tending toward "un piélago de vulgaridad y mal gusto" (an abyss of vulgarity and bad taste). He fears that Puerto Rican industry is limiting itself to the purely commercial. And he is anxious lest Puerto Rico lose sight of its cultural debt to Europe and the United States.

El Museo answers these concerns. It is an example of what native industry can build, using local labor and almost entirely native materials; it will expose the country to art works never before available, and will serve as a teaching center; and it affirms the influence of Europe and America on Puerto Rico.

At the opening, the museum's architect quoted Frank Lloyd Wright, who early in life had to decide between two attitudes, "hypocritical humility" and "honest arrogance." Mr. Stone admitted that in this case he would choose the latter. "I find this building perfectly beautiful," he said. No sooner had it opened than it became clear that he was not exactly alone in his view.

Have You Registered To Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, on February 14, I inserted into the Record the text of a letter I had received from Mr. T. S. Repplier, the president of the Advertising Council, endorsing H.R. 12297. This legislation would authorize a special postal cancellation mark bearing the words, "Have You Registered to Vote?"

I have now heard from Mr. Thomas D'Arcy Brophy, the president of the American Heritage Foundation, endorsing my bill.

Most of use are aware of the outstanding work performed by the American Heritage Foundation and the Advertising Council in encouraging broader participation in our democratic process by encouraging more Americans to exercise their right to vote.

I am very pleased indeed to have the support of these two organizations for my bill. I include Mr. Brophy's letter endorsing H.R. 12297 as part of my remarks in the Appendix of the Record:

The American Heritage Foundation,
New York, N.Y., February 21, 1966.
The Honorable James G. O'Hara,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman O'Hara: I hope you will forgive this belated acknowledgment of your cordial letter of January 26 enclosing a copy of the January 25 issue of the Congressional Record. I have just returned to the office after several trips away from the city and this is my first opportunity to respond.

We are deeply grateful to you for reintroducing legislation to provide a special canceling stamp or postmark bearing the words, "Have You Registered to Vote?" which, as you agree, would be a great help in publicizing the importance of registration.

I was very happy to endorse your previous bill and look forward with interest to hearing from you as to the outcome of H.R. 12297.

Many thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Thomas D'Arcy Brophy,
President.

Resolution From Railway Labor Executive Association Opposes Increase in Size and Weights of Parcel Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter and also a resolution adopted unanimously by the Railway Labor Executive Association who are strongly opposed to pending legislation proposed by the Post Office Department to increase the size and weight limits of parcel post. A letter from the Railway Labor Executive Association and the resolution they adopted follow:

Railway Labor Executives' Association,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1966.
Hon. Glenn Cunningham,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Cunningham: Hearings on H.R. 1367 and related bills have been scheduled to begin on March 1, before the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

These bills are a direct threat to the jobs and future security of over 40,000 members of the Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees and the International Association of Machinists, and will indirectly affect adversely some 700,000 members of the various organizations represented by Railway Labor Executives' Association. The bills propose a vast expansion of the parcel post system which will wipe out the livelihood of the employees of REA Express and other regulated carriers involved in handling small shipments.

The attached resolution expresses the great concern of our association. This is urgent and important. We earnestly request your support in defeating this latest attempt of a government business to destroy private industry by doubling the scope of its operation.

Sincerely yours,

Donald S. Beattie,
Executive Secretary.

Resolution Adopted Unanimously at the February Meeting of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, Miami, Fla., February 17, 1966

Whereas the 2d session of the 89th Congress will be faced with a greater problem than confronted the 1st session when they considered H.R. 5938; and

Whereas the introduction of H.R. 12367 by Congressman Morrison, Democrat, of Louisiana, and S. 2843 by Senator Monroney, Democrat, of Oklahoma, has brought out into the open the wish of the Post Office Department to amend or repeal Public Law 199 enacted January 1, 1952; and

Whereas the repeal or amending of Public Law 199 will bring on many hardships among private enterprise common carriers and their employees by siphoning off substantial revenue business; and

Whereas this move by the Post Office Department, if accomplished, would, in effect, destroy the jobs of over 40,000 employees of REA Express represented by the Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, the International Association of Machinists, and also destroy the jobs of various other employees represented by the Railway Labor Executives' Association and AFL–CIO; and

Whereas the repeal of the duty of the Postmaster General to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that revenues from parcel post will come within 4 percent of the cost of providing parcel post service, would remove the only specific legislative "brake" against building up more Government transportation business through the means of subsidized, money losing rates; and

Whereas it would be a greater burden upon the taxpayer to allow the Post Office to spend funds without any limitations or restrictions on the use of such funds, and: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Railway Labor Executives' Association representing some 700,000 railway and express employees reaffirm its support of the position of the Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees and International Association of Machinists in this matter, adopting their position as its own, to wit: We shall oppose the amending of the size and weight limitation now covered by Public Law 199 and oppose amendment of the law codified title 39 in United States Code 695 which requires the Postmaster General to make a certification to the Treasury Department that certain fourth-class mail revenues are within 4 percent of the cost of providing services as embodied in H.R. 12367 and S. 2843 and similar legislation, and we hereby direct the executive secretary-treasurer to communicate this position to the Members of Congress, and especially to the members of the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and to work in behalf of the members of the Railway Labor Executives' Association for the defeat of that portion of this legislation which would expand the size and weight limits and also that portion of the legislation which would amend the certification requirements.

God Out of School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by Mr. Gene Rickett, 5000 Terrell Street, Annandale, Va., to include in the RECORD one of the poems contained in his book "Poems of Inspiration."

Since the subject of this particular poem is currently pending before the Congress in the form of a proposed constitutional amendment, I thought it would be appropriate to comply with Mr. Rickett's request.

Mr. Rickett's poem follows:

GOD OUT OF SCHOOL

The Supreme Court made a decision today
To put God out of the schools in the U.S.A.
And now the problem that we have to face,
Is what will become of the human race.

Are we better today than we were long ago
Or have we just reached an all-time low?
And "we the people" could be a lot worse
When we face the maker of this great universe.

And these Justices, who claim they stand tall,
Who took an oath, under God, to serve us all,
And did they really have so little to rule,
Than to pick on God, to put Him out of school?

Can we send our children to an atheist school,
Where they can't even mention the Golden Rule?
Where God isn't welcome, He was even expelled!
By this decision that was straight out of hell.

Is it freedom of religion, or freedom of speech,
When the Government tells us what we cannot teach?
Is it justice, or just tribulation,
And doesn't it warrant an investigation?

War on Coronaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "War on Coronaries" which appeared in the February issue of the News of New York, a publication of the Medical Society of New York State.

There is not a more exacting profession; there is not a profession which makes greater demands upon those following it, and which more entitles them to the gratitude of mankind than the profession of medicine. Dr. Irving R. Juster, chief cardiologist at Glens Falls hospital, is the founder of the Glens Falls anticoronary program. He has helped to establish a similar program in Whitehall and North Creek, N.Y. Others are scheduled to get underway this year in Kingston, N.Y., and Burlington, Vt.

I wish to express my appreciation and congratulations to Dr. Juster on the fine work he is doing with respect to his declared war on heart disease. I am, likewise, impressed by the number of men and women who have joined with this distinguished specialist in an effort to help themselves and to help prevent coronary heart disease. The article follows:

WAR ON CORONARIES

More than a year ago a 67-year-old Glens Falls physician declared war on coronary heart disease.

And the unique Glens Falls anti-coronary program, started by Irving R. Juster, M.D. is gaining national recognition as one of the first of its kind in the United States.

It's a community-level project conducted at minimum expense and medical supervision with one goal in mind:

Prevent, or at least retard, coronary heart disease.

Dr. Juster, chief cardiologist at Glens Falls Hospital, decided to start the program in October 1964. By the following January, with the help of the local board of education and the superintendent of schools and hospitals, it was underway.

More than 100 men, age 30 to 60, met weekly to take part in an exercise program. Additional calisthenics, based on the Royal Canadian Air Force Physicial Fitness manual, were performed at home.

Throughout the week, they performed daily exercises, followed a low-fat diet and abstained from smoking.

Two months after the first group got underway, two more classes were formed, one for men, the other for women.

Since then Dr. Juster and his staff have helped start similar programs in White Hall and North Creek, N.Y., and hope to get others underway this year in Kingston, N.Y., and Burlington, Vt.

When Dr. Juster started his program he pointed out many studies had shown those who are overweight, lead sedentary lives and smoke are more prone to coronaries than those who don't.

He wanted to help people help themselves, but on a community basis. With the aid of community leaders, he did.

Its community-sponsorship is what makes the program unique, what makes it a success.

At a recent White House Conference on Health, Wilhelm Raab, M.D., professor emeritus of cardiovascular diseases at the University of Vermont Medical School, cited the success of Dr. Juster's community program.

Although prevention of premature degenerative heart disease is important, Dr. Raab pointed out that no organized program—other than Dr. Juster's—has been started in the United States.

He pointed to the Glens Falls program as one which offers hope that interest in this area of health care is on the rise.

Speech of James Edward Proctor of Hammond, Ind., in Winning the Hoosier Division of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, James Edward Proctor, of 7125 Wicker Avenue, Hammond, Ind., was successful in winning the Indiana first prize in the speech contest on "What Democracy Means to Me" conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary in the voice of democracy contest.

This year over 300,000 school students over the Nation participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. First prize is a $5,000 scholarship, second prize is $3,500, third prize is $2,500, fourth prize is $1,500 and the fifth prize is $1,000.

The winning contestant from each State comes to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, during their convention the week of March 7. The following is the winning speech on "What Democracy Means to Me" delivered by James Proctor during the Hoosier contest trials:

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

Ralph Barton Perry once said that "democracy is both the best and the most difficult form of political organization—the most difficult because it is the best."

This definition best embodies my conception of a democracy. A democracy is difficult to maintain because man is given his greatest freedom to exercise free choice and decision in life—a right that basically leads him to good or evil. Yet it is this freedom of expression that distinguishes the democratic man, because he has achieved his status through his own efforts, through actions as an individual.

To me a democracy is a blackboard being used to teach young minds new facts. It's crossing the street at the corner of your choice. It's working in a steel mill after high school or going to college. It's sleeping on election day or splitting your ticket in the ballot booth. You can be court martialed or congressionally cited in a democracy. You can stand up and sound off on any issue you choose and someone is bound to listen. You pay taxes and you are protected in a democracy.

Democracy is a decision. It is either a reward or a refute. Some of the choices above are my prerogatives as a high school teenager—to watch or ignore the blackboard, to cross at a corner or jaywalk, to finish high school or drop out. Little things, granted, but basic things in a democratic way of life.

This is my personal role at the present—to be cognizant of and objective in my decisions in elementary democracy; for as a child learns with his first building block set, a good foundation insures a strong structure.

The closest the average American ever gets to working toward a stronger democratic government is by scrutinizing candidates for political office and voting for the man or woman of his choice. It is what might be called a chronological right—you are granted it on your 21st birthday. I can't vote. Thus, what can I actually do to participate in my democracy?

I quote Catherine M. Sedgwick for the answer: "Knowledge and goodness—these make degrees in heaven, and they must be the graduating scale of a true democracy." Knowledge, not a chronological right, but a timeless quest that I can enlist in my personal preservation of democracy.

I can study the great documents of the United States—pieces of parchment that have given me the right to this knowledge. A familiarity with our governmental process can promise me a deeper present and future appreciation of politics. The enemies of my country shall also interest me. To learn how and why they would usurp personal freedom and dignity and with what they would replace it may help me protect democracy from aggression and maintain it for posterity. Again simplicity for the continuity of complexity.

Democracy is a complicated business. It's rather a bit like life itself—complicated in means, yet unique in its end. No other political institution in the world guarantees its citizens what democracy does. The simple rights of individual freedom, personal dignity, life and liberty are protected by the balances of power in national, State, and local government and by every American's right to influence his legislators.

Responsibility is the password for the continued protection of democracy. My generation must realize the gravity of our task and we must be willing to work, to fight if necessary as responsible Americans to guard the rights which make us free.

What a Heritage To Leave Our Grandchildren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the national debt will total at least $322 billion by the end of fiscal 1967. It will cost $12,854 million to pay the interest during fiscal 1967.

Let us assume, for the sake of illustration, that both the debt and interest rates will remain the same for the next 100 years. But the time the year 2067 rolls around, the taxpayers of the United States will have paid $1,285,400 million in interest—well over $1¼ trillion—and they will still owe the $322 billion principal at the end of the 100 years.

Why worry it? Why not just ignore the national debt?

While it is true that you and I and our children will have departed for a debt-free sweet-by-and-by before 2067, should not we be concerned about our children's children?

A taxpayer who is now 40 could become a grandparent 30 years from now, when the taxpayer would be 70. If the grandchild also reached 70, that same grandchild will help pay the last of that more than $1¼ trillion in interest in 2067—and he and his fellow taxpayers will still owe the $322 billion.

Let us at least quit adding to the debt.

It Is Up to Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, while I sympathize with the state of the opposition party, it is my feeling that it has brought its present condition upon itself.

A political party cannot remain static and still hope to cope with the many and constantly changing needs of our great Nation. The Republican Party has been accused—and I think justly so—of having no "positive ideas," only "negative reactions," to Democratic proposals.

The people made their choice in 1964. Following the recordbreaking mandate given by the voters in that election, the "action" party took office and started to get things done. The quantity and quality of the legislation passed in the 1st session of the "fabulous 89th" stands as a tribute to the President and to the Democratic Party. Although some Republican leaders attempt to take credit for their supporting part in the voting, no one could suppose that these measures would ever have been proposed—let alone voted upon—had the GOP been in the majority instead.

Now it is said that the two-party system has been destroyed and that we must put more Republicans back in Congress. The Wyoming Eagle recently published an editorial concerning this very subject. With permission granted I place it in the Record for the benefit of my colleagues.

[From the Wyoming Eagle, Feb. 12, 1966]

IT IS UP TO THEM

The National Republican Party is sending up a mournful cry for a return to a strong two-party system.

The inferrence we draw is that the GOP feels we should support Republican candidates, regardless of their qualifications, just to help rebuild the Republican Party.

We readily admit that, in our time, we have never seen a weaker Republican Party nationwide. But we submit the Republican Party and its leaders have brought much of their problem on themselves.

The Democratic Party has done its part toward maintaining a strong two-party system. The Democratic Party is very strong, indeed.

We suggest it is up to the Republican Party and its leaders to rebuild the GOP.

They might start by:

Coming up with some forward-looking, realistic policies and programs—programs designed to keep pace with our times.

Offering the voters topnotch candidates, capable of seeing the state, the Nation and the world as they are today, rather than as they were back in the days of the horse and buggy.

The voters can scarcely be expected to support backward-looking candidates and negative programs simply to help rebuild the GOP.

From Cracker Barrel to Computer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit, for inclusion in the Record, a speech presented by our distinguished colleague, Congresswoman Catherine May, at the International Consumer Credit Association Conference on February 20, 1966, at Sacramento, Calif.

Congresswoman May's speech, entitled "From Cracker Barrel to Computer," presents a timely and informative discussion of the consumer in America today at the food market.

She points out that modern packaging and marketing have resulted in large-scale gains to the consumer in improved products and lower costs, and that the vast majority of those in the industry are conscientiously and sincerely trying to do the best job possible in serving the public.

I invite attention to Congresswoman May's speech. She does an excellent job of "setting the record straight":

FROM CRACKER BARREL TO COMPUTER

(Address of Congresswoman Catherine May, International Consumer Credit Association, 29th Conference, Credit Women's Breakfast Club, Sunday, February 20, 1966, Sacramento, Calif.)

First of all, may I say thank you for this opportunity to participate in the International Consumer Credit Conference. You in your profession have been working with the consumer for many years. So, we have something in common. I was in Congress when the Government discovered the consumer. This was a fascinating experience, especially for a housewife who had been naively assuming that I had been around all the time. Today, however, I can proudly announce to you without fear of contradiction that Mr. and Mrs. Consumer of America have the Government seal of approval and are now officially in existence.

At this point, may I say that my attempts at levity in these opening remarks are only partly serious. I realize that many people view the consumer movement today with both cynicism and suspicion. This is certainly not to be wondered at because so many self-appointed spokesmen for consumers just don't seem to know what they are talking about and so many self-appointed protectors of the consumer have proposed a number of very impractical—even improbable—legislative solutions. But, nevertheless, the consumer movement gains its impetus and popularity because of a vacuum in consumer information—because the abundance of our age has quite honestly brought bewilderment and confusion to the men and women who shop our fabulous modern-day stores. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the food industry. So, this morning I'm going to talk about the consumer and her grocery store.

The National Commission on Food Marketing was created by Congress in 1964 for the purpose of making an 18-month study of our entire food marketing structure. I am a member of this Commission and I have found that one of the most absorbing aspects of the study has been in the area of the tremendous changes that have come about in the way we get food from farm to dinner table as compared to 30 years ago. A little recognized but very important fact is that one day back in 1953 the United States became the first country in the history of the world to develop to the point at which a larger percentage of its work force was engaged in the tasks of distributing goods and performing services than were engaged in the tasks of producing goods. Modern home economists point out that their jobs have changed because the home has ceased to be a production unit and has become instead a consumption unit. What is true for the American home today is also true of the American economy. In the sense of the employment of most of our population, we are a consuming and a marketing Nation, not a producing Nation and there is a very big difference, which is dramatically illustrated in what has happened to our food industry. In a few short years we have come to the place where only 8 percent of our population is engaged in producing food—and fewer than 10 percent of all the farms in America account for fully half of total American farm sales. In this same span of time, we have seen the disappearance of corner grocery stores—known as the "Ma and Pa" stores—as they are being replaced by the huge one-stop convenience shopping centers. Change in this field is still occurring rapidly and we have no idea yet what the future will bring.

Come to think of it, maybe we do have some idea and I'm not sure that the prospect is so pleasant if it goes this far. I read the other day about a new supermarket in West Germany which has become fully automated. Everything is displayed behind glass. The customer presses a button when she comes in the store. This button turns a turnstile and gives milady a shopping token. She wanders through the aisles looking at the various displays. When she sees something that strikes her fancy as a good idea for the family dinner, she drops the token into the vending machine, punches a button and the machine delivers the product while marking the price on the token. When all her various food items have been chosen, she drops the token into a payment slot and receives her bill. She then puts her money into another machine and it delivers her change. The owners pointed out that this automated type of shopping protected the little woman from "temperamental clerks, coupons, salesmanship, and shoplifting temptations." Columnist Phyllis Battelle made a whimsical comment on this store in one of her columns the other day when she said, "drop your token in the slot and don't be surprised if you hear, 'I'm sorry; the calf's liver you have dialed is not a working liver—please dial a pork roast.'"

Well, however little the prospect of this type of progress may please—in food shopping we have come from cracker barrel to computer. And, in the process, the great public issue called consumerism has had a meteoric career.

I think most of us thought we were pretty well off until our protectors began to tell us that our supermarkets are jungles and our department stores usurers. Now people are lining up to get the chance to protect us from all this—and from ourselves. For a number of reasons that I will spell out in some detail here today, I'm beginning to believe that we may need protection from them.

This is not to say that these self-appointed consumer spokesmen are not sincere and nobly motivated. Yet I think that in their zeal to protect us all in the marketplace, they have failed to grasp a number of fundamental truths about the way in which our economy works, and about the nature of poverty, which many of their actions are said to alleviate.

Turning to the marketplace first, it seems to me that my protectors have failed to recognize either the motivations or limitations on businessmen in a consumer-driven society.

Businessmen are not, we should all understand, either better or worse, or more honest or less so, than any other group of human beings. The vast majority are simply trying to do an honest job for their companies, and to earn a profit by performing a service for which a number of people will pay. There are, of course, some quick-buck operators who profit by deceit. There always will be. But most are not dishonest, and much of the appeal of the so-called consumer spokesmen is based on the misconception that most businessmen are cheats.

By the same token, these critics of business have, I believe, badly underestimated the practical, existing legal, and competitive limitations on the ability of a businessman seeking long-term growth for his company to do so through deception.

It should be pointed out for the record that our Nation today is not without laws designed to protect consumers in the marketplace. The Federal Government is involved in 296 programs to help the consumer—118 of these activities directly protect and advance consumer interest. Costs of these programs total over $100 million a year and employ over 7,000 Federal workers full time.

Just as an example, the Federal Trade Commission, after testifying in support of a new packaging and labeling legislation because, according to its Chairman, it was powerless to act in the field, found only a couple of months ago that it has always had, after all, the power to stop cents-off labeling when its effect is misleading.

Important as these existing legal restraints are, however, of equal importance is the power of free choice in a competitive, consumeristic economy.

Most consumer goods industries today are highly competitive and individual items usually earn very small profits per unit of sale. I'm told that in the food industry, for example, it takes 3 years for a typical new product to earn enough money to pay off the initial investment and begin to generate a real profit.

This means that selling this item just once isn't going to get anyone anywhere.

Enough consumers must prefer it over alternatives and choose it regularly—not just once—in order for the manufacturer to get his money back. In other words, it's repeat business—not the one-shot sales—that pay off. And I am convinced by my own experiences as a shopper that businessmen try hard to earn this repeat business, and that those who do not earn it don't get it.

This protection, regulated by competition in the consumer interest, is the very heart of our free enterprise system. I think it's a good system, and one that works.

Yet it is precisely this system which the consumer spokesmen so distrust that they would substitute for it their own judgment about what it is that I, as a consumer, most want. I do not question their sincerity of purpose. I do question their ability to make my value judgments for me. And when faced with a choice between regulation by a system and regulation by men, I'll take the system. It's slow and cumbersome, in many cases, but it is not susceptible to whim or prejudice, and it works.

The second truth about the marketplace that our new consumer spokesmen have often failed to grasp—and this is the reason I'm afraid we may need protection from them—is that it is possible to get more consumer protection than we are willing to pay for.

For another built-in protection we get from our system has resulted from the development of efficient, high-speed machinery and other cost-cutting manufacturing procedures designed to bring consumers the things they want at low unit costs. Since many of the self-styled improvements consumer spokesmen say they want me to have would arbitrarily overturn many of these economies, they would add to the cost of the merchandise I buy. This might give me more protection and certainty, but I question whether it's really worth it.

For example, mass production techniques require that packages be filled and weighed in bulk, rather than individually. This means that 100 1-pound packages of something will weigh 100 pounds, but each individual package may weigh slightly more or less. Actually, in practice, many manufacturers tell me that they purposely overfill their packages so that any errors will be more likely to occur by overfilling than by underfilling. One cereal manufacturer adds a pound of product to every 24 pounds, so that the total weight of a case of any of his products will actually weigh more than the total listed weight of the contents.

Most regulatory agencies have recognized that this mass weighing is an absolute necessity if we are to have the cost-cutting benefits of mass production. It is a compromise that I find easy to understand, but many consumer spokesmen have labeled it a form of economic cheating. In some cases, movements have been started to abolish the current systems of tolerances. I don't think it's worth the cost.

Another example has to do with the size of consumer packages and their net contents. Few consumer spokesmen seem to recognize the fact that the system I find doing so well, and they find so dangerous, has built a high degree of standardization in package size. Again, the reason businessmen have done so is to give their companies—and, because of competitive forces, the consumer—the full benefits of mass production.

Let me give you one classic example on this point. In an attempt to drum up support for Federal control for packaging and labeling one of our chief spokesmen for the consumer in Government refers to a survey she made some time ago. She sent a number of housewives out and asked them to choose from a supermarket the cheapest—in terms of price per ounce—products in several categories. These ladies found a lot of trouble when it came to buying tunafish and now this is being used as an illustration of packaging fraud. I'll be the first to tell you that when you stop by the tunafish display in the average market you are going to have to make some decisions on selection because there are so many different kinds of packs of tuna. And the reason there are so many different kinds is because one is designed to one job and another, another. I buy one kind of tunafish for salad and another type if I am going to use it in a creamed dish. The tunafish packer knows that this is what I want in the way of selection. So, he packs tuna in whole pack and chunks, in oil, and in brine. But each of these different kinds of products is put in the same size can. Naturally, the weight between cans is going to vary because of the way they are packed. Whole tuna in oil, for example, will have a different weight than chunk tuna in oil, even though they are both in the same size can. Why do manufacturers do this? Well, simply so that they can get maximum use out of their can making and can filling machinery and still offer variety to consumers. This makes for good consumer values. Yet, many of the consumer spokesmen cry that this causes confusion and that the weight should be standardized instead. And, they make no mention of the fact that this will add to costs. Again, I question whether this kind of protection is worth the price.

The main thing here is that there has been a sizable and regrettable misunderstanding in the minds of these very well-meaning people about what consumers actually want in terms of value. Most of the consumer movement today is involved in trying to push through legislative and administrative measures to assure that consumers can always find the thing that costs them least per ounce.

But speaking for myself—and, I believe, most other shoppers—I can assure them that, while price comparisons are important, they are only part of the way in which I judge value. Of far greater importance, it seems to me, is the intangible, subjective question of whether or not a product is going to satisfy myself and my family.

If we want bran flakes, for example, the fact that oatmeal may (or may not) be less expensive per pound doesn't really make any difference to me. The value really lies, in that case, in the more expensive product. And making it easier for me to make this—to me—essentially meaningless comparison isn't going to earn my appreciation, especially if doing so has raised the cost of both products.

But, the consumer spokesmen say, this is of vital importance to the poor, and should be done for them. Yet while it is unquestionably true that helping the poor get more for their money is a worthy enterprise, I sincerely question whether the mass of consumer protection ideas will really do the job.

I question this because I believe that the most common consumer protection measures are designed to solve essentially imaginary problems, ignore the real problems, and in any case, mistakenly assume that treating poverty's symptoms will somehow cure the disease.

It is a fact, I believe, that supermarket shopping today does present some problems. But the problems are not those of simple price comparisons. A more basic problem is the fact that businessmen's sheer inventiveness and ingenuity has spawned such a great variety of new and tempting products that how to best use them presents some very real shopping problems.

These are problems of abundance, not foisted off on an unsuspecting public, but offered us in an atmosphere of free choice. Many consumer spokesmen say this itself is a bad feature of the American marketplace and that the confusion this creates should be diminshed by somehow restricting the number of new products that come on the market. How this would be done, I do not know. I am convinced that shoppers are more grateful to the businessmen who found they could package au gratin potatoes in convenient packages than they are to their spokesmen who, in the hysterical discovery of the obvious, complain that the packaged form is far more expensive than the ingredients.

The real problem is not standardizing boxes or contents. The real problem is educating and training people to make the best use of the abundance that is available to them. And solving the problem begins with an effort directed at the people, rather than at the products.

The fact that a shopper can instantly recognize the lowest cost item available to her in a certain category is meaningless if she hasn't got enough money to buy the product in the first place. The fact that a buyer of something on credit can instantly recognize a high rate of interest is meaningless to him if he needs the product and can't get the credit at a lower interest rate.

Concerning credit, the pressure is building for passage of credit control bills.

You should know and be pleased that your California statute regulating credit and installment sales of goods and services, which I believe is known as the Unruh act, is looked up to nationally as a model law. In it, we see reasonable legislation that has met the needs of the consumer and industry exceptionally well. It has furnished to the consumer adequate information upon which to make a decision on choosing the businessman to whom he will offer his credit.

Likewise, conformity with the law has presented no problem to the seller who wishes to follow the precepts of good business. The proof of the Unruh act's sufficiency is in the fact that it has stood the acid test of years. Proposals to amend it—allegedly for greater protection of the consumer—have been rejected when the spotlight showed up the fuzzy thinking behind such proposals. These, in fact, were poorly concealed efforts to put a straitjacket on the granting of credit to service retailing's customers and to facilitate merchandising.

For many Americans, poverty is a very real and grinding truth. What can be done to mitigate it should and must be done. But careful listing of price comparisons or interest rates are of little help to someone who can't read or judge. And it seems to me that if anywhere near half the effort currently being expended in the name of consumer protection were spent instead on educational efforts aimed at helping make smart shoppers out of today's buyers, something far more valuable would be accomplished.

Supermarket people tell me that the real secret to wise buying in their stores involves simply building a shopping list around a set budget, and then sticking to the list when you get to the store. Additionally, a recent U.S. Department of Agriculture study shows that shopping a store's specials will allow a consumer to chop 16 percent a year off of her food expenditures.

My point is that manufacturers and retailers, competing for our patronage, offer us values. We will be best off as we best learn to turn these honest competitive efforts to our own advantage, turning the attributes of the system to our own use. Only this way can we get the protection we really need.

I think by now you have gotten the point that I do not believe that we should look at today's supermarkets as a vast wasteland. As consumers we should look with grateful eyes on the supermarket as a bountiful, even though often confusing and bewildering, symbol of the inventiveness and ingenuity of the food industry and the abundance of the Nation's farms. In trying to make a balanced judgment of value, I ask myself, "Am I willing to pay the price of some confusion and doubt for the tremendous variety of wonderful food that is being brought to me and my dinner table in an ever-increasing palatable and convenient form?" My answer is, "Yes, sir," without qualification. I'm glad to pay the high price of seasonal and sharply reduced markets. And, as a working wife myself, I would be the last to suggest to 8 million women who divide their time between a home and a job that they can't have the convenient food forms that make their tasks less burdensome. And those are only a couple of the alternatives that would arise if some of the regulators of the marketplace had their way.

Instead, there is a very practical and possible way to reduce the price of confusion in choicemaking—not by turning the Nation's supermarkets into a stultifying panorama of bland similarity but rather educating consumers to the point that they can best use the variety which is offered.

There is a great challenge here to many persons in our country—to the food editors, to the home economists, to our schools and to our consumer education services at various levels of our government. Too few people are trying to help our consumers buy wisely in relation to their needs. One housewife's "giant economy size" can easily be another housewife's waste. Consumer education should be oriented more to the buying and using of foods than to cooking. Formalized education in our schools has a tremendous challenge to keep pace with new products and services and changing methods or distribution. In only a few schools are they meeting this challenge. As one critic commented the other day, "Virtually all courses in the field are cup-and-teaspoon oriented while we live in a thaw-and-serve age." Yet, just last year, half the population of the United States became 25 years old or younger—40 percent of our population is under 20. Studies show that 80 percent of all teenage girls shop for their family's food and spend one-fourth of the entire family food budget—97 percent of them help plan the meals and help cook them. This is a real challenge in consumer education starting at the teenage level.

And I would like to give the knuckles of industry a gentle rap in this connection. What are they doing in the field of consumer education? As one industry spokesman admitted the other day, "We have, perhaps, become so interested in engineering change that we have neglected to tell anybody about the significance or implications of the changes in terms of the basics of shopping cart and kitchen economics, rather than dead statistics."

The whole point I am trying to make is that an educated consumer is a protected consumer. And a dynamic, changing, keenly competitive food industry makes a happy and fortunate consumer.

To quote myself from a speech made sometime ago,

"All the Government officials and all the Government laws in the world are as nothing compared to the impact Mrs. America has on Mr. Manufacturer and on Mr. Storekeeper when she makes up her mind to buy one brand over another. And when she makes that decision, no power on earth can save the businessman or the producer of the product who made the mistake of displeasing her. She has done and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring and in regulating American business enterprise.

"And, to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more Government regulations and laws—I want to protect her freedom of choice."

Tax Adjustment Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12752), to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rates reductions, and for other purposes.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, on January 13 of this year, I rose to speak against the reimposition of the "luxury taxes" on automobiles and telephone service that had been suggested by the President the evening before in his state of the Union message. I maintained then, and I continue to believe today, that automobiles and telephone service are necessities to most Americans and should not be taxed as luxuries. For this reason, I will vote to recommit the bill before us, with instructions to strike the provision delaying the excise tax reductions on autos and telephone service.

If the bill is not returned to committee, I will be compelled to vote for final passage for a very important reason: additional revenues are required to offset the rising costs of the war in Vietnam, or serious inflation will be stimulated.

Congress Backs President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, America is faced with critical decisions in 1966, especially in our war in Vietnam. I am proud to support our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, in his efforts to win freedom for the people of South Vietnam and preserve the peace around the world. I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely editorial, written by Rex Edmondson of the Jacksonville Journal, of Jacksonville, Fla., which applauds the President's stand. In this I certainly concur.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, Feb. 19, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S STAND

How much power should a President have in times of crisis?

That question seems to be the main point of contention in Congress right now as the Senate Vietnam debates go on.

Eighteen months ago, acting with the speed and unanimity of crisis, Congress voted President Johnson its endorsement of "all necessary measures" to bar aggression in South Vietnam.

Now those Congressmen are seeming to recant on their previous stand. They are contending that they will go over the President's head and to the people to gain support opposing the administration's stand.

Those Senators who cannot go along with the strong line against North Vietnam are listening politely to those testifying who do not agree and then apparently ignoring their advice.

Retired Diplomat George F. Kennan, an expert on communism and foreign affairs, summed up the feelings of a lot of us when he contended that although we probably should not have been caught in the Vietnam struggle, we are in it and that it would be unthinkable to back out now.

It is Kennan's idea that we should avoid getting in deeper, that our best bet is to hold what we have and hope for some sort of outside intervention that will solve the problem.

Senator ALBERT GORE of Tennessee thanked Kennan for his views, but said plainly that Members of Congress are determined to project their own views.

This, as President Johnson agreed later (at least on the surface) is not only the right of Congress, but the duty as well.

Much of the dissention over President Johnson's order to resume the bombings in Vietnam stems over what some Senators claim was a mistaken idea of what they were endorsing in 1964. Some, among them Senator GAYLORD NELSON, a Democrat of Wisconsin, say that they voted for the resolution with the understanding that the American mission would remain one of supporting and advising South Vietnam, not of fighting the war.

That category is one all of us would have preferred, but we have been forced into a situation where fighting now is mandatory.

This fact should not be obscured, nor should the fact be underplayed that the President, under the Constitution, is still Commander in Chief and as such must make the decisions.

The notion of the Communists that we are a paper tiger cannot be blamed on anything but the wide breach of opinion that exists now within our Government on what should be done in Asia.

If anything is to be salvaged from the sacrifices already made and which will be made in Asia it will come only because this Nation pulled itself together in one common cause.

President Johnson should not be made the scapegoat for a situation which is unprecedented in our history and one in which nobody has any ready solution. He must only do what he things is right.

Congress should stand ready to support any President who moves firmly and honestly in that direction.

Guidance and the Political Apostolate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the National Catholic Guidance Conference Journal, Dr. John Norman, professor of history and government at Fairfield University in my district, has published an article entitled "Guidance and the Political Apostolate."

Dr. Norman discusses the role of the Catholic layman in politics but he also makes some extremely interesting observations about the responsibility of all citizens in a democracy.

In the belief that Dr. Norman's article will be of interest to my colleagues, I offer it for insertion in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

GUIDANCE AND THE POLITICAL APOSTOLATE

(By John Norman, professor of history and government, Fairfield University)

Pope Pius XII once declared that "While there is much talk about the maturity and strength of the layman in the church, it is in public life that this must be practiced and proved. To act in this field is truly to act in the church." Yet insufficient attention is directed to what the layman can do to promote Christian principles in public life, for he must not only particpate more actively in civic and political affairs, but he must do so under the conscious guidance of the ethical precepts of the church. If he cannot take part as a candidate, he can do so as a rational, informed, and unselfish voter. It is not too much to say that in a democracy, the voting booth is the secular equivalent of the confession booth. Both provide a private test of one's conscience.

In a democracy politics is almost always on the edge of ethics, and often overlaps it. Its very terminology is in large part ethical in connotation. Let us consider a few examples. "Politic" itself stems from a Greek word meaning citizen, and now signifies one who is wise or prudent. "Vote" originally meant to vow in Latin. "Suffrage" indicates a prayer of intercession or supplication as well as the right to vote. "Franchise" once meant freedom from some restriction or servitude. "Candidate" in old Rome was one who dressed in white (purity or sincerity) when offering himself as a suitable aspirant for office. "Office" now means, among other things, duty, place of trust, or religious service. "Republic" represents the common weal (commonwealth) or state. And Aristotle once defined the "state" as "as association of similar persons for the attainment of the best life possible."

THE ETHICAL IMPERATIVE

Today we are laymen with reference to clergymen, but not with reference to politicians, since in a democracy all citizens are in a real sense politicians. Grover Cleveland put it well when he said, "Your every voter, as surely as your chief magistrate, exercises a public trust." The ancient Greeks were keenly concerned over the ethical imperative to participate in civic affairs. Indeed, they referred to laymen not involved in public matters as "idiots," as any good dictionary will show. The classic expression of this feeling is found in Thucydides, who quotes Pericles thus: "We alone regard a man who takes no interest in public affairs, not as a harmless, but as a useless character; and if few of us are originators, we are all sound judges of a policy."

But American laymen have been too frequently unsound judges of policy in the absence of proper guidance from their priests. For one thing, clergymen have not been in the forefront of overdue reform movements in the United States. Moreover, in view of the large number of priests who have expressed sympathy or support for such demagogs as Father Coughlin and Senator McCarthy (not to mention Mussolini), laymen should resolve to become autonomous Catholics in politics, and not automatic ones. Where politics is concerned, ethics is too important a matter to leave solely to the clergy. Catholics need the guidance of informed laymen, who, in the words of Jerome G. Kerwin, "hear nothing of the application of the moral to public affairs from their pulpits."

However, in the matter of greater Catholic involvement in politics, matters are improving. Only a decade ago, Rev. John Tracy Ellis complained that, though Catholics had risen to prominence on the local level (not always to their credit), very few had attained high positions on a national level. Only a few years later, D. W. Brogan observed that the President and Attorney General were Catholic, as were the leaders of both Houses of Congress and nearly 20 Governors. This did not represent a Jesuit conspiracy, he added, but America's coming of age.

It was also the coming of age of the laymen, many of whom had apparently heeded such exhortations that an upright Catholic was bound by a serious obligation to run for office only "when his election is certain, when he is able to avert grave evils from the community, when he can accept without grave inconvenience to himself, and when no other equally competent candidate is available."

This trend toward greater participation, if continued, will help expiate the wrong of days past when corrupt bosses were almost a synonym for Catholic politicians. For there was then a kind of Gresham's law of politics, that bad politicians tended to drive out good ones. This of course does not mean that laymen will be saintly. In fact, surveys have shown that Catholic-educated individuals behave no better—and no worse—than other members of the community. But then, if men were angels, no government would be needed, as James Madison once remarked.

OBLIGATION TO VOTE MORALLY

For those who do not run for office, the moral obligation to vote is obvious. But not so obvious is the obligation to vote morally. This does not imply that there should be a Catholic vote. It means simply the application of Christian principles to politics in accordance with one's individual conscience. We neither have nor need a Christian Democratic Party. The political lay apostolate may be effectively exercised within the American party system, which peaceably reconciles the divergent interests of a pluralistic society. In this sense, Catholicism and democracy are not mutually incompatible. Far from it. Alexis de Tocqueville wrote that in the United States the Catholic religion had been mistakenly considered the natural foe of democracy. "Among the various sects of Christianity," he said, "Catholicism seems to me, on the contrary, to be one of the most favorable to equality of condition among men."

Since Catholics have frequently advanced claims to moral superiority over other sects, it would be well to try to live up to these claims, even at the risk of straining human nature. Catholic laymen could set an example for others by endeavoring to vote as though the question on conflict of interest applied to a private citizen as well as to a public official. In other words, he should not vote for his own best interest if it conflicted with the general interest. This is seldom stressed in either Catholic or public schools, or in pulpits. It is scarcely understood. When it is considered at all, it is looked upon as idealistic or unrealistic, as if idealism were not in the long run the very essence of realism.

Yet there is nothing new about the idea, even though it has been swept under the political rug. John Stuart Mill asserted, "The voter is under an absolute moral obligation to consider the interest of the public, not his private advantage, and give his vote, to the best of his judgment, exactly as he would be bound to do if he were the sole voter, and the election depended upon him alone." In all candor, how many of us vote that way? Or how many of us have ever been taught to think that way?

Mill's sentiment found an echo in one of the best and least known speeches of a great Catholic, Al Smith, in his last address just before the 1928 presidential election, although he almost certainly never read Mill. Said he: "* * * It is the duty of every American citizen, man or woman, to vote according to the dictates of conscience, solely upon the basis of what he or she believes to be for the best interest of the country itself and not upon the basis of any passion or any prejudice. Any man or woman or any group casting a ballot for any other reason except the welfare of the country is doing what they possibly can to negative the whole theory of democratic government."

Things like this need to be discussed and acted upon among Catholics. One reason for this is that only within recent years have Catholic colleges and universities acknowledged political science as a legitimate discipline. A noted Catholic political scientist, Jerome G. Kerwin of the University of Chicago, pulled no punches when he affirmed that "Even now there are Catholic schools where it is scarcely recognized, or where it forms some minor part of history, sociology, or economics. * * * If we have Catholics in the field of political science, they come largely from the secular schools." As part of the political apostolate, Catholic alumni could enhance the prestige of their alma maters by urging the completion of this unfinished business of modern Catholic education. They had better realize that most of the advances in the social sciences have developed through the efforts of non-Catholics.

ETERNAL DRUDGERY

Apart from running or voting, political participation may entail the bother of helping out with speeches, releases, meetings, doorbell ringing, fund raising, telephone calls, stuffing envelopes, taking care of party headquarters and other grubby details. The price of liberty, therefore, is not so much eternal vigilance as it is eternal drudgery, a thought otherwise expressed in the trite but true maxim that either you run the government or the government will run you. And party politics does help run the government.

There is always the fear that one may somehow become morally contaminated by going into politics. The risk is not much greater than in any other field. If power corrupts in politics, it also does so in business—or in the priesthood itself, for that manner. It has been said that politics is the art of the possible, so that only compromise and consensus can be expected instead of perfect solutions. In a democracy it often takes deals to approach ideals. The better the laymen who enter politics, the better the results. Einstein once testified to the fact that more was accomplished in science than in political science because the latter was a much more difficult field to master.

Thus the political apostolate is far from easy. It will involve the layman in controversy, misunderstanding, and sacrifice. He must be as tough of hide as he is tender of conscience. American politics is no game for those who are only Sunday Catholics.

West Virginia's Statues in the U.S. Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, Harry W. Ernst has written for the Charleston Gazette an excellent article on the two West Virginians whose statues are in the U.S. Capitol. Under unanimous consent, I include this article on the history and significance of the statues of Francis H. Pierpont and Senator John E. Kenna:

WASHINGTON'S MOUNTAINEERS IN MARBLE

(NOTE.—Each State allowed statutes of two sons in the U.S. Capitol. Here are the choices of West Virginians.)

(By Harry W. Ernst)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—One championed the Union and helped create the State of West Virginia. A Methodist and Republican, he was too uncompromising to be a successful politician. He was descended from an early American family.

The other, son of an Irish immigrant, helped carve out of the Missouri wilderness a farm when he was a boy. When he was only 16, he was wounded fighting for the Confederacy. His congeniality made him a successful politician. A Roman Catholic and Democrat, he was the youngest Member when he served in the House (29) and U.S. Senate (35).

They were Francis Harrison Pierpont, "the father of West Virginia" who was Governor of the restored (loyal to the Union) State of Virginia from 1861 through 1868, and John Edward Kenna of Charleston, who served in the House and Senate from 1877 until his death in 1893.

West Virginia has honored both men by placing marble staues of them in the U.S. Capitol where each State is permitted to remember two of its prominent citizens in statuary.

Selection of two men of such contrasting background and achievement perhaps reveals a facet of West Virginia's character that isn't fully appreciated.

Although a rural, somewhat provincial State, West Virginia generally practices what its State motto preaches—"Mountaineers are always free." Without self-conscious ideology, West Virginians for the most part believe in equal rights and the right to dissent. They don't preach about such fundamentals of democracy, but simply live confortably with them.

None of the other 17 border and Southern States has made as much progress as West Virginia in moving to end the barbaric humiliation of the Negro. And McCarthyism, which equates dissent with treason, never flourished in the State where a small number of right- and leftwingers have little difficulty being heard.

The reason may be that West Virginians are basically uninterested in ideology—whether it enslaves men because of their race or because of their politics. Their fellow citizens can seek truth by handling snakes or protesting against the war in Vietnam as long as they respect the rights of others to disagree or to be left alone.

In his novel, "Absalom, Absalom," William Faulkner discusses the cultural shock to a man who migrated from the West Virginia mountains to Mississippi in the early 19th century. In West Virginia, "the land belonged to anybody and everybody"; in Mississippi the land and the people were neatly divided and "a certain few men * * * had the power of life and death and barter and sale over others."

The selection of Pierpont and Kenna to represent West Virginia in Capitol statuary indicates the State's passion for diversity and tolerance. How could a State honor both a lover of the Union and a fighter for the Confederacy during the same period?

Perhaps the answer lies in the character of the two men, who their fellow citizens obviously respected although they may have hotly disagreed with them on some issues.

The statue of Pierpont is really a monument to the State he helped establish during the Civil War, as Senator Jonathan P. Dolliver of Iowa, a West Virginia native, pointed out when it was unveiled at the Capitol in 1910.

"It is a monument to times that we hardly yet understand," Senator Dolliver observed. "It is a sort of a memorial of our heroic age."

With his reputation as the father of West Virginia, Pierpont could hardly be ignored by his fellow citizens. Shortly after his death in 1899, the State society of the Grand Army of the Republic persuaded the legislature to place his status in Statuary Hall.

Franklin Simmons, an American sculptor living in Rome, completed it in 1904. But it wasn't formally unveiled until 6 years later because of the maneuvering of several State politicians who disliked Pierpont and because of the illness of his only grandchild, Mrs. Frances Pierpont Siviter, who unveiled it.

Pierpont's life and character are well known to students of West Virginia history. Prof. Charles H. Ambler of West Virginia University wrote a biography of Pierpont that was published by the University of North Carolina Press in 1937.

But few West Virginians probably know who their second marble representative in the Capitol was.

Born in Valcoulon, Kanawha County, on April 10, 1848, Kenna was 8 years old when his father died and left his family practically penniless.

His mother, a great-granddaughter of frontier fighter Gen. Andrew Lewis, took Kenna and his two sisters to live with her brother on a Missouri farm.

After the Civil War, Kenna joined his family who had returned to Kanawha County. He studied at St. Vincent's Academy in Wheeling for two and a half years and then entered the law office of Miller & Quarrier in Charleston.

Kenna had to wait 6 months before he could be admitted to the bar until the lawyers' test oath, which forbid Confederate sympathizers to practice law, was repealed. In 1872 when he was 24, he was elected prosecuting attorney of Kanawha County and became a circuit court judge 3 years later.

His campaign style was strikingly similar to that of John F. Kennedy. Kenna was tall, handsome, and glamourous because of his war record. He was also a powerful speaker who shunned vituperative attacks on his opponents.

Like Kennedy, he appealed to younger members of his party. And Kenna tried new ways of stirring up voters. In 1877, he campaigned with a circus to help persuade West Virginians that they should make Charleston the permanent location of their capital.

Instead of a game of touch football, however, Kenna and his youthful lieutenants celebrated his election as prosecuting attorney by playing marbles in the backyard of a friend's house.

Kenna was defeated in his first try for the House of Representatives in 1874. But 2 years later he overcame the opposition of influential Democrats and upset the incumbent, Representative Frank Hereford, of Union, Monroe County, who was chairman of House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

He served three terms in the House and was chosen in 1883 to succeed Henry G. Davis, who declined to seek reelection, in the U.S. Senate.

Kenna's popularity in southern West Virginia partly resulted from his successful efforts in obtaining Federal aid for a slackwater system that made the Kanawha River navigable, which helped open the region's natural resources for development.

A personal friend of President Grover Cleveland and one of the strongest defenders of his administration, Kenna was considered a liberal Democrat who championed Federal regulation of the railroads—the dominant economic power of his era.

During Kenna's second term in the House, the West Virginia Legislature instructed the State's Congressmen to support the Texas Pacific Railroad bill. But Kenna declined, explaining:

"I have not denounced subsidies to come here and support them. I have not raised my voice in opposition to class legislation against the interests and rights of the masses to come here and lend my voice to the consummation of that very work.

"I have not joined in the indignation of my people at the stupendous power and corruption of the American lobby to come here and surrender myself helplessly into its hands."

A fellow Congressman described Kenna's position as "a bold stand for a young man * * * to take against the unanimous action of the legislature of his own State." But Kenna was persuasive. The West Virginia Legislature reversed its action.

Kenna also was ahead of his times in advocating a stronger Presidency more independent of Congress. He emerged as a leader of the Democratic minority in the Senate when he argued for 3 hours and 20 minutes that President Cleveland was right in refusing to detail his reasons for dismissing certain officials who had been appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate, whose Republican majority was attacking Cleveland for his action.

At 45, Kenna died from heart disease at his home in Washington near the Capitol on January 11, 1893. A service was held in the Senate Chamber and another one at Charleston in the small Catholic church that Kenna had designed when he was 25.

In a memorial address, a New York congressman described Kenna as believing "in the fullest possible freedom of thought and action * * * he was a bigot only in his hatred of bigotry."

"Most men live too long," observed Senator Blackburn of Kentucky. "This man died too soon." There was general agreement that Kenna's death cut short a promising career.

Less than a month after his death, the West Virginia Legislature authorized a statue of Kenna to be placed in the U.S. Capitol—the first West Virginian to be so honored, which indicated his unusual popularity in a State known for rough treatment of its politicians.

Kenna's statue, which was sculptured by Alexander Doyle, now stands in the Capitol's Hall of Columns under the House Chamber. On the floor above is Pierpont's statue in Statuary Hall where the House of Representatives originally met.

The 1864 act, which authorized the Capitol to also serve as a museum dedicated to the Nation's history, permitted each State to donate two statues that are Federal property and can't be removed from the building without the permission of Congress.

By 1932, the weight of the statues had become too much for the floor of the old hall. One from each State was left in the hall and the other's were dispersed throughout the Capitol, perhaps indicating that the weight of history is even too much for buildings to bear.

Some of history's strains, however, were lifted last month when a ceremony in Statuary Hall offered hope that the Civil War has finally ended. The United Daughters of the Confederacy, in remembering Robert E. Lee's birthday, also laid a single red rose at the base of statues of both Confederate and Union heroes including Pierpont of West Virginia.

DESCENDANTS OF JOHN E. KENNA

Although all of Senator John Edward Kenna's children now are deceased, several of his grandchildren still make their homes in West Virginia.

Senator Kenna's first wife died. Their only child was a daughter, who became a Catholic nun and died in a New York convent many years ago. He had four sons and a daughter by his second wife.

One son, the late Jo N. Kenna, was judge of the State supreme court. Judge Kenna was the father of Lee M. Kenna, a Charleston attorney; and Nancy Kenna Ivison, who now lives in Connecticut.

Another son, the late Edward B. Kenna, who died at the age of 32, was listed as editor of the Gazette in R. L. Polk & Co.'s "Charleston Directory" of 1911. Edward's only child is Capt. William E. Kenna, U.S. Navy retired, who now lives in Connecticut, also.

The third son, the late Arthur Kenna, was a Charleston photographer, who had five children. They are Mrs. Gertrude Kenna Thomas of Pittsburgh; Mrs. Louis K. Henderson of St. Albans; Mrs. Ann Kenna Moore of Vienna, Wood County; Alexander P. Kenna of St. Albans; and John E. Kenna, III, of Charleston.

The fourth son of Senator Kenna was the late John E. (Jack) Kenna, II, who was a salesman and pitched semipro baseball for the old Charleston Senators. He never married.

Senator Kenna's only daughter by his second wife was the late Mary Kenna Elkins, who married Blaine, one of the sons of the late Stephen Benton Elkins. Their only child is Stephen Blaine Elkins, a Washington real estate developer.

West Virginia still is honoring the name of Senator John Edward Kenna. Kenna, Jackson County, is named after him, as is Kenna homes in South Charleston. And, one of the new elementary schools that will be built in Kanawha County under the most recent bond issue, will be the John Edward Kenna School in North Charleston.

Honolulu Declaration Rises Above Militarism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, typical of many editorials I have read is one in the Sacramento Bee which found the Honolulu declaration "heartening" in its avowal:

> The war for the hearts of the people is more than a military tactic—

The paper quotes the declaration—

> It is a moral principle. For this we shall strive as we fight to bring about a true social revolution.

The paper believes:

> If the new domestic improvement and stability offensive of the Honolulu declaration is translated into reality the South Vietnamese people will obtain the greatest possible stake in resisting communism and defending freedom.

The newspaper adds that—

> It is most welcome that President Johnson has determined to export a measure of the Great Society to this and other southeast Asian nations. This export may well equal 100,000 more American troops.

Because of the significance of the Honolulu declaration, I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Feb. 11, 1966]

HONOLULU DECLARATION RISES ABOVE MILITARISM

The Honolulu Declaration issued in the form of an agreement between the United States and South Vietnam as a result of President Lyndon B. Johnson's visit to Hawaii contains one very welcome new emphasis.

While L.B.J. and South Vietnamese heads of state declared their determination to persevere in military resistance to the Vietcong, there was nothing said about expanding the war. Instead there was a pledge to expand social, economic, and political reforms.

Said the declaration:

"The war for the hearts of the people is more than a military tactic. It is a moral principle. For this we shall strive as we fight to bring about a true social revolution."

How heartening it is to witness America remembering its revolutionary origin and pledging to use this heritage as a weapon in the Vietnam conflict. The signatories of the Hawaiian declaration promised that both nations would undertake to give "full support" to political and social reforms and "special support" in helping to stabilize the economy and increase the food supply for the people of South Vietnam.

Real substance has been given to these pledges by the swift dispatch of Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman along with Ambassador at Large W. Averell Harriman to South Vietnam as well as to other Asian nations.

One of the most critical problems which has dogged the defenders of South Vietnamese independence has been the unrest of the people. Millions of South Vietnamese have maintained an attitude of neutrality toward the war. This fact has made it possible for the aggressors to find refuge and sustenance among the people and often to conceal their identity. Some of this neutrality has arisen because the people have been caught in a squeeze between the warring forces.

In some measure, however, the Vietnamese people have remained unalined because their standard of living has been so low many of them are not certain their lot would be any worse under the Communists. Ten different governments in 10 years have caused political instability and confusion which aids the aggressors.

If the new domestic improvement and stability offensive of the Honolulu Declaration is translated into reality the South Vietnamese people will obtain the greatest possible stake in resisting communism and defending freedom. It is most welcome that L.B.J. has determined to export a measure of the Great Society to this and other southeast Asian nations. This export may well equal 100,000 more American troops.

Estonian People Remembered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, each year on the appropriate days, Members of this Chamber join their fellow Americans throughout the world in remembering that millions of persons in countries behind the Iron Curtain live their daily lives subjected to Soviet imperialism. It is well that we vocally remember, thereby keeping alive even a faint hope that someday the captive nations of Europe may join the international community as free and independent members of the family of nations.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to the greatness of the Estonian people, and to recall that 48 years ago these proud people declared themselves independent. They then reestablished their national independence which they had lost in the course of imperialist Russian expansion to the west. But the Estonian people were able to enjoy their freedom for merely two decades. The new masters of Russia—the Communists—with their Red army—overran and occupied the country during World War II. That these traditionally free people are not free today is one of the great tragedies of our times.

Since World War II began, approximately 55 former colonies representing about 1.5 billion people have gained their independence, these peoples constituting about one-third of those living today, are free. In many more cases, western colonial powers helped and nurtured their colonies toward responsible independence. What we in the West and most of the newly independent countries fail to realize is that during this same period of time, not a single colony of the Soviet Union has become an independent state. In fact, the Soviets have expanded their empire where they have been able, and have brutally repressed those under their yoke who have sought to attain their freedom.

Yet it is the Soviets, employing the Marxist dialectic, who have branded the Western nations as the colonial powers, when in fact, Mr. Speaker, behind the Iron Curtain lies the largest colonial empire the world has ever seen and suffered with. We ought to recognize the spurious Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for exactly what it is: a colonial empire which makes a mockery of sovereignty, freedom, human justice, and social conditions.

We shall not let ourselves be fooled by the Russian propaganda agencies. Life in this "worker's paradise" is difficult, as the Estonians watch their wherewithal being shipped out of their country; as they watch their women and children being forced to work hard and long hours and days for no apparent increase in the nation's standard of living; as they crave the amenities of life, especially clothing, only to be told, "perhaps next year"; as the majority of Estonians outside the major cities live in substandard housing, many of these units having only outside plumbing; as wages rarely rise, and almost never faster than the cost of living. It is a sorry life, but it should not surprise us to see this. The millions of people in the captive nations learned a long time ago that the true nature of Russian socialism is somewhat less than colonial poverty.

We are not deceived. We shall not forget. The Estonian people have our faith, our trust, and the everlasting hope for a brighter tomorrow.

Tribute to the Air National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, while we have read a great deal recently about the contributions being made by members of our armed services, the work of the Air National Guard has not received the attention it deserves. The part-time military men who compose the Guard have been providing full-time assistance to the Military Airlift Command and assuming an increasing share of responsibility for our total military airlift program.

Last year the "weekend warriors" of the Air National Guard played an unprecedented role both in hauling tonnage to Europe and in helping to speed the movement of men and materiel to southeast Asia. In 1965 the 26 Air National Guard heavy transport squardons carried approximately 25 percent of the total cargo tonnage delivered to Europe by the Military Airlift Command. In recent months, Guard aircraft have provided a significant additional capability to enable the Miliary Airlift Command to reduce the backlog of military cargo in stateside terminals.

So that the splendid service of these civilian airmen may be more widely recognized, I include in the RECORD the following article from the January issue of the National Guardsman magazine:

THE AIR GUARD'S AIRLIFT—ANYWHERE, ANYTIME

(By Maj. Corb Sapchet)

(NOTE.—Air Guard transports serve the Nation three ways: flying cargo hauls, troop airlift, and aeromedical evacuation flights. While in a training status, its fleet of 212 ocean-spanning aircraft has flown more than 27,500 tons of cargo overseas for the Military Aircraft Command, demonstrating its "ready now" status. Its 1,122 experienced pilots are a significant asset for a pilot-short Air Force, its planes one-third of the MAC fleet.

In nearly 5 years since its beginning, it has flown more than 34 million miles, carried 260,000 passengers, and hauled nearly 52,000 tons of cargo for the National Guard and MAC combined, and with a safety rate better than that of MAC. Its planes could move the men of one infantry division in one "lift". The Air Guard MAC fleet is truly a "go anywhere, any time" force in being that provides the Air Force that added "go power" when the going gets rough.)

Now 5 years old, the Air National Guard's heavy transport force plays a significant role in the Nation's airlift picture.

As part of "training" activities, Air Guard transports carry thousands of tons of vital military cargo to points all over the World—tonnage which otherwise would have to be borne by the already heavily-committed craft of the Military Airlift Command (ex-Military Air Transport Service) or farmed out to commercial carriers.

Air Guard transport crews also voluntarily have flown hundreds of "special" missions above their normal training requirements whenever MAC has become hard pressed, and cargo and passengers stack up at MAC's terminals.

Air Guard transports also answer the call when special airlift projects arise for which MAC's Regulars can't be spared from their primary tasks. Such a case is the just-concluded "Christmas Star" in which 76 Air Guard transport crews took time off from their civilian jobs and families to fly 406 tons of Christmas packages, gifts, and mail from an appreciative Nation to its fighting men in Vietnam.

MAC couldn't handle the cargo—it was stretched tight already, supporting the southeast Asia effort. In fact, it used the opportunity to ship 139 tons of military cargo to Vietnam aboard the Air Guard transports along with the Christmas gifts.

Ironically, it was at this very time of the greatest need for airlift, and amidst greatly increased use by MAC of the Air Guard capability to help carry the growing cargo requirements, that announcement was made that three of the Air Guard's C–97 and C–121 Transport Squadrons were scheduled to be eliminated by October 1966, thereby reducing that strategic airlift capability.

The Air Guard's heavy transport fleet has grown from an initial 47 C–97 Stratocruisers received in January 1960, to today's powerful force of 159 C–97 and 53 C–121 Super-Constellation aircraft.

This fleet, by the end of 1965, was scheduled to have logged more than 450,000 flying hours and 37 million miles flown since 1960 with a near-perfect safety record—a record consistently better than MAC's overall performance.

More than 55,000 tons of cargo and 270,000 passengers will have been carried for MAC and the National Guard. During the past fiscal year. Air Guard transports flew 1,469 overwater flights which carried 11,388 tons of cargo for MAC—a significant byproduct of training.

Monthly, MAC can ship an average of 16 tons of cargo or 160 passengers on each of 120 overwater training flights of Air Guard transports. That's 8 tons or 80 passengers per plane going overseas, and the same amount coming back.

Some 20,348 tons of cargo were carried by Air Guard transports for MAC between January 1, 1963, when the compilation of separate records began, to July 1, 1965. Indications were that by the end of 1965, the Air Guard would have boosted this to 27,500 tons—an outstanding contribution to the Nation's cost-reduction program by making each training dollar do the work of two.

During December, in addition to the "Christmas Star" flights, and despite the Christmas holiday "lull," Air Guard transports were scheduled to fly 109 overseas missions. On each of 8 days, more than 30 Air Guard transports were winging across an ocean on a normal training flight and carrying cargo for MAC while accomplishing their normal training requirements.

Besides being operational in the two areas of cargo and passenger carry, since August 1, 1964, the Air Guard transports have been flying an average of 22 aeromedical evacuation missions a month to supplement the regular MAC aeromedical system, hard pressed by demands of the southeast Asia effort.

These flights travel domestic routes and overwater routes to Alaska, Bermuda, Cuba, Newfoundland, Panama, and Puerto Rico. By December 11, these Air Guard transports had carried more than 3,948 patients and passengers some 308,700 miles—about 15 percent of the MAC aeromedical evacuation effort.

AIRLIFT POWER PROVEN

In support of the annual field training of Army and Air Guardsmen and Army reservists the past 2 years, the Air Guard has excellently shown its troop-carrying potential during the "Guardlift" mobility exercises. More than 30,000 troops were airlifted last summer in "Guardlift II" when Air Guard transports flew 2.2 million miles—the equivalent of five round trips to the moon. These flights were conducted as part of normal aircrew qualification training and were not part of the MAC missions.

Thus the Air Guard has demonstrated its tremendous triple-threat strategic airlift power in performance of cargo and passenger lift and aeromedical evacuation flights.

The Air Guard fleet represents about one-third of the total MAC airframes, Active and Reserve.

This force gives the Nation a flexible response to strategic airlift needs. It has enough airframes to send cargo into many widely scattered troubled areas, with cargo dispersed among different aircraft so that an aircraft loss would not be as drastic as that of combat losses of the larger C–5A aircraft planned for production 4 years from now.

Cost of operating an average Air Guard transport squadron is $2.9 million a year; or, to put it another way, the expected $35 million per plane cost of the yet to be built C–5A would operate an Air Guard transport squadron for more than 10 years.

Today, these Air Guard MAC transports have the capability of airlifting either 2,120 tons of cargo or more than 16,000 troops at one time. That's enough airlift to move the personnel of one infantry division.

That's MAC's "bonus air fleet."

Driving the Educators to St. Peter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Al McIntosh of the Luverne (Minn.) Rock County Star-Herald wrote an interesting editorial the other day dealing with school administrators' reactions to the new primary-secondary education law. Al's conclusion:

> This is the penalty all of us pay for a rubberstamp Congress that abdicated its responsibilities to the citizenry.

Perhaps a full reading of the editorial will help to explain why, and I place it in today's RECORD:

DRIVING THE EDUCATORS TO ST. PETER

We predict that the Federal aid to education is going to drive a lot of our school superintendents to any early grave, from overwork and overworry. If not to an early grave there certainly will be a mass exodus to the St. Peter mental hospital's "violent ward."

We're talking about title I of Public Law 89–10. It was silly and hastily conceived by an overheated Congress from a momentary dark-of-the-room romance without heeding the words of caution from the "premarital" advisers, the professionals.

No educator or any professional association was consulted.

The "get" of that momentary romance has turned into something not beautiful like its announced aims but a hideous Mongolian idiot. The unworkable, inequitable, phases of the law are driving schoolmen crazy.

The one thing certain is that hundreds of millions of dollars are going to be shoveled out like so many millions of bushels of wheat on the ground—from lack of proper planning.

The Luverne School Board is doubling the frequency of its meetings. All because of the extra time-consuming hours spent trying to wrestle with project planning under title I.

One prominent southwestern educator (not from Rock County) told us this in a long-distance conversation.

"It is the most frustrating thing in the world," he said.

He sighed a minute and then said "I don't like to use this language but it makes me damn mad."

The Redwood Falls Gazette recently queried 20 school superintendents on their plans and progress.

"We just keep holding meetings," said one official.

"It is impossible for me to exaggerate my disappointment with the administration of Public Law 89–10," a superintendent commented.

There was total agreement by the educators on one thing—that the redtape, reports, rules, regulations, interpretations, and misinterpretations are overwhelming.

"This thing is putting school boards and superintendents behind the eight ball like nothing before ever did," another educator told the Redwood Falls newspaper.

In the meantime the educators are like blind men on a rubber raft trying to skirt the perilous rapids and rocks of the Snake River.

The danger of it all is that in order to get some of that Washington "free money" some schools will saddle themselves with costly, poorly planned projects that will add to the burden of the local taxpayers forever.

This is the penalty all of us pay for a rubberstamp Congress that abdicated its responsibilities to the citizenry. It yielded its commonsense and moral principles because of political backbreaking tactics of the "social planners."

Survey of the Atlantic Alliance in the Milwaukee Journal's Great Decisions Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the excellent traditions of the Milwaukee Journal is the yearly series of articles published in its Sunday editorial section on the "Great Decisions" confronting the Nation. Last Sunday, February 20, the future of the Atlantic alliance was the subject of this series.

Eric Waldman, professor of political science and director of the Institute of German Affairs at Marguette University in Milwaukee, contributed a succinct yet comprehensive survey of the political and military problems of NATO. Professor Waldman is a leading expert on this subject.

In the other article, I outlined my view of a hopeful trend in the Atlantic alliance on matters involving the Common Market, trade, aid, and international monetary reform.

I include the articles hereafter:

GREAT DECISIONS, 1966: WESTERN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES—EUROPE WEATHERS TEMPESTS—BRIGHTER SKIES PREDICTED

(NOTE.—The two articles below relate to the third week's topic in the Great Decisions series, which poses the question: "End of the Atlantic Alliance?")

(By Representative HENRY S. REUSS)

Crisis is the normal state of affairs for the Atlantic Alliance. Prophets of doom saw the end coming when President de Gaulle blocked Great Britain's entry into the Common Market in January 1963; when the multilateral nuclear force (MLF) proposal was sunk almost without trace at the end of 1964; when the Common Market went into shock a year ago. The glorious alliance, the grand design, and the free world community have all been pronounced dead. My reaction is like that of Mark Twain when reports of his death were brought to him. The reports seem greatly exaggerated.

If the United States can take its eyes off the cobra stare fixation of southeast Asia long enough to get on with the task of rebuilding the Atlantic community, the happy Marshall plan days of unity can be here again.

Today I see some brighter colors across the whole spectrum of transatlantic cooperation in economic, political and military matters:

1. An outward-looking Common Market: The United States from the beginning supported the continental Common Market on the premise that it could be widened to include all of Western Europe; that it would pursue outward-looking, rather than narrow nationalistic policies; that the economic prosperity which it engendered could spin off to the rest of Europe and the world.

We placed particular reliance on two supranational aspects. The Common Market commission, an international body with the sole power of initiating common action, and the end of the system of one member veto, taking effect this year, by which one dog in the manger Common Market member could drag the others down to its level.

President de Gaulle announced some time ago that he was out to wreck both these provisions. But when the smoke of battle cleared from the meeting of the Common Market ministers at Luxembourg late last month, the five—Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg—stood fast. If they continue to stick to their guns, a Common Market which will be outward looking, and which others can join, again becomes a hopeful possibility.

PAYMENTS GAP SHRINKS

2. World trade: The Common Market crisis cast a pall over the Kennedy round negotiations at Geneva, which have to be completed by June 1967. The American position, as set forth in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is to achieve a significant reduction of trade barriers on a multilateral basis. Had France succeeded in bending the Common Market to its will, the chance of meaningful negotiations would have dwindled.

Now we need to press full speed ahead with Kennedy round negotiations. Our first line of attack should be to attempt an across-the-board negotiation with all of the 65 negotiating countries, which between them account for 82 percent of world trade.

But if France should become intransigent, we must not let the entire negotiation fail because of it. As an alternative fallback position, we should make clear our readiness to negotiate with the other 64 countries, accounting for 77 percent of world trade. An intransigent France should be denied the most-favored-nation treatment benefits of such a resulting 65-nation trade liberalization agreement.

Incidentally, discreet rattling of this "secret weapon" would itself be the best guarantee of a more cooperative France at the bargaining table.

3. International monetary reform: The historian will record with regret that the United States did not move vigorously in the early sixties to bring its international payments into rough balance, and to embark upon a long overdue reform of the international monetary system.

For years we allowed our payments deficit to hover around the $3 billion mark, and we proceeded to lose gold—and control over our domestic economy—in the process. Worse, because our payments were still badly out of balance, the countries of Europe were not ready to undertake monetary reform.

In 1965 we have done much better. Our payments deficit is down to some $1.3 billion. And early this month we tabled before the Group of 10—the leading financial nations of the Atlantic community—our proposal to create a composite reserve unit which can, to some extent, supplement gold and the dollar as the free world's monetary mechanism. There is much negotiating still to do before agreement is reached. But at least we have started.

4. Development aid: While the Atlantic countries have been growing richer every year, the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are making little progress, and in many cases are growing poorer.

Recently hopeful signs have appeared that the developed world is recognizing its joint responsibility toward the developing countries.

The House of Representatives this month passed the bill to set up an Asian Development Bank, in which the 19 developing countries of Asia will join with the Atlantic countries to provide long-term economic aid to Asia.

In addition to the United States, Germany, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and nine other European countries have made generous contributions. France alone is conspicuous by its absence.

Together with the Inter-American Development Bank for Latin America, and with the new African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank can channel help on a multilateral basis to where it is desperately needed.

5. Military security: France's removal of most of her military power from NATO command, and her insistence on a separate nuclear striking force, have damaged the NATO structure. But the central idea of one for all and all for one in the military defense of Europe remains. If the Soviet Union is to be persuaded to act with restraint, and if a beginning to discussions for German unification and a more humane order in middle Europe is sought, most leaders realize, the West must stick together.

France may, if she wishes, insist that the United States remove her European supply line from France's soil. If she did, we could set up more direct supply lines to our troops in Germany through north European ports, incidentally achieving some savings on our balance-of-payments expenditures. Life could still go on.

UPGRADING THE OECD

If President de Gaulle wants NATO headquarters removed from France, there are other places in Europe where it could be installed. And Secretary McNamara's proposal for a continuous consultative procedure on nuclear arms for the NATO alliance seems a far more satisfactory approach than the ill-fated multilateral nuclear force, which aroused apprehension of a possible German finger on the nuclear trigger.

6. Improved institutions: Attempts over the years since NATO was formed in 1949 to put political and economic flesh on its military bones have been unsuccessful. But there is another organization in being which, with a little beefing up, could provide a truly dynamic institution for Atlantic cooperation. This is the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, created in 1961.

OECD's purpose is to achieve full employment without inflation in its member countries, to contribute to the economic expansion of developing countries, and to expand world trade on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis. Its members include the United States and Canada, almost all the European countries including the neutrals, and Japan—generally, the advanced countries of the free world.

The trouble is that the OECD today lacks the prestige and the independence to initiate common solutions for the free world's problems of trade, aid, payments, and economic growth. Its decisionmaking body, the council, only infrequently holds meetings at which its members are represented by high ranking, ministerial level officials. And it lacks a genuine executive agency, such as the Common Market's commission, as well as a consultative legislative assembly.

President Johnson could give Atlantic cooperation a forward surge by calling for a three point upgrading of the OECD; permanent ministerial level representation on its council; an independent executive commission, perhaps of five "wise men," to initiate proposals and make recommendations to the council; and a parliamentary assembly of legislators drawn from the legislative bodies of the member nations to debate and make recommendations concerning the central business of the OECD.

NATO's Illness: Diagnoses Differ

(By Eric Waldman)

The well-publicized troubles of the Western defense alliance have given some support to the view that "NATO is dead"—or at least in its terminal illness. According to this line of thought, the crisis in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization does not involve mere organizational difficulties or differences of strategic opinion, but is the sign of an irreversible disintegration process. Therefore, in 1969 when the North Atlantic Treaty expires, the alliance formed 17 years ago to build a powerful collective deterrent against further Soviet expansion in Europe will actually come to an end.

These pessimistic views about the future of NATO call for an examination of some of the major factors which brought on the current crisis.

One of the most important points at issue is the question of the continuing need for an Atlantic collective security system. Some observers feel that NATO has outlived its usefulness because of the fundamental changes in Soviet foreign policy toward the West.

CITE SOVIET THAW

While the relatively hard Soviet position on Vietnam has clouded the picture somewhat, those who argue that NATO is obsolete point to the restraint which the Soviet Union has exercised for some time in dealing with the Western Powers as proof of the peaceful coexistence policy. They believe that the cold war has ended with a relaxation of tensions in Europe and that a costly military alliance is no longer required.

Exponents of this view would see merit, in fact, in a complete breakup of NATO, since they feel it would further accelerate finding solutions to some of the still unsolved problems of European unity and security, such as final treaty arrangements between the World War II victors and Germany.

A diametrically opposed analysis holds that there is no substantial change of long range Soviet intentions and that it was and still is the strength of NATO's deterrent power which prevented the Soviet Union from pursuing a more aggressive policy toward the West.

Champions of this interpretation of the situation in Europe can point at the approximately 90 Soviet divisions stationed in central and eastern Europe, the 3,000 modern tactical aircraft ready for immediate employment, and the 800 medium-range ballistic missiles equipped with nuclear warheads and pointed at West European targets as strong indications of a continuing danger from the East. It is explained that a decrease in the deterrent power of NATO, or its complete disintegration, would result in a revival of Soviet aggressiveness as in the immediate post-World War I era.

DE GAULLE'S IDEAS

That U.S. policymakers give much weight to this view is evident from the continued presence of more than 300,000 men of the American Armed Forces in Europe, including about 220,000 in West Germany and 6,000 in Berlin. This is half again as many American troops as are fighting the hot war thus far in Vietnam.

An entire complex of problems has been thrust upon NATO by the French chief of state. President de Gaulle's policies and actions are strongly influenced by the following concepts:

His notion of an expanding "European Europe" from the Atlantic to the Urals requires a disintegrated Eastern Europe, which he suggests could only become reality if preceded by a similar process in the West.

France is destined to be the leading continental power and therefore British and

American influence must be curtailed in Europe.

Germany must not be permitted to share in any nuclear arrangement since this would result in strong Soviet reaction detrimental to easing of control in Eastern Europe and would challenge France's superiority on the Continent.

Since the "nation state" is the primary historical and political unit, integration, or subordination as De Gaulle prefers to call it, is contrary to a nation's interest and has to be opposed. This concept applies equally to NATO, to the European Common Market (EEC), and to other European organizations.

No nation can indefinitely rely on another country's nuclear power for its own security. France, therefore, must have its own force de frappe. De Gaulle realizes that the limited French nuclear potential (it is estimated that France may have 3 percent of the West's nuclear weapon power by 1970) cannot compete with the nuclear might of the Soviet Union, therefore he insists on the strategic concept of immediate massive retaliation directed against major cities as a deterrent against aggression.

The broad scope of De Gaulle's policies makes it possible for many observers, including American experts on Europe, to agree with one or more of his views and at the same time strongly reject others.

The official U.S. view opposes De Gaulle's position and favors further steps toward European and Atlantic military integration as necessary for an effective Western security system.

Washington appears greatly annoyed by the doubts expressed by Europeans—and the French are by no means the only ones—that the United States would commit its nuclear forces in the case of a Soviet attack in Europe. Neither repeated pledges made by American Presidents and Secretaries of State, nor the American forces sent to Europe in past wars, have convinced all our European partners of our credibility.

Nor do some admit the futility of a nuclear deterrent of the size France can maintain.

A French atomic strike, American strategists warn, would fail to hurt substantially the Soviet retaliatory capability and therefore could only serve to trigger total destruction to its user.

The United States, sympathizes with those NATO partners, including West Germany, which want to participate in nuclear decision making related to the defense of their own countries. The ill fated multilateral force (MLF) was an American attempt to provide for this participation in a small fraction of the available nuclear forces without giving up final United States control on their employment. However the scheme met with only lukewarm support in Western Europe and bitter opposition from the Soviet Union. The recently created nuclear planning committee may prove a more acceptable means to provide the NATO partners with the status of nuclear consultants.

Recently efforts have been made to update NATO strategy and to provide the means for a flexible response to Soviet aggression. The doctrine of massive retaliation, the exchange of the most destructive nuclear weapons whatever the provocation, had lost its credibility. But the failure of the NATO countries, except the United States and West Germany, to supply adequate conventional forces has kept the means for flexible response below desired levels.

STRATEGIC JUSTIFICATION

Despite all the difficulties enumerated, the U.S. administration clearly considers the continuation of NATO still essential to its own and Western Europe's security. Efforts will continue to find a basis of co-operation with all NATO countries, including France, even though at times it appears a frustrating endeavor.

The strategic view that the nation's military policy must be based not on the attitude of a potential opponent as it appears at the moment, but must consider his capability (which does not change so rapidly), seems to be the justification for persistent United States efforts to help NATO survive its recurrent crises.

The Spade and the Spear—A Problem of Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, just about everyone in the United States has something to say about the war in Vietnam, and rightly so, because it involves every American.

One of the most inspired and enlightening sermons on the subject that I have read was deliveded by the Reverand William H. Hudnut III, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Indianapolis, on February 6, 1966.

The logic and forcefulness of Reverend Hudnut's presentation have went to the heart of the matter, and sum up with amazing clarity the reasons that America must resist further Communist aggression.

Under unanimous consent, in order that every Member of Congress can read this brilliant sermon, I have permission for the article to be published in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE SPADE AND THE SPEAR—A PROBLEM OF CONSCIENCE

Text: Nehemiah 4: 16: "Half of my servants worked on construction, and half held the spears, shields, bows, and coats of mail."

Perhaps some of you read the New Yorker, and if so, you may be familiar with those biting cartoons by Whitney Darrow that lampoon much in our way of life that needs to be punctured. Several years ago, a drawing appeared depicting two clergymen, one a scrawny young neophyte, the other a wide-girthed, double-chinned, white-haired elder statesman, obviously a resounding ecclesiastical success.

They were conversing in the latter's richly appointed study. The stinging caption underneath the drawing read: "Meadows, if you want to get on in the church as I have done, there are two subjects never to speak on: one is religion; the other is politics."

This morning, at the risk of not "getting on in the church," I aim to disregard that piece of advice, because bearing hard upon my conscience is the exceedingly perplexing matter of American involvement in Vietnam. There is a lot of confusion in our country about the war there, a lot of soul searching, a lot of agony, a lot of determination, a lot of comment. Everybody's concerned about it.

Everybody's talking about it. It is the topic foremost in American minds. And the pulpit has a responsibility, does it not, to grapple with such a question that vitally concerns church members? We do not want our church to be a place where we insulate ourselves from the world, do we? Our church should be a place where we seek to equip ourselves for ministry in the world, for understanding of the world which God loves and wants to save, and for transforming that world by the application of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the problems that vex it.

I believe that in the life of the Christian church, so serious a problem as Vietnam should not be ignored or bypassed, but discussed and placed, if at all possible, in the context of our Christian faith.

So we speak, hopefully without arrogance, rather with humility and sincere concern. I have no special wisdom to offer, only some convictions to express. To talk about military strategy or the politics of the war would not be fitting, because it strikes me as rather gratuitous for a minister to use his pulpit to deliver himself of free advice upon matters he is not professionally competent to handle—although there is nothing wrong with him having an opinion about them. But it is not out of place for the pulpit to direct attention to certain ethical and moral implications of our involvement in the struggle in southeast Asia.

I

Any time Christians, either individually or collectively, become involved in armed conflict, they have a problem of conscience. On the one hand, our Christian ethic of love of neighbor enjoins us not to kill and to overcome evil with positive good will. Yet on the other hand, we have our Christian responsibility for our brother, our duty as citizens, our involvement in the problems of the world, our battle, if you will, against the powers of darkness.

If we disavow armed conflict, taking the way of nonviolent resistance, our conscience will be stricken by our disassociation from the struggle which may allow evil to win a victory by default; yet if we participate in that struggle, our conscience will be vexed by our perception that we have forsaken the more ideal way of brotherly love that Christ desires of His followers. Christ himself appreciated the dilemma in which His disciples would be placed when He exhorted them to be "wise as serpents and innocent as doves." The Christian is someone who learns to live with a bad conscience and understand the interplay within himself of the serpent, or we might better say, the hawk, and the dove, which warfare is projected onto the stage of history in the world at large, resulting in various spasms of civilization such as the one we are now experiencing.

Perhaps the Old Testament figure Nehemiah provides a relevant Biblical illustration of this tension. Nehemiah, you remember, was the highly placed Jew in the court of Artaxerxes, the fifth century B.C. Persian monarch. Nehemiah returned to Jerusalem as governor to rally his people to the task of rebuilding the city's walls which had been lying in ruins ever since Nebuchadnezzar destroyed them in 586 B.C.

While the construction was proceeding, Nehemiah's enemies, certain non-Jews, gathered round the city, ridiculing his efforts and threatening to attack. Consequently, as a precaution, Nehemiah equipped his workers with armor. "Half of my servants," he wrote in his diary, "worked on construction; and half held the spears, shields, bows and coats of mail." Half were engaged in peaceful activity, the other half were prepared to wage armed combat. Half were trying to cement good relationships in the community, the other half were ready to fight if the occasion demanded. Half carried tools of peace—trowels, shovels, wheelbarrows, bricks, and mortar; the other half carried the instruments of destruction—swords, spears, shields, bows, coats of mail. The upshot of the matter was that the attack never came, and eventually the walls were finished.

Do we not have here in the story of Nehemiah a symbolic representation of the two vantage points from which Christians must view the war in Vietnam, or any other conflict in which we may become engaged—the spade and the spear? The spade represents the Biblical hope of a peaceful world in which men live together in brotherly love; the spear suggests the Biblical awareness of the reality of evil and the obligation to oppose it. Perhaps it would be instructive to examine then in turn.

II

Consider the first the spade. In Scripture we can find a winsome longing for peace and a stern command to work for it. Isaiah envisions the day when "nations shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks," when "nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore" (2:4). Zechariah dreams of the day when Jerusalem shall not need any walls to protect her against invasion (2:4). The Book of Revelation speaks of the healing of the nations (22:2).

But the Bible also makes peace a present imperative as well as a future hope. Build peace into the structures of life, says Scripture. "Blessed are the peacemakers," said Christ in the Sermon on the Mount. Paul appealed to the church at Rome: "Let us pursue what makes for peace and for mutual upbuilding" (14:19); and also, "do not be overcome by evil but overcome evil with good" (12:21).

If we take such Scriptural passages about peace seriously, and sincerely endeavor to subordinate our opinions to the Word of God and make ourselves captive to the mind of Christ, will we not be driven to the conclusion that the priority of our witness as Christians must be given to peacemaking; and that the Biblical injunction to seek peace provides our war-weary world with a goal, whether accepted by all or not, that challenges and rebukes the pride and self-justification of the nations as they compete antagonistically on the stage of history? I think this implies at least the following four things:

1. Christians should deplore war as contrary to God's intention for His children. War should be clearly condemned as "a particular demonstration of the power of sin in this world and a defiance of the righteousness of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and Him crucified" (Oxford Conference on Life and Work, 1937). War is a scourge, said Lincoln. "War is stupid crime, (the) devil's madness," wrote the Poet Robert Service. "War is cruel and you cannot refine it," remarked William Tecumseh Sherman as he marched into Atlanta in 1864; and later, he said, "war at best is barbarism * * * war is hell." And what is hell, but alienation from God and rejection of love?

2. Christians should never lose their capacity to care. A Christian gentleman is someone who cares. Being Christian means being able to say, "Your grief is my grief. Your tears are my tears. Your suffering is my suffering." But unfortunately, one of war's first casualties is almost always our spiritual and ethical sensitivity.

War can dull our consciences and dehumanize our feelings. Yet Christianity teaches respect for human life and love of neighbor. It recognizes that God has made "of one blood every nation of men to live on all the face of the earth" (Acts 17: 26) and that consequently all men, regardless of race, nation, social status or political persuasion, are in some sense, children of God and brothers to each other.

Christian faith says with John Donne: one man's death diminishes us all. Therefore, to grow insensitive to the taking of human life, to view with composure or even with rejoicing, the large-scale death of other human beings, to talk glibly about bombing a whole people "back into the Stone Age," to give way to the frightening, irrational, brutalizing emotions of hatred, fanaticism, belligerence and vindictiveness, is to forsake the practice of such virtues as patience, steadfastness, forgiveness, forbearance, and compassion, which Jesus Christ our Lord demanded of His followers.

3. Christians should, it seems to me, express to the responsible national leaders, following the suggestion of Pope Paul, their desire that nothing be neglected that might bring minds closer together, and that no favorable occasion, however slight, be overlooked, to achieve a peaceful, honorable, and just solution of the crisis in southeast Asia.

They should welcome free and open discussion in the public forum of this vexing issue, and respect the right of men to disagree without impugning their loyalty. And they should worry not so much about saving face as about doing what's right and what the strongest Nation in the world can do to avoid unnecessary escalation and achieve reconciliation.

4. Christians should be concerned about eradicating the causes of war and planting the roots of peace wherever possible. The conflict in which we are engaged is primarily ideological, not military; and we will be fighting it on that front long after some accommodation has been reached on the battlefields of Vietnam.

We are engaged in a battle for the minds and hearts of men. It is a battle for the moral and spiritual rearmament of mankind, and it is incredibly naive to suppose that military victories alone can win that battle. So should we not be thinking about filling the vacuum that military competiton creates with a positive program of reconstruction?

This means praying for peace and for those who suffer so terribly in southeast Asia. It means caring for refugees and displaced persons, perhaps by contributing to Church World Service or a similar agency. It means supporting the work of the Christian Church around the world in its ministry of healing. It means uprooting the things that frustrate the cause of peace—things like abysmal poverty, race prejudice, injustice, disease, illiteracy, and all the rest of it. And it means, so far as each one of us as individuals is concerned, trying to be peacemakers.

So much then for the spade. It stands for the constructive aspects of the human mind, the nonmilitary ways of dealing with the conflicts and misunderstandings that inevitably arise among people. It points us to the positive peace that lies beyond the truces of military strategy, diplomatic science, and atomic stalemate. It suggests the hope of growth and regeneration. It symbolizes the triumph of life over death, good over evil, light over dark, and peace over war.

III

Now what about the spear, which, as we suggested earlier, though a last resort, and below the spade on our list of priorities, is nonetheless the second necessary vantage point for understanding the Vietnamese struggle?

It is interesting to note that Nehemiah decided to arm half his men only after he had prayed about it. In that tense situation, God led him to understand his responsibility to protect his people against possible attack. Which is to say, in a world where men attack other men, spears are necessary as well as spades, and can represent some facet of the will of God.

Christian faith at its best is realistic. Christ taught in some of His parables, like the wheat and the tares, that in history there will be no simple triumph of good over evil, but rather a struggle to the end in which Christians must responsibly involve themselves.

In a fallen world, imperfect, sinful, plagued by demonic powers that produce division and hostility, beset by vaulting human ambitions, if you equip yourself only with spades, the men with the spears may destroy you.

That is why, in my opinion, a pacifist ethic of nonviolent resistance to evil is illusory and irrelevant. Of course, genuine Christian pacifism is a valid position. It represents the perfectionistic impulse in the New Testament that serves as a conscience for us all. But it is not the final answer, because there is no guarantee that perfect love will ever win a worldly victory.

So those who tell us to stand by, to quit playing policeman to the world, to pull out and come home, are naively handing the world over to power and, indeed, assuring the extension of the area of conquest, violence, and suffering.

Somewhere tyranny must be resisted, or it will continue to grow. Somewhere the lust for power must be checked, or it will produce war and more war. Somewhere the rotten apple must be found, or it will infect the whole barrel. Somewhere the cancerous cell must be tracked down and removed by surgery, or it will destroy the whole body.

Somewhere freedom must be defended, or it will be tramped upon by the boot of unconscious power. Somewhere the integrity of a people and their right to self-determination must be protected, or a hungry bear, with a nibble here and a gobble there, will in a matter of time consume everything.

So we take our stand. Somewhere we draw a line. Most of the debate right now seems to be whether or not we have drawn it in the right place. But somewhere we draw a line, and there we make a commitment, relying upon the sober judgment of our national leaders and supporting them when the chips are finally down. We hold our spears. We fight, knowing that worse than peace is dishonor and extension of tyranny.

Not that our hands are clean. Indeed, they are dirty. Not that the situation is clear or unambiguous. Not that we are all right and the other fellow is all wrong. But we will not stand blithely by the side of the road, while our neighbor is attacked. We will not fiddle while Saigon burns. In the name of love of neighbor, we will fight for his rights, after all rational and nonviolent means of reconciling conflicting feelings have been explored and exhausted. In order to be our brother's keeper, as the Old Testament has it, or to bear one another's burdens, to use a New Testament phrase, we will do what we judge has to be done in the struggles of history, perhaps remembering that line from the First Epistle of Peter, which reads: "Your adversary the devil prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking someone to devour. Resist him."

A man, if he is a man and not an animal, does not ever want to fight, but when those things he holds dear are threatened, perhaps he has to. When Henry Van Dyke saw Augustus Saint-Gaudens' statue of General Sherman, to whom we have already referred, he composed a bit of verse:

> "This is the soldier brave enough to tell
> The glory-dazzled world that 'war is hell':
> Lover of peace, he looks beyond the strife,
> And rides through hell to save his country's life."

Sometimes you have to ride through hell to save what you love and believe in. I believe that riding through hell in Vietnam is worthy of what we believe in as Americans and Christians. I believe that in today's historic struggle, after all the ambiguity has been stripped away, there is a clear preponderance of right on our side, which I hope can be affirmed without arrogance or self-righteousness, and that those who obscure it are deluding themselves.

If we cannot make a distinction here then there are no historical distinctions which have any value. I believe in a government of laws not men. I believe that government by consent is more just than rule without it. I believe the individual is more valuable than the state. I believe that faith in God is better than atheism, and emancipation of men better than enslavement. I believe that the perimeter of freedom must be defended against the encroachments of tyranny. I believe South Vietnam is the zone of contact, as Senator Javits has stated, in the struggle for freedom of Asia. I believe the fight there, now that we are into it, needs to be waged. And I believe it deserves our support until by the grace of God it has been satisfactorily concluded.

The last line in the Book of Nehemiah reads: "Remember me, O my God, for good." There were probably some things Nehemiah did he should not have done, and unquestionably other things he should have done that he did not do. Without a doubt, he had an uneasy conscience. But he tried.

Taking spade and spear, he attempted to do the right as God gave him to see it. And so it is with us and our country. We take our stand. We do what we think must be done, unsettled conscience though it gives us. We try our best with both spade and spear to achieve under God a just and lasting peace among ourselves and the nations of the world. And then at the end of the day, knowing how imperfect we are, we humbly and hopefully pray: "Remember us, O God, for good."

High Court's 10th Member—Thurgood Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the post of Solicitor General of the United States is indeed a very high and important one. It must, therefore, be filled only by a lawyer of extraordinary ability, one possessed not only with the mentality to think clearly, logically, and in accord with established legal principles, but also must have the faculty of being able to present arguments and legal briefs submitted on behalf of the Government in such a convincing manner as to be persuasive.

As one of the Representatives in the Congress from the State of Maryland and from the great city of Baltimore, I can perhaps take justifiable pride in the fact that my city has, during my time, furnished the Nation with three distinguished lawyers that filled the office of Solicitor General. They were Philip B. Perlman, Judge Simon E. Sobeloff, who is now on the Federal bench, and the present Solicitor General Thurgood Marshall, who is indeed a worthy successor to his predecessors in that high office.

The Baltimore Sun of February 20, 1966, printed a very interesting article about the present incumbent of that office. Under leave to extend my remarks, this article written by John Dorsey will be inserted at this point in the pages of the Congressional Record. The article is as follows:

High Court's Tenth Member; City-Born Marshall, U.S. Solicitor General, Once "Free-Bee" Lawyer

(By John Dorsey)

The Solicitor General of the United States occupies a position of dignity and power. The third-ranking member of the Justice Department, he decides which cases the United States should appeal to the Supreme Court and argues his Government's position on many of them himself.

The visitor to the Solicitor General's offices in the Justice Department building in Washington is apt to reflect on the prestige of the post as he is asked by a secretary to wait in a huge anteroom, its upper walls adorned with friezes, its windows framed with heavy curtains, its floors covered with rich rugs. Sitting there, one is amply prepared to be awed by the man who had granted him an interview.

The mood changes abruptly, though, when a small door in the end of the room opens, a big head, clothed in gray hair, pepper-and-salt mustache and dark-rimmed glasses pokes out and what must be the down-homey-est voice in official Washington calls, "Hi! C'mon in."

Baltimore-born Thurgood Marshall is a big (6 foot 2, 210-pound), easygoing, informal kind of a man whose manner puts absolutely everybody at ease and disguises a brilliant and forceful mind with few peers in the legal profession.

CHAMPION OF NEGRO RIGHTS

As the chief counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Marshall worked for Negro rights for 26 years. The 32 cases he argued before the Supreme Court in those years resulted in 29 victories, including the 1954 school integration decision, perhaps the most farreaching and certainly the most famous Supreme Court decision of modern times.

Appointed in 1962 judge of the U.S. District Court for the Second Judicial Cirrcuit (New York) by President Kennedy, Marshall seemed to have attained that point of security and prestige toward which he had been working all his life.

Then last summer President Johnson asked Marshall to become Solicitor General, a position held by Baltimoreans Philip Perlman, and Simon E. Sobeloff before him. So the judge went back to a familiar occupation—arguing before the Supreme Court.

There, in traditional striped trousers and cutaway coat, he presents his positions with simple eloquence and in distinguished tones that bear no trace of the Negro accent he puts on in less formal situations.

CONCEPT OF EQUALITY

Unlike his predecessor Archibald Cox, a legal scholar who was fascinated by the fine points of the law, Marshall's appeal has always been directly to commonsense and logic rather than to legal technicalities. As when arguing about segregated schools:

"Neither Congress nor anyone else can say you get equality of education in a segregated school. The 14th amendment requires equality. The only way to get equality is for two people to get the same thing, at the same place, and at the same time."

And again, when talking about why the South clings to segregation:

"It can't be because of slavery in the past because there are few groups in this country that haven't had slavery someplace back in the history of their groups. It can't be color, because there are Negroes as white as the drifted snow, with blue eyes, and they are just as segregated as the colored men.

"The only thing it can be is an inherent determination that the people who were formerly in slavery, regardless of anything else, shall be kept as near that state as possible and now is the time, we submit, that this court should make it clear that this is not what our Constitution stands for."

Marshall claims that his passion for argument, and his ability at it, came from his father, William Marshall, a headwaiter at several Maryland private clubs, including Gibson Island, who made young Thurgood back up everything he said and who gave him orders to fight anyone who called him "nigger." His mother was a schoolteacher in the Baltimore public schools.

It was a naturally argumentative family, in fact, and one used to fighting for its rights, into which the Solicitor General was born on July 2, 1908. (That was the year William Howard Taft was elected to the Presidency, and also the year a group of people got together and formed the NAACP.

His great-grandfather, brought to Maryland from the Congo by an Eastern Shore slaveowner, was impossible to handle and was finally freed by his master on the condition that he go away and never come back.

FIRST SITDOWN IN MARYLAND

Marshall's paternal grandmother, Annie Marshall, staged what may have been the first sitdown strike in Maryland when the electric company came to put up a pole outside her corner store. She took a chair out, put it over the spot the company had designated, and sat on it all day. And all the next day. After a few days the company put the pole up somewhere else.

It was his other grandmother, Mary Eliza Williams, who taught him to cook. She agreed, she said, with his parents, who wanted him to be a professional man, but "you never saw a jobless Negro cook."

Marshall has told these stories a hundred times, but he always enjoys going over them again. He likes jokes just about as much as he likes the poker he doesn't get much time for—"Isn't it nice no one cares which 23 hours a day I work?"—and he seems to have an incident to relate in illustration of practically everything, from the tenacity of his ancestors to the perversity of human nature:

"Why is it you never remember the good guys? I went to Korea in 1951 to do some investigating, and there were two soldiers I spent a good deal of time with. One of them was just about the nicest fellow you ever want to meet, and the other was the meanest man in the world.

"When I got back to Japan I wanted to write something nice in my report about the one fellow, but do you think I could remember his name? Of course not. I remembered that no-good-so-and-so's full name, though. Still do."

In Korea, Marshall was investigating charges of discrimination against Negro soldiers, and got reductions in sentences of several who had been court-martialed. Though his greatest fame was still to come he was established then as the NAACP's leading lawyer.

DISCRIMINATION IN BALTIMORE

It had been a long road from Druid Hill Avenue, where he grew up in the days when, as he remembers it, "Baltimore was the only major city in the country where Negroes didn't go into the downtown department stores."

At Lincoln University in Pennsylvania his grades weren't especially good. They would have been good enough to get him into the University of Maryland Law School, though, except that the University of Maryland Law School didn't take Negroes.

So he went to Howard University Law School in Washington, graduated in 1933 and came back to Baltimore to set himself up in practice. He didn't make much money, because he was willing to take cases for people who couldn't pay. "It wasn't long before I got to be known as a 'free-bee lawyer' and I started thinking, 'something's got to be done about this.' "

He argued civil rights cases right from the beginning, and in 1935 he went to court and got the first Negro admitted to the University of Maryland Law School by proving there wasn't any equal facility for Negroes in Maryland.

It must have been a personal satisfaction for him, though it didn't make many headlines. (In 1935 people were talking about

WPA and NRA and CCC and FDR. In Baltimore that year, Omaha won the Preakness and Howard Jackson won another term as mayor.)

The following year the NAACP enticed him to New York to be a lawyer for the association, at a salary of $2,400 a year. Then began the long series of cases that eventually led to the Supreme Court.

The cases weren't only civil rights cases. He often went South to defend Negroes accused of murder or rape, or lesser offenses, on little or no evidence. It had its frustrations, and even its dangers.

Arguing one case in Mississippi, he moved from place to place each night, because feeling was running so high it wasn't considered safe for him to lodge 2 nights in the same place.

Another time, he imported some of the country's leading minds from the North to testify in a southern court that there is nothing inherently inferior about the Negro race. Before handing down his decision, the judge descended from the bench, went over to Marshall and said the evidence had had a profound effect upon him, had given him a whole new outlook that he would never have believed possible. "Then he went right back up there and ruled against us," the Solicitor General recalls.

One of Marshall's chief assets in dealing with frightened and doubtful plaintiffs in civil rights cases in the Deep South was his adjustable Negro accent, which grew more and more pronounced the farther south he went. It made others feel at home with him and confident in his presence.

Until the late forties, the NAACP's strategy had been to show, in school cases, that separate facilities in individual places were not equal. "But we weren't getting far enough with that," Marshall remembers. "So we had to attack it from a different point of view—with the idea that separation itself means inequality and is unconstitutional."

THE 1954 RULING

It was this idea that Marshall argued before the Supreme Court in the case of Brown versus Topeka Board of Education, and with which the Supreme Court agreed in its 1954 opinion declaring segregation in public schools unconstitutional.

(That year Marshal did gain the national spotlight, and the decision took its place as one of the most important stories of the year, along with the Army-McCarthy hearings, the suspension of J. Robert Oppenheimer by the Atomic Energy Commission, and the withdrawal of the French from Indochina.)

The lawyer opposing Marshall in the 1954 case was John W. Davis, then 80, who 30 years before had been the Democratic candidate for President and who was known as one of the most brilliant lawyers of his time. He had been Marshall's hero ever since, in the latter's Howard Law School days, he had skipped classes to go to the Supreme Court whenever Davis was arguing a case.

"And every time I heard him I'd ask myself, 'Will I ever, ever?' And every time I had to answer, 'No, never.'

"After the 1954 decision, Davis was the first person to call me up and congratulate me."

In the succeeding years Marshall became internationally recognized in the legal profession. He has received numerous honorary degrees, and in 1960 was invited to Britain as special adviser to the 14 African members of the Kenya Constitutional Conference. In helping to draft a constitution for Kenya, Marshall was faced with the problem of writing into the documents safeguards for Kenya's white minority.

"After this experience," he said on his return to this country, "I'm going to understand our own problems in the United States a damn sight better than before."

BATTLE FOR EQUALITY

Despite the 1954 decision, Negroes have had to fight every step of the way toward integration in the South, and in some places in the North, too, and today, 12 years after that decision and 2 years after the Civil Rights Act of 1964, true integration is still a long way away in many communities.

Some places, such as Baltimore, integrated their schools quickly, however, and Marshall, who had left the city in 1936 "glad to be rid of it forever," came back in 1955 to say, "Now I go around the country bragging about the fact that I'm from Baltimore."

At present, the Solicitor General believes that the Civil Rights Act and the voting rights bill are important steps in the Negro civil rights movement, and is pleased that congressional leaders lately have seemed more amenable to civil rights. "They are the people who mold public opinion." But he says it will take more laws and more court actions in the flight for real equality for the Negro.

He thinks every case, "right down to the $5 fine," is important, and does not want to be reminded how far the Negro has come. "What's important is where he stands now in relation to the white man.

"Token integration, one or two Negroes in a school system, doesn't mean much. What we must have, and will have eventually, is total integration, of schools, housing, the power structure, everything. The country club is the last step. Not until you have young people growing up together on an equal basis from the start are you going to have real acceptance. It is too late to do that for most of the present generation of children, but we can try to do it for the next.

"Take, for example, the cooperative apartment house we lived in in New York. There were whites, Negroes, Catholics, Jews, Orientals, every group—all living side by side and there was never an incident. Now those children have a pretty good chance of growing up without prejudice."

Marshall now lives in Capital Park, an integrated area in Southwestern Washington, with his wife, the former Cecilia S. Suyat, whom he married after his first wife died in 1955, and his two sons Thurgood, Junior, 9, and John, 7.

The Negro protest movement has a continuing importance, Marshall feels, even though there is always the danger of violence. "There will be violence as long as there are human beings. But you have to keep on hoping.

"What is important is that the Negro keep impressing three things on the American conscience. One, that the Negro has had a bad shake all these years. Two, that he is entitled to a better shake. And three, that he wants not partial, but complete equality."

On the old fear that integration will produce intermarriage Marshall has a short, simple, and effective answer. He can't say there won't be more intermarriages, but, "after all, the white person can say no."

As Solicitor General, Marshall deals not only with civil rights cases, but with all cases which the U.S. Government may take to the Supreme Court. He must decide whether to send them to the Court and who will argue them.

He argues the ones for which he feels the best qualified and for which he has time. Though presumably if Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach wants to argue a particular case he will do it, he still is required to get the nod from Marshall.

AN AIR OF HUMILITY

Despite his powerful mind and an extensive knowledge of both the law and the Supreme Court—he has been called its "10th member"—Marshall brings to his new job an air of humility rather than confidence.

Sitting casually at his desk in a little room adjoining his big office, the windows behind him framing the Capitol dome, he reflects for a minute and then points to the ceiling:

"Up there, on the floor above this, I've got another little room, where I do my private thinking. It's up there that I go down to the deepest deeps, that I can feel my conscience beating on me, telling me I'm not just thinking for myself. I'm thinking for the U.S. Government."

It was widely speculated, at the time of Marshall's appointment to the Justice Department, that President Johnson has plans to appoint him to the Supreme Court some day. He would be the first Negro member of that Court. But if he has hopes in that direction, or even entertains such thoughts, he gives them no voice.

"I don't think about the future. I got too much right here to think about. I've always believed if you put everything you got into the job at hand, the rest will take care of itself."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson Delivers Significant Address on Highway Beautification at American Road Builders National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on February 23, 1966, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson was the principal speaker at the American Road Builders Convention in Denver, Colo.

The theme of the 3-day conference of the highway construction industry and related industries was highway beautification, a field in which Mrs. Johnson has provided inspiring leadership. The significance of this conference was attested to by the presence on the program of Representatives GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the House Public Works Committee, and WILLIAM C. CRAMER, ranking minority member. Representing the administration were the Under Secretary for Transportation of the Department of Commerce, Alan S. Boyd, his Deputy, Lowell K. Bridwell, and Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator. Much of the credit for a successful conference belongs to Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, retired, executive vice president of the American Road Builders Association and deputy executive vice president, Burton F. Miller, other staff members and all persons who spoke during the event.

Mrs. Johnson's address on the closing day of the convention was the high point of the meeting as evidenced by an attendance of over 900 persons. The First Lady's commitment in this field was expressed not only in her penetrating remarks, but also in her willingness and desire to greet personally more than 700 guests in the receiving line.

I commend to Members of the Senate, Mrs. Johnson's concept of "the new slide rules of public values" to be applied not only to highway construction but to the entire range of public works. The First Lady's challenge to Government agencies to improve their relationships with the public is a matter of first-rate importance to us all. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Mrs. Johnson's speech and my introductory remarks.

There being no objection, the speech and introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, INTRODUCING MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS ASSOCIATION CONVENTION LUNCHEON SESSION, DENVER HILTON HOTEL, DENVER, COLO., FEBRUARY 23, 1966

The theme of this convention of the American Road Builders Association is timely in its emphasis on highway beautification.

These years of the middle and late 1960's will, I believe, be acknowledged by later commentators as a period of our greatest effort to preserve the treasures of the American landscape and the values of our natural resources. A full measure of the credit for this awakening of a new national consciousness belongs to our First Lady.

For the first time, in our time, a concern for esthetic values has brought beauty out of the galleries and studios onto the highways and byways of America. And it is one of the ironies of our culture that the area of esthetic values—which many American men have customarily left to the direction and governance of women—has been brought into the mainstream of political and commercial life by the wife of the President of the United States.

There is irony here, but also much wisdom. The commitment for beauty is a part of our life and should not be cloistered. As the President stated in response to the White House Conference on Natural Beauty last year, "Beauty cannot be a remote and just an occasional pleasure. We must bring it into the daily lives of all our people. Children, in the midst of cities, must know it as they grow. Adults, in the midst of work, must find it near."

Thus, if we are to create a truly Great Society, esthetic values must become an organic component of the visual scene—protecting natural beauty still unmarred, eliminating the ugly, and restoring those areas that have been despoiled.

Our programs for beauty must apply to our public buildings as well as our public highways, our cities as well as our countryside. For beauty is not mere ornamentation added to something already created—it is an organic quality, infusing the whole, and interwoven with the very fabric of our experience.

There have been but a few First Ladies whose force of character and personality have propelled them beyond being solely a wife and helpmate to the President. These women have left their imprint on the tone and quality of American life. Such a person is Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, who will be long remembered for having challenged all citizens to a new regard for the preservation and creation of beauty.

REMARKS BY MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS ASSOCIATION, DENVER, COLO.

Senator, members of the American Road Builders Association, the President asked me to bring you his personal greetings today. Both of us deeply appreciate the wholehearted support which your organization has given to the highway beautification program.

So I am glad to have this opportunity to thank you in person and also to discuss with you what I feel is the most exciting public works program in the history of mankind.

By 1973, the country—you primarily—will have completed the Interstate Highway System.

This highway program is staggering in its size. It is 35 times as large as the Panama Canal, Grand Coulee Dam, and St. Lawrence Seaway combined.

Above that, in the next 6 years, you are planning to build half-a-million miles of road.

Your creations, your works are as public as any can be. They are public property. They are open to all and for the service of all. And inevitably they affect the lives of the people, for better or for worse. Therein lies both the glory and the burden of roadbuilding.

Whether we will one day stand in pride and be able to say "well done" depends very much on the skill and imagination and sheer determination we put forth in the next 6 years.

And that is why I accepted your invitation to come here today and say to you that your countrymen are counting on you. I know because I hear from them day after day.

There is a rising tide of desire in this country to make our towns and our landscapes everything they can be—in beauty as well as in service.

I'm not bringing you any news because I know that this is very much on your minds, too, and that the meetings you attend, more and more, discuss and are concerned with such new demands as "social and esthetic values," "scenic vistas," "historic routing"—an unheard-of vocabulary today.

But let's take a look at why it is a most necessary vocabulary today.

We are the road-buildingest nation on earth. There are 3,600,000 miles of streets and roads in our land—nearly a mile of pavement for every square mile of land, and a lot more of this country is going under concrete and asphalt.

In disturbing that much of the turf of this beautiful country, we have a special obligation—not only in terms of land use, but also in an esthetic sense. We are obliged to leave it looking as good if not better than the way we found it.

The scope of this obligation becomes staggering when you look at the statistical side of the story. Every day, American industry is producing enough cars to form a bumper-to-bumper line 125 miles long. Last year, we had 90 million registered vehicles traveling our Nation's streets and roads. In the next 4 years, it is predicted that will swell to more than 100 million. That means more roads, more parking facilities, more bridges, more cuts and fills.

We are a nation on wheels and our affluence and leisure have whetted our appetite to enjoy the journey—not just head for the destination.

Today, the average American commuter spends 350 hours each year behind the wheel of his car just driving to and from work. On weekends, he's off in the car again, driving to the ocean or the mountains or just around the city—what in yesteryear they called "motoring." There's more of this than you realize—35 percent of those on the road are driving for pleasure.

Driving for pleasure is the most popular form of recreation in America. It exceeds baseball, swimming, fishing, any form of sport. The challenge of a civilized society is to make those hours on the road refreshing and enjoyable ones.

Last spring, I took a trip down in Virginia. For one small segment we drove along Highway No. 1, with its jumble of signs and junkyards, the landscape blighted. And then we swung over to Interstate 95—that sweeps up the rolling hills of Virginia between tall stands of oaks and evergreens laced with white dogwoods. From this road itself, you know why Virginians love their State.

We all know the difference between the road that beckons and the road that depresses.

I know what a lift of spirit and surge of pride I feel when I drive up over the crest of the hills back home near Llano, Tex. There, in the distance is Pack Saddle Mountain, and on either side of the broad right-of-way, a long sweep of bluebonnets and then a roadside park, golden with daisy-like wildflowers, and picnic tables under the live oaks.

Every time I see that sight, I bless the garden clubs that started the wildflower program in Texas, and the highway department that has expanded and nurtured it.

In the kaleidoscope of my most cherished memories is a road through Vermont in early October when the majestic mountains are covered with maples—flaming torches of scarlet and crimson against the evergreens. Astors and goldenrod line the roadside, and I remember nature's bounty of pumpkins and apples piled high at roadside stands.

Certainly, this lush display of color is one of the most priceless resources of the State of Vermont. Knowing this, the Governor is proposing legislation to create a scenic corridor one mile wide along certain portions of its interstate highways to protect its native charm.

The Merritt Parkway in Connecticut is an early ancestor of our present great freeways, but to drive along it, is still to drive through one of the most enchanting natural gardens in the world.

Along the Pacific coast, the first designated "scenic highway" in the Nation is a dramatic road that hugs the jagged cliffs above the surf, and winds its way from Carmel, Calif., to the Hearst San Simeon Castle.

These great roads not only get you from "here" to "there," but they afford a revelation of America's great beauty along the way.

It is the difference between just pouring asphalt or concrete between two points or building a landmark—a monument—that will live. I, as a citizen, am proud, not only of the result, but of the kind of talent that produced it. If I were the roadbuilder, my pride would be very keen and very personal.

This is a difference illustrated best by the story of how Sir Christopher Wren one day walked unannounced and unknown among various craftsmen who were raising the timbers and placing the bricks of his St. Paul's Cathedral.

According to legend, Sir Christopher approached one carpenter and inquired:

"What are you doing?"

"I'm following the plans," the carpenter replied, without even stopping his hammering.

Of a workman pushing a barrow loaded with materials, the architect asked: "What are you doing?"

"Working for wages," was the reply.

Then Sir Christopher went up to a mason who was applying mortar to bricks and asked: "What are you doing?"

Somewhat taken aback, the stonecutter put down his trowel, stepped away from his work, looked up at the half-formed structure, and said:

"Why, can't you see? I'm building a cathedral."

Pride in works is one of the most substantial joys in life. It gives a cathedral—and a highway—the lasting quality of greatness.

Today, millions of Americans have been traveling far and near and looking at their new highway systems with fresh eyes. A few months ago when the Highway Beautification Act became law, it marked the beginning of what I hope will be many considered public decisions in behalf of beauty in America.

Within your hands and hearts is the opportunity to implement this legislation with imagination, and with vision about the future of your country.

Most of the news stories about the legislation have featured the fact that it provides funds, and authority, to screen automobile junkyards and control billboards along the Nation's major highways.

That is a dramatic and evident need, but a less publicized and most exciting facet of the act, to my mind, is that Congress has appropriated 3 additional cents for every dollar of Federal highway funds—a total of $60 million—to be used for the acquisition and maintenance of beauty spots adjacent to highways.

States can use their money for such items as—

A meadow of wildflowers where motorists can take time out to stretch their legs and breathe the fresh air.

A scenic overlook—Colorado and the Rocky Mountain States are spectacularly rich in potential.

A yet-untouched stand of timber, where travelers can picnic.

An entrance to each State marked by some of the trees and flowers most typical of it. In Washington, D.C., we plan to plant cherry trees at 10 entrances this spring. They will be a wonderful introduction to the city.

The possibilities are almost limitless for a beauty-minded citizenry through whose communities and countryside the highways run.

You, in the roadbuilding profession, have done so well in your work that the public now takes the safety and utility of your pavement surface for granted. But what they remember about a trip are the masses of blooming flowers along the roadside and the stunning vistas, and the delightful camping and picnic spots.

As one highway official told me, "That's what brings in the fan mail."

One point that concerns me particularly is that each year it costs American taxpayers $100 million to clean up the litter on our roadsides.

It is an interesting side of human nature, but one of the byproducts of beautification is the sharp reduction in vandalism.

We have had that experience in Washington in landscaping some of the schools. Broken windows cost the District of Columbia about $118,000 each year. I stood in front of a school one day and counted 26 broken windows on one side alone. But (and here is the magic) at the nine schools we have landscaped, the breakage has dropped to almost nothing.

I believe we will see some of the same results along the highways. The motorist is just not as likely to toss that soft drink bottle into a roadside park or a well-maintained landscape. If we make our travelers beauty conscious, that $100 million litter cost each year may very well diminish sharply.

I know that you know there is a rising aspiration for beauty abroad in the land.

And there is an increasing effort of State governments to compete for the tourist dollar.

The highway—and the beauty which Congress has now made possible with the new bill—offers States a perfect opportunity to use these funds to beckon the tourist.

More and more States are now planning their State line information centers.

I love that sense of welcome I feel when I cross the State line into Florida and I am met by palmettos and palms.

I suggest that States would do well to use their native trees and flowers at their State lines as a welcoming natural backdrop. For instance, glossy magnolias and crepe myrtles in the Deep South; giant saguaro cactus rising like sentinels in Arizona and the West; fields of purple lupin in Wyoming; tall evergreens in the great Northwest—all of these offer great possibilities and bespeak the State's individuality.

What a tragedy it will be if we do not make our highways instruments of beauty as well as convenience in the vast construction program which lies ahead of us.

Much of what we have talked about are the easy-to-solve problems—really the joy of construction and the imagination we can put to it.

But you and I well know that unavoidable knotty problems still rest with us. Simply, it is "Where do you put the road?" Always there is someone who will be hurt.

I cannot solve these problems, but I know they exist. I hear about them most emphatically and you do, too.

They will become larger.

Even though we are growing wiser about them, they will become more numerous as the interstate highway program goes into its final and most complicated months and increasing mileage is planned in cities.

The voices that you have been hearing—and that I have been hearing—are going to rise in volume. For that voice is the voice of all of us—reaching out, aspiring to a better, more constructive, more lovely world.

The standard criteria on the routing of roads, such as careful consideration of the taxpayers' dollar and safety, are, of course, still with us.

But a civilized society—and a humane government—can do more than that. And plainly, it is clear that we must also weigh in the social and esthetic values of the routing.

We must improve the public hearings which the law requires to be truly open hearings and openminded hearings at an early stage of planning. Hearing all sides is time consuming, but empathy and understanding can help both sides realize each other's problems. And it does require tolerance on both sides.

The citizens who don't want the new highway to split up their neighborhoods, destroy their homes and places of business, their schools and churches; the preservation groups who don't want an historical landmark demolished; the conservation groups who want to keep the natural contours of the land, protect the stream valley, the great forests, the vistas and wildlife—all of them deserve not only the right to be heard, but a right to be heard sympathetically, with the new slide rules of public values.

They won't always win. They can't always win. But let's not just fall into the attitude: "I'd rather fight than switch." Sometimes our technical know-how at an early stage can produce a better route.

Anyone in public life—and that, I believe, includes you and me—learns to respect public opinion and the new appearance of a public need.

There is great room for improvement in the relationships of Government agencies with the public, as well as with each other.

And I urge you—at the earliest possible time—to review your plans with all who might be affected. You have done this in working with fish, wildlife, and recreation agencies. But this type of relationship should be extended to those who speak for other public interests—the private as well as the official groups.

Those who so often are your critics can come to understand decisions if they are alerted to you problems and your goals early enough.

While it is true that the public is demanding, you have already shown them they are not asking for the impossible.

New equipment advances have provided the machinery to make beauty more possible. Your developments in new mowing equipment are fantastic. Today they can give the sides and back slopes a manicured look never possible 5 years ago.

Your machinery can tunnel under mountains and in precious parts of cities. You can maneuver to preserve the vistas. You are not defeated by terrain. You have developed great engineering know-how and I know you will continue your inventive efforts.

Now lies before us the opportunity for great understanding, great human know-how.

I have no doubt you will rise to these challenges with all the skill that the public has come to expect—and that our country deserves.

Special Milk and National Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the Members' attention a communication which I received from Mr. Thomas O'Hearn, a purchasing agent in the department of education for the Archdiocese of Boston, which points out the difficulties which have arisen as a result of the decision to cut back on the amount being expended for the special milk and national lunch program. Personally, I am of the opinion that this is a bad policy.

We have, during this year, set up many new programs to aid the poor. To curtail such tried and true programs as the special milk and national lunch program would, in my mind, be folly.

I am including special editorials from the news desk of station WEEI in Boston:

WEEI BUSINESS NEWS

(From the desk of Arthur Smith, editor)

Almost on a par with mother, apple pie, and Old Glory as sacred American symbols is the national school lunch program, now in its 20th year of operation. Some 18 million children in 71,000 public and nonprofit private schools will be served federally subsidized hot lunches under this program in the current school year.

Now comes President Johnson with this disturbing word: Because of the high costs of war in Vietnam, the Federal contribution of cash and surplus food to the lunch program will have to be cut back in fiscal 1967, except in poverty areas. Before the battle of the hot lunch is settled, however, the President may wish he had chosen to save money elsewhere in his budget.

The lunch program enables children to enjoy a complete lunch for an average payment of 27 cents. This lunch actually costs about 50 cents. But the Agriculture Department donates about 8 cents worth of food from surplus stocks and supplemental purchases, and 4½ cents is provided in the form of a cash reimbursement. Another 11 cents of the lunch cost is picked up from State and local sources.

President Johnson proposes chopping $70 million off the Federal school milk and school lunch programs in the fiscal year beginning next July 1. Both Federal cash contributions and the support for supplemental food purchases would be slashed. Moreover, the Agriculture Department is working on a new formula under which so-called well-to-do schools would have to buy virtually all the food without Government financial help. This would help to pay for new poverty-oriented school meal programs, such as giving school breakfasts to needy children in slum areas.

Even before the budget-cutting step was announced, the school lunch program was in trouble. Many school systems were reporting a sizable reduction in the amount of basic commodities, meat and cheese, they were receiving from Uncle Sam. With surplus food stocks dwindling, the local systems had no choice but to purchase more of these items on the local market at going prices.

Thus the price charged for the plate lunches has been rising. A charge of 35 cents per lunch—$1.75 a week—is now common. For parents with three or more children in school the answer frequently is to start packing lunches at home. A vicious spiral ensues as the number of children buying lunches falls and unit costs rise.

Agriculture Department officials concede that the price of school lunches in many cities has gone as high as it can go without driving kids out of the cafeteria line. The alternative seems to be for local school boards to start providing greater financial support for the program. Not all systems now include in the school budget the administrative expenses required of the school lunch program—a central staff, equipment, warehousing, and delivery system.

Some observers still expect Congress to come to the rescue. It enacted the National School Lunch Act in 1946 "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other foods." The higher price of a school meal ticket is one issue that touches millions of homes in the country. In an election year, few Members of Congress wish to tangle with the mothers' lobby.

The Late Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp was pastor to us all. There was not a member of this body who did not feel a personal closeness to him. Our grief at his passing is deep and it is universal. He served his God and his fellowman with humility and dedication. The influence of his spirituality, reflecting his simple but unquestioning faith, will remain with us forever.

He was devoted to his wife and children, and after the death of Mrs. Braskamp he seemed to be marking time, as it were, until the happy hour of his reunion with his beloved in the realms above.

To his daughter, Mrs. Norman E. Tucker, and his son, Bernard, Jr., and other members of the family I extend my sympathy.

It seems only yesterday, although actually a number of years ago, that Dr. Braskamp was telling me with pride of his son's marriage to a charming young woman of Chicago's South Side. After that marriage the Chicago delegation felt that we had a share in the proprietorship of the House Chaplain. We often reminded him that while he may have been born and brought up in Iowa, his daughter-in-law came from our State of Illinois. Dr. Braskamp was so beloved everyone sought some reason for claiming a special share in him.

Untying Parcel Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1966

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in recent months the press has given excellent coverage to the programs outlined by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien to tackle the problems besetting our postal service.

My interest in helping Postmaster General O'Brien develop the finest postal service in the world is very deep. On January 27 I cosponsored S. 2843, a bill to reform the fourth-class parcel post service, one of the major problems confronting Postmaster General O'Brien in his efforts to modernize the postal service. On February 19 Business Week carried an article entitled "Untying Parcel Post," which I have read and found to be most enlightening and comprehensive, as well as fair. I commend this article to the reading of every Member of the Congress because I think it brings this problem into proper perspective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the other Members.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNTYING PARCEL POST

The ailing parcel post service may get a vital lift from a new bill recently introduced in Congress. Backed by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, the measure would substitute uniform rules for the tangled regulations that have been strangling use of fourth-class service. The measure also calls for a rate hike of 8 cents per parcel and a 12-percent boost in catalog mail rates.

The proposed legislation would allow all first-class post offices to accept parcels weighing up to 40 pounds and measuring up to 100 inches. The present law limits size to 72 inches and weight to 40 pounds for shipments between first-class offices less than 150 miles apart, and to 20 pounds for parcels addressed to all other first-class offices.

"If the bill becomes law," says O'Brien, "the parcel post service can look forward to increasing health and financial solvency."

Steady decline: The service has been headed steadily downhill since 1952, when the present complex regulations became law. Between fiscal 1951 and 1965—while the economy zoomed—the number of pieces shipped by parcel post plummeted 29 percent, and pounds shipped dropped 41 percent. In 1963, a legal requirement that parcel post revenues be kept within 4 percent of costs had to be suspensed, and over the past 3 years the service has incurred a deficit of $322 million.

The Post Office attributes the decline to a vicious circle started by the 1952 law. Faced with tighter and more complex restrictions on parcel post usage, many companies cut their shipping volume or shifted to rival means of transport. This forced the Post Office to raise rates, which in turn spurred further reductions in volume and new rate hikes. Since 1951, parcel post rates have jumped 128 percent.

Countertactics: At the same time, many businesses—such as drug suppliers and mail order houses, which depend on parcel post to survive—have been scrambling for ways to live with the regulations.

A widespread tactic has been drop shipping—that is, trucking packages to distant post offices to take advantage of more liberal size and weight allowances. One result of these trends has been to deprive the Post Office of revenue-earning volume, while encouraging wasteful practices by business to circumvent the regulations.

Pro and con: The O'Brien proposal will face stiff opposition from some quarters. Both the Association of American Railroads and the National Association of Motor Bus Owners will fight the new size-weight limits as placing the Government in unfair competition with private carriers. William B. Johnson, Railway Express Agency, Inc., president, says the law "would cut our business by 40 percent and force us into bankruptcy within a few months."

Nevertheless, the measure is expected to have relatively smooth sailing in Congress, both because of the Postmaster General's relations with the legislators and the fact that the proposal contains features that appeal to expressmen and shippers alike. The rate hike, for example, will undoubtedly be favored by many carrier groups and may soften some of their resistance to the bill's other provisions.

On the other hand, both the Parcel Post Association and the Direct Mail Advertising Association say they will support the measure despite natural misgivings about the rate increase.

"We've fought for liberalized rules for a long time," says Robert F. DeLay, president of the Direct Mail Advertising Association. DeLay believes passage of the bill would halt the erosion in parcel post usage.

Break even: According to the Post Office, the new law would boost parcel post revenues by over $100 million, of which $40 million would come from larger and heavier packages. The Department claims this should bring the service well within 4 percent of breaking even, as required by the congressional edict that will go into effect again this year. House hearings on the bill are slated to begin March 1.

Estonia's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 24 the thoughts of Americans will be with the brave people of Estonia because that will be the 48th anniversary of Estonia's proclamation of independence as a democratic republic.

In September of 1921 Estonia was admitted to the Legue of Nation's. In 1939 the Soviet Union forced a mutual assistance treaty on Estonia and established Russian naval and air force bases on Estonian territory. In June of 1940 Russian troops took over and established a puppet government. Today the proud land of Estonia is a Soviet colony.

On February 24 Americans everywhere will join with millions throughout the free world in prayers for the quick delivery of the brave people Estonia from Soviet bondage.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I take note of the 48th anniversary of the independence of Estonia. Estonians all over the world would like to say that their nation continues to be free and independent, but they cannot. On June 17, 1940, the army of the Soviet Union brought that freedom to an end by brute force of arms.

In two short decades Estonia had made marked progress toward the development of a thriving democratic system. Despite the hard times experienced by other democratic states during the period between the Great World Wars, universal sufferage and democracy triumphed in Estonia. Her economy grew because of a skillful mixture of public and private ownership of the means of production.

As examples of the progress made during independence, area under cultivation rose by 17.5 percent, grain production by 45 percent, milk yield by 67 percent, railway line length from 800 to 1,434 kilometers, and 56,000 more farms were erected as a result of land reform. In 1934, 95.1 percent of the inhabitants of Estonia lived on earned income, the mark of a true democracy. Such progress could have continued through today, but for the aggression of the Soviet Union, in violation of explicit treaty obligations.

Under Soviet occupation the income of the average Estonian fell by 33 percent. An exporter of food before 1940, this valiant nation, thereafter, subsisted at the pleasure of her conquerors. Not only did the people suffer from the lack of food, but they also endured massive extermination and banishment to forced labor camps deep in the Soviet Union.

The sordid record of communism in Estonia is there for all to see. Our country must continue to take interest in the Estonian cause to repair the damage of Soviet occupation and strive toward the reestablishment of a free and independent Estonia.

Poll Results on L.B.J. Reforms Are Fantastic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, this is reported in the Sacramento Bee:

> President Lyndon B. Johnson has fantastic support at the grassroots level for his social programs—the war on poverty, medicare, Federal aid to education, rebuilding the blighted cities, etc. Just how much is beginning to be manifest in public opinion polls.

The paper said:

> A poll was taken on this question: "Because of the American involvement in Vietnam, should the President reduce the size of his program at home, such as education, poverty, and health?"

It revealed:

> Nationwide, 72 percent flatly said this program should not be reduced.

These figures will be most interesting to my colleagues, and I include the entire article in the RECORD, where others may study the results of the survey:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Feb. 14, 1966]

POLL RESULTS ON L.B.J. REFORMS ARE FANTASTIC

President Lyndon B. Johnson has fantastic support at the grassroots level for his social programs—the war on poverty, medicare, Federal aid to education, rebuilding the blighted cities, etc. Just how much is beginning to be manifest in public opinion polls.

For example, Louis Harris, in a poll conducted for the Washington, D.C., Post Co., and published in the San Francisco Examiner, went to the people recently with the question which, paraphrased, asked: Because of the American involvement in Vietnam, should the President reduce the size of his program at home, such as education, poverty, and health?

Nationwide, 72 percent flatly said this program should not be reduced. Only 22 percent said it should be reduced. And, amazingly, only 6 percent had no opinion.

This suggests three things: That the American public definitely knows its mind on these domestic issues; that the large majority is committed to these social programs; that as a consequence, these programs are firmly established in the American life and probably will be expanded, not cut back.

Harris found, furthermore, that by and large the people who want to cut the President's domestic programs are inveterate opponents of Government spending at any time. These question: "Where is the money coming from?" Those who support the programs take the position that if Americans really are the most wealthy society in the history of the world, how can they afford not to attack poverty, create the greatest possible educational opportunity and rip out blight? One housewife said:

"If we cut down education and poverty programs at home, we would be in the same condition as the other nations we are facing."

There were two other disclosures of the American attitude in the Harris poll. Where it could have been expected that 84 percent of the people who voted for Johnson in the last election support the L.B.J. program, as Harris found, consider also that 50 percent of those who voted for Barry Goldwater, the extreme conservative, would not reduce the

L.B.J. domestic effort. An amazing commentary, this. Furthermore, the largest uncommitted opinion sectionally was only 8 percent, and this was in the South where there is generally a lack of political sophistication.

These findings are immensely interesting. They indicate the American people want to make that "beginning" urged by John F. Kennedy, and want to "continue" as urged by Johnson.

Full Application of Employment Act of 1946 Has Come in the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this week we have been commemorating the momentous step the United States took 20 years ago by the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946.

In an article published in the Washington Post of Sunday, February 20, Joseph R. Slevin points out, however, that it was only in the Kennedy-Johnson administrations that the central idea of the act—the deliberate, persistent use of Federal power to obtain economic growth and full employment—has been fully applied.

By now this idea has gained widespread acceptance with the result that the current economic policy debate focuses on questions of how and when, but not whether Federal power should be asserted.

As Mr. Slevin says:

> The United States has come a long way in 20 years.

I include the text of the article hereafter:

A 1946 MEASURE MARKED POLICY TURNING POINT—BOOM IS TRIBUTE TO EMPLOYMENT ACT

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

The Employment Act of 1946 is 20 years old today. The American economy is booming. And there is an increasingly hot debate about whether President Johnson ought to call for higher taxes to damp the fires of inflation.

The booming economy is a very real tribute to the Employment Act.

So, too, is the burgeoning tax debate.

The Employment Act established a national policy to use the power of the Federal Government to influence economic activity. The economy is booming in large measure because those powers have been used.

The deliberate, persistent use of Federal power to influence the economy is a new development. It has gained increasing acceptance since the Employment Act was passed but it has won general recognition only in the decade of the 1960's—during the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

MEMORIES OF THIRTIES

The expectation in 1946 was that the Government would have to take steps to prevent a deep depression and to provide millions of jobs for the American people. Memories of the great depression of the 1930's were fresh in mind and the main goal of the act's original sponsors was to see that another such calamity did not follow World War II.

The bill started out as a "full" employment law but a Senate-House conference committee watered down the final version and set the more modest "maximum" employment target. Among other things, the legislators wanted it clear that the Government was not guaranteeing a job to anyone.

As it turned out, the immediate postwar problem proved to be inflation. After that, the challenge was to offset mild recessions, with the one exception of the Korean war boom in the early 1950's. More recently the Government has been trying to move toward the twin goals of attaining noninflationary full employment at home while balancing the U.S. international payments accounts.

Four recessions have hit the United States since the end of World War II. They came in 1948-49, 1953-54, 1957-58, and 1960-61.

EISENHOWER WAS COOL

The Employment Act approach almost died a young death when Eisenhower became President in 1953. He was suspicious of economic planning and mistrusted both the setting of goals and the use of Federal power to achieve them. Mr. Eisenhower intended to abolish the Council of Economic Advisers established by the act but decided to rebuild it under the chairmanship of Arthur Burns only after he had been in office for some months.

The historic Employment Act breakthrough came in June 1962 when Harvardman Kennedy went to Yale to accept an honorary degree and called for reducing taxes to stimulate a growing but sluggish economy.

Mr. Kennedy acted primarily at the prodding of Walter Heller, the chairman of his Council. It marked a profound change in President Kennedy's own instinctively conservative position.

Ten months later President Kennedy made his precedent-setting decision to call for lower taxes even though the country was increasingly prosperous and even though the Government still had a large budget deficit.

The budget no longer was to be viewed as a set of books that were to be balanced in good times and that, if necessary, could be allowed to become unbalanced in poor times.

Instead, it was to be looked upon as an economic tool to achieve broader national policy goals—more jobs, higher living standards, increased production, stable prices, and the like.

The tax cut became law in the winter of 1964 after Dallas and after Lyndon Johnson had become President.

It supplied the prescribed stimulation. Economic activity rose strongly and steadily after it became law.

But the current U.S. prosperity was not entirely planned that way despite some strong administration hints to the contrary.

The theory of the tax cut was one thing. The actual execution of the plan was something quite different.

Congress voted a substantially larger cut than the administration had asked so the rapid pace of the upturn that followed was partly fortuitous.

Then, there was Vietnam. The economy is rocketing ahead in significant measure because of the very large additional stimulus the Vietnam buildup has provided since last summer.

Employment has been going up much faster than the administration expected a year ago and unemployment has been dropping much more rapidly than it anticipated.

PLANNING LESS THAN SCIENCE

All of which makes the point that economic planning as it is practiced in the mid-1960's continues to be something less than an exact science.

Now the debate is over the great and central stabilization question of whether Mr. Johnson is acting vigorously enough, soon enough. It is adding a new, important dimension to the Employment Act as it enters its 20th year. More will be heard of it at a special 20th anniversary symposium that will be held here on Wednesday.

Perhaps the most striking thing about the debate is that no one, not the most conservative participant, is arguing about whether it is proper for Mr. Johnson to intervene to prevent inflation.

An occasional voice is raised to assert that Mr. Johnson should reduce inflationary demand pressures by slashing Federal civilian program spending in preference to increasing the Nation's tax burden.

But the heart of the debate is over the question of whether the President is acting vigorously enough, soon enough.

There is agreement that it is right and proper for him to act, for the Government to intervene.

The United States has come a long way in 20 years.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that all of us here note the passing of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D.D. Dr. Braskamp has faithfully served the House of Representatives for 16 years and during all those years provided a needed and welcomed daily moment of reflection and rededication.

For more than 40 years Rev. Dr. Braskamp served his church and God well. His church in return recognized his service and godliness. At the time of his death he was moderator of the Synod of Baltimore, dean of the Presbyterian Ministers in Washington and president of the Princeton Theological Seminary Association in Washington.

It was the mark of the man, Mr. Speaker, that despite the many different religious beliefs held by the many Members of this body he was able to find a common, sincere ground for all. He daily was the means whereby each Member, in keeping with his own faith, could for a moment at least withdraw from the frenetic life and ponder the higher order of things. It is ironic and sad, Mr. Speaker, that this same privilege is denied many of our schoolchildren.

In the past 16 years that Dr. Braskamp was Chaplain of the House of Representatives, I came to know him quite well. It was a matter of some amusement between us, for instance, that Brooklyn could also claim him as a son since he was ordained there in 1911. The power, sincerity, and warmth of the man were such that I consider myself fortunate to have known him. To that I can only add that I have lost a true friend as was his lovely wife who passed away about 5 years ago.

I extend to his son and daughter and loved ones my deepest sympathy upon their great loss.

Foreign Affairs: The Most Important Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the New York Times editorially has opposed many of President Johnson's actions concerning Vietnam.

Without suggesting in the least that the Times' dissent should be or has been muffled, I believe much of that criticism was answered today on the Times' own editorial page by one of its own political observers, C. L. Sulzberger.

Mr. Sulzberger argues that we are winning the shooting war in South Vietnam and that the political and social aspects of the conflict have been acknowledged. "But the third and most important battle, the battle of Washington," he says, "shows disquieting signs of disaster."

His article, which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point, should be read by every Member of this House.

The article follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: THE MOST IMPORTANT BATTLE

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

Three concurrent battles are now underway in the Vietnam war. The military engagement in the boondocks is slowly being won. The political and social operation has at least and at last been acknowledged as a strategic factor. But the third and most important battle, the battle of Washington, shows disquieting signs of disaster.

General Taylor was correct to say France lost Indochina in Paris, not at Dienbienphu. M. Mendès-France's subsequent refutation of this statement was at best disingenuous. And now, in the name of democracy, there seems an excellent chance the United States may lose its own Indochina campaign in Washington.

THE COALITION

The great debate on Vietnam policy has been featured by misinformation, passion, political opportunism, vanity, and hints of a smarmy dislike for President Johnson. Both Peiping and Hanoi must have gained fresh encouragement by the joining of our know-nothings with our know-it-alls.

As a nation we venerate pundits who make occult pronouncements on strategy. Public opinion and those who aspire to guide it are indeed vital factors in war and revolution.

Napoleon said: "Three hostile newspapers are more to be feared than a thousand bayonets," and Lyndon Johnson's press itself seems increasingly filled with bayonets. The Duc de Mornay observed that you can do anything with that weapon save sit on it.

Since they have chosen to proclaim themselves wiser than their government, I think it fair to examine the judgments of certain administration critics of whom the most distinguished on the liberal side are the brilliant George Kennan, who once authored our policy of containing Russia, and Walter Lippmann. Ambassador Kennan, now an admitted "neoisolationist," believes "we should show ourselves a little more relaxed and less terrified of what happens in the smaller countries of Asia and Africa, and not jump around like an elephant frightened by a mouse."

Kennan is not himself unflappable, as he once demonstrated by provoking Moscow to demand his removal as Ambassador, and his subsequent irascibility with Yugoslav editors. This, of course, is beside the point, but I would scarcely consider the menace of expanding Chinese dynamism as mouselike.

The totem of Johnson's liberal opponents is Lippmann, whose pronouncements from the ivory-towered eminence of a public philosopher carry particular authority. On May 19, 1933, after reading a speech by Chancellor Hitler, Lippmann advised:

"We have heard once more, through the fog and the din, the hysteria and the animal passions of a great revolution, the authentic voice of a genuinely civilized people. I am not only willing to believe that, but it seems to me that all historical experience compels one to believe it."

Lippmann already knew Europe and Germany well so there was a basis for such lucid and reassuring prescience. He knows Asia little and Vietnam not at all. His jungle stories parable comparing Chinese and American power to an elephant and a whale is pleasant nonsense. Were the southeast Asian peninsula to fall under Chinese suzerainty, as Lippmann seems almost to recommend, island Indonesia would patently go along. Australia and the Philippines would be directly menaced.

One must only hope the counsel President Johnson receives in private is superior to that he gets in public. Senator GRUENING suggests no draftees should be sent to Vietnam—as if to make certain we ape France's Indochina disaster in detail. Senator R. KENNEDY proposes Communists be included in the Saigon government. It would be more honest to suggest abandoning Vietnam without even bothering to negotiate.

There has been thought among strategists who don't understand what "revolutionary warfare" is all about that we might stay in South Vietnam—but restrict our troops to limited enclaves. This is even more naive than France's hope of squashing Germany by sitting in the Maginot Line.

DOUBTS AND IGNORANCE

What has emerged so far in our great debate is a deep-seated doubt about ourselves and deep-seated ignorance of the world we inhabit. Elegant platitudes founded on myth are offered to the President as substitutes for policy.

There is an old Chinese adage: "If you know yourself and know your enemy, in 100 battles you will win 100 times." We don't know ourselves very well and it is questionable whether we know our enemy at all.

Lithuania

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commemorating the independence of Lithuania. This little nation was once free, but is now suffering under the yoke of Communist dictatorship. On this 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I should like to pay my respects to those Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain and to those who share our freedom in Pennsylvania and other States of the Union. Many residents of the Sixth District of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, have relatives in unhappy Lithuania. Although this courageous nation lives under the shadow of the Soviet Union, her people's desire for freedom remains undaunted.

As Americans we can understand and support this desire. We owe it to ourselves and those among us of Lithuanian descent to make this anniversary an occasion to honor this brave nation for its determination to recover her independence.

Once before on February 16, 1918, Lithuania succeeded in breaking Soviet domination. After World War II, independence was again on the horizon and a Congress was formed to lay the groundwork for independent nationhood. This moment was thwarted by the force of Soviet arms. Force, however, cannot dim the aspiration of Lithuanians to be free.

Let us on this 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence rededicate ourselves to continue to carry on the work necessary to help Lithuania once again be free.

Individual Thought Aim of Lexington Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Boston Traveler of Monday, February 14, an interesting account of an interview with the superintendent of schools in Lexington, Mass., Dr. Rudolph Fobert.

Dr. Fobert has had a distinguished career as a teacher and a school administrator and has brought a high standard of excellence to the Lexington school system. His philosophy is summed up in the following comment:

> There is no greater gift that one generation can give to another than a better public school system.

I think that this standard can be an important example to other communities around the Nation and I have unanimous consent to include Mr. Richard Gross' article from the Traveler concerning Dr. Fobert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

INDIVIDUAL THOUGHT AIM OF LEXINGTON SCHOOLS

(By Richard C. Gross)

The Lexington school system operates under a philosophy geared to the optimum development of each child and to the idea that education is concerned with what man should be, not with what he is.

The philosophy is the conception of an idealist who believes that it isn't necessary to surrender one's idealism.

But Superintendent of Schools Dr. Rudolph Fobert is as much a realist, for the goals and objectives he has set for his school system are far from impractical. His enthusiasm and organizing abilities extend into every facet of his school system.

Dr. Fobert said he orients his thinking toward the individual in society and, through education, the improvement of that individual.

"Regardless of the inherent difficulties of mass education," the soft-spoken superintendent said, "the public schools have an obligation to create an environment in which individual thought and action are accepted and rewarded.

"To achieve this objective," he continued, "we must individualize instruction wherever possible."

ATTENDED TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Fobert has combined his education at Tufts University, where he received his B.A. in sociology and his master's in education, with his doctorate in education administration he obtained at Columbia University.

"If society is ever going to improve," Fobert said, "one of the institutions you have to rely on is education."

As superintendent of the Lexington school system for almost 2 years. Fobert is at the head of 8,067 pupils, 502 teachers and 23 administrators in 9 elementary, 2 junior high schools, and 1 senior high.

"The pupil-teacher relationship is very precious," Fobert explained, somewhat proudly. "It's the focal point of the whole program. I would not hesitate to set aside any hierarchical structure that would interfere with this relationship."

With regard to teachers, Dr. Fobert said he believes that they play a vital role in developing this Nation and this society.

He asks that the teachers "by subtle example, or open communication, do everything possible to build a strong intellectual and ethical foundation so that the students may, as adults, improve the world in which we live."

Lexington, which has a 27 to 1 student-teacher ratio in the elementary schools and a 16 to 1 ratio in the secondary schools, will hire 25 teachers in September 1966.

Some 3,000 applications were filed for 120 positions last year. "We have a very aggressive recruiting campaign that reaches into every State in the Union," Fobert explained with pride.

He said also that Lexington is rather unique in that area because one of its assistant superintendents travels to other States. "It's perhaps one of the most important functions we perform," Fobert said.

"You can influence quality by attracting the best people you can find," he added. "We want the top teacher in each State."

Lexington pays $5,500, the highest minimum salary in the State. Commenting on salaries, Fobert asserted, "A good salary plan helps us to keep our good teachers and to attract more applications from a variety of sources."

"In addition," Fobert continued, "we must create the type of intellectual climate which will encourage teachers to be creative and to fulfill themselves as individuals."

"Teachers perform one of the most valuable services in our society," Fobert declared. "They should be paid enough to permit them to use their full talents. In this matter, though," he added, "I think each community has to decide for itself on how they value their service."

Concerning his own job, Fobert explained that a superintendent "should not merely be satisfied with transmitting the culture to future generations, but with improving it."

Asked about high school students in general, Fobert said, "The kind of behavior that we used to expect from college kids we now get from high school kids. They're much more mature than the kids of two generations ago," he said.

"We're already planning to open a 10th elementary school in 1966 and an 11th in 1967," Fobert said, replying to a question about the future of Lexington's schools.

"If growth continues the way it's been going," he added, "we'll need more schools. We're thinkg of a junior high in 1971 and, if the kindergarten progam, is implemented, another elementary school by 1969."

SHOULD EXPECT THE BEST

"The type of community Lexington will be in 15 years is directly related to the educational opportunities youngsters are now experiencing in the schools," Fobert explained.

"As I see it," he continued, "the Lexington schools are faced with the problem of which direction they shall move in the future."

"The citizens of Lexington,"' Fobert went on, "have every right to expect the best possible educational opportunities for their children and to receive full value for the money spent."

"In my opinion, there is no greater gift that one generation can give to another than a better public school system," he added.

Formerly a mathematics teacher in Natick, and a director of guidance in Danbury, Conn., Fobert became the superintendent of schools in East Windsor, Conn., in 1960. He came to Lexington in 1963 with his wife, the former Ellen McCormick of Belmont, and six children—five girls and a boy.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baldwin, John F., *Calif*	
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*	1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*	
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6215 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	1705 Longworth House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg*	914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*	
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Fogarty, John E., *R.I*	1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*	301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn*	119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George, *Idaho*	
Hansen, John R., *Iowa*	800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Jones, Walter B., *N.C*	
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	4517 Wetherill Dr., Westmoreland Hills, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y*	The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*	
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*	
Kupferman, Theodore R., *N.Y.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	

Appendix

American History Club of Austin, Tex., Finds McKittrick Canyon in Guadalupe Mountain Region Is Worthy of Being Preserved as Part of a National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, February 26, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, since 1963, I have been working for a Guadalupe Mountain National Park because of the grandeur and uniqueness of this area in my home State of Texas.

Recently, I received a letter from the American History Club of Austin, Tex., signed by the club's president, Mrs. James N. Ludlum, in which the American History Club of Austin lends its support to the efforts of making this area a national park.

Within the Guadalupe Mountain Region is McKittrick Canyon which has heavy stands of the famous Ponderosa pine and other tall trees on its ridges. The creek in McKittrick Canyon is stocked with mountain trout and a herd of about 500 elk roams the area. There are deer, wild turkey, mountain lions, and many other birds and animals, large and small, in this area. As a tribute to this beautiful area, one of the members of the American History Club of Austin, Frances Alexander, has written a poem about McKittrick Canyon.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the American History Club of Austin, Tex., along with the members' names, and this beautifully descriptive poem be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, with the list of names, and the poem were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN HISTORY CLUB,
Austin, Tex., February 12, 1966.

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: We, the members of the American History Club of Austin (organized in 1893), wish to thank you for your past efforts in considering the area embodying McKittrick Canyon, Hudspeth County, as a site for a national park. We seek your continued, bold support of this endeavor.

We have prevailed upon one of the poets of our group to summarize in verse the grandeur of McKittrick Canyon.

Preservation of this area by our Federal Government is uppermost in our thoughts, so that Texans and peoples of the earth who visit our magnificent State may enjoy this spectacular natural phenomenon.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. JAMES N. LUDLUM,
President.

MEMBERS

Mrs. William B. Alderman.
Miss Frances Alexander, 2708 Enfield Road.
Mrs. Stephen Barker.
Mrs. S. Conoly Bartlett.
Miss Edleen Begg.
Mrs. Few Brewster.
Mrs. Paul H. Brown.
Mrs. Harris Brush.
Mrs. R. A. Buford.
Mrs. Martha Cavin.
Mrs. G. M. Cox.
Miss Sarah Dodson.
Dr. Llerena Friend.
Mrs. Leon Green.
Mrs. Meade F. Griffin.
Mrs. Robert W. Hamilton.
Mrs. H. T. Irvine.
Mrs. Donald D. James.
Mrs. James N. Ludlum, president.
Mrs. Charles T. McCormick.
Miss Kathleen Molesworth.
Mrs. Julian Montgomery.
Mrs. Fred Morse, Jr.
Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker, Jr.
Mrs. Ben H. Powell.
Miss Fannie Ratchford.
Mrs. Betty Brush Ross.
Mrs. H. Irving Schweppe.
Mrs. T. L. Shepard.
Miss Ruby Smith.
Mrs. Will R. Wilson.
Mrs. Benjamin F. Wright.

MCKITTRICK CANYON

(By Frances Alexander, Austin, Tex.)

El Capitan stands tall
Eight thousand feet and more
To enthrall
The human eye,
And to confer
With the taller Guadalupe Peak
While they speak
Of distance and of time.
There they stanchly hold
Against the heat and cold
Against the rain and thunder
That strive to best their grandeur
And wash them to the sea.

Other lofty mountains
Range around them
And join their hardy set
Against erosion's leveling
Making beauty out of loss
With cliffside beveling
And shadowed canyon.
There, Ponderosa pines
Five by seven score
With ring on ring
Keep tally
Of years on years
In gulch and valley.

Deep embedded fossils
In limestone walls
Make record that recalls
The shallow Permian Sea;
The whitened bones
And remnant arrow stones
Tell tales of the Apaches
And the Spanish searchers
For the seven cities
Built of gold;
And rusting bridle bits
Give credence to the story
Of Bartlett's lost patrol.

Thousands of feet
Below the cliffs' gray draperies,
A 4-mile trout stream
Traces McKittrick Canyon
And whispers tales
Of Old Ben Sublett,
His mine and nuggets
Then disappears
Into some hidden cavern,
Leaving the threading winds
To tell of other seekers
On nimble-footed mules
Who dared the edges
And explored the ledges
Finding sea shells
Arrow heads
And plane propellers
Eagle nests
And rodent dwellers.

A modern cowboy
Breaks upon the skyline,
Looks across the vastness
Of the hardy peaks
And down into the hollows,
Then bravely follows
On sure-footed mount
To take the perilous turns
And dizzy switchbacks
Down and down and down
Into the many acred bowl
To find the level trails
By creatures made
Where virgin wilderness
Still keeps the elk,
The pig-nosed bear,
The big-horn sheep,
Wild turkeys,
And the porcupine.

Where rock wrens whistle
Above the thorn and thistle
And mockingbirds make song
Above the Lupine and the Columbine;
Where green-winged bugs
And crimson dragonflies
Seek pond and creek
That hold a streak of sky;
Where autumn chill
Sets maple trees aflame
And spring rains coax
Maguey and cactus bloom
Where weeping junipers
Give ample room
To sleeker trunked
Madrona clumps.

Saddle sore
The cowboy rests
Within a cool grotto
Where white stalactites
Slowly drip and grow—
No hotel register
Found to show
What hardy souls
Had rested there
Before him.
In fancy he can read
The names: Geronimo,
McKittrick,
Butterfield, Bob West,
Bartlett of the lost patrol
Ben Sublett and his own son Rolth
And old Ben Watson
Who still declines
To tell the placing
Of the Sublett mines.

The inky record
Would be scarcely dry
That held the names
Of Pratt and Hunter
And Noel Kinkaid
Of sourdough fame.

The cowboy leaves
The cool grotto
And mounts again.

He takes the upward trail
Through crag and brake;
And on Pine Peak at last
He gazes at the tumbled vast—
Then pictures to himself
The scientists
The journalists
The beauty lovers
Adventurers and poets
Who may one day come to wonder,
And to companion
The majesty of mountains,
The mysteries of cave and canyons.

"Hoosier": A Unique Nickname

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, February 26, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as Indiana celebrates this year its sesquicentennial, the spotlight will often focus on Hoosier traditions and history. One of the distinctive features of Indiana folklore is the origin of the nickname "Hoosier." Many tales portray its beginnings. On February 21, 1949, an outstanding account of the historical development of this unique name appeared in the Washington, Ind., Times-Herald. In the past, distinguished Hoosier Congressmen have brought this article to the Congressional Record. Today, I believe it again merits reproduction.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Hoosier," a Word With a History All Around It

For 33 years, or ever since the Indiana centennial of 1916, historians, teachers, and research scholars have been delving into pioneer archives seeking the origin of the distinctive nickname: "Hoosier." It is a term of dignity and character, they conclude, and applies to anyone native to Indiana or who is a resident within the State's borders.

Specifically, the scholars have concluded the word Hoosier means: An important caller, and a dignified, self-reliant person.

But reports in the files of the Indiana Historical Society disclose there are three schools of thought concerning the manner in which the word might have been born, perhaps between 1810 to 1830, and got into common usage.

AN IMPORTANT CALLER

There are many claimants for "who's hyer?" said to have been hallooed by a cabin settler to a wayfarer on horseback, or vice versa, during territorial times. The traveler, according to a poem written in 1830 by John Finley, titled "The Hoosier Nest," proved to be an important caller and a fine gentleman. Novelists of Indiana's later golden age of literature, including Lew Wallace, of "Ben Hur" fame, and Booth Tarkington, liked the idea of "who's hyer?" becoming in time "Hoosier," and meaning important caller or friendly traveler.

The second school gives the word military dignity—from hussar.

It is said Colonel Lehmanowski, a Polish hussar of the Napoleonic wars, appeared so resplendent in his uniform of military braid and decorations during a sojourn across the new State of Indiana that he inspired coonskin-capped riflemen of the frontier militia to glorify themselves as hussars, which they pronounced "Hoosier." The scholars declare that in the war with Mexico and long after the Civil War all parade soldiers in Indiana were called Hoosiers.

The poet, James Whitcomb Riley, believed either of these legends could have been the true source of Indiana's nickname, but in his lyceum recitals he pointed out that much of Indiana's speech, quality talk, and slang stemmed from a southern immigration.

THE THIRD SCHOOL

The third school suspects this southern group of immigrants gave the word "Hoosier" to Indiana, and remarks that it was popularized by Riverman Mike Fink of Pittsburgh. He was a man of invincible strength, who picked up the word "husher" and used it often while traveling up and down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

"There is not another like myself in all this country. I'm a hoosher;" the keelboatman is said to have remarked with gusto.

"Hoosier" was Mike's pronunciation for "husher" meaning mighty man. Researchers found husher is out of the particular dialect of settlers in the Carolinas and Georgia, who hailed from Cumberland, England. "Husher" means big, important, large, able.

Tracing the word back to England the scholars found it was written "hoozer," and that Mink Fink, the skull cracker and braggart, used the word "hoosher" to proclaim he was the best man in a crowd. When challenged he promptly staged an eye-gouging hard knuckle fist fight. For years his strength, vocabulary, and use of firearms provided fabulous tales for rivermen and settlers throughout southern Indiana.

His skill and gusto gave the word "hoosher" real meaning as it became hoosier and denoted a unique individual of exceptional abilities, the historians declare.

FEW CHALLENGERS

Few dared to say that Mike wasn't a very remarkable fellow, nor did they argue about the prowess of his 100 boatmen. Most rivermen agreed that Mike was something they didn't want to get tangled up with, yet were his friends. Mike roared, boasted, fought, and raced up and down the length of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers from the close of the American Revolution to 1821. "Then," says an idolatrous historian, "to use the words of Mark Twain, he moved westward with the jug of empire."

Wandering ahead of the tide of settlers, Mike accompanied a fur-trading expedition up the Missouri River, and met his death at a lonely post near the Yellowstone in the winter of 1822–23.

Bill Kugle Writes That Big Thicket Wildlife Should Be Preserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, February 26, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, for heritage, knowledge, history, and enjoyment, there is a movement in this Nation to preserve those areas of wildlife in our country that only nature can produce and man might destroy.

One such area is the Big Thicket in southeast Texas, an area that abounds with wildlife—both animal and botanical—and a truly unique section of my home State. During October of last year, I had the privilege of touring the Big Thicket area and witnessed its beauty and wilderness. This trip convinced me anew that something should be done very soon to preserve its manifold wonders and attractions so that all Americans will be able to enjoy the type of area and wildlife that does not exist anywhere else.

To illustrate the worthiness of preserving the Big Thicket, I ask unanimous consent that an account of that trip written by a member of our party, Bill Kugle, of Athens, Henderson County, Tex., which appeared in the October 20, 1965, Athens Review be printed at this point in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nature Abounds in Big Thicket

(By Bill Kugle)

For years I have conceived the Big Thicket as an area resembling the Florida Everglades—where a man who ventured in was not likely to be heard from again.

After Don Kennard and I made the Guadalupe Mountain trip, Senator Yarborough was sufficiently impressed with our merits as conservationists to invite us to tour the Big Thicket with him. We readily accepted and I met Senator Yarborough in Liberty on Friday afternoon. He landed in a helicopter in the middle of town and we then attended a reception at the city hall. Mayor Dempsey Henley, of Liberty, was our host for the weekend and entertained us royally. While we were waiting for Senator Yarborough's helicopter, however, I got acquainted with the other folks he had invited on the tour. Kennard was the beneficiary of an appreciation dinner in Fort Worth that day and did not arrive until the next morning. The other members of the tour were Dr. Don Correl, a botanist from the Renner Foundation, Dr. Clarence Cottam, director of Welder Wildlife Institute, Bill Bowen, superintendent of Padre Island National Park, Jack McElroy, national forest supervisor, and Jim Bowmer, president of Texas Employers Club.

After the reception in Liberty, we drove to Dempsey Henley's ranch to spend the night. Dempsey threw a fish fry for the members of the tour as well as a bunch of folks from the area. We were shown a movie of the Big Thicket and our trip into the thicket on the following day was planned.

About midnight after a very enjoyable evening, I was chatting with a group of the people from Liberty about Senator Yarborough's hopes of making the Big Thicket a national park or a wilderness area. One of the local businessmen said that he understood what the distinguished scientists were doing there, as well as the Forest Service men and the Padre Island Park director, but that my connection with the tour was not clear. It had already occurred to me that my own credentials as a wildlife expert were at best dubious, but I hastily replied, "I am here because I am the greatest outdoorsman since Daniel Boone." An absolute statement like this leaves little room for rejoinder, so I was not again challenged.

It was interesting that Senator Yarborough's old political foe, Price Daniel, introduced him at the reception in Liberty and came to the fish fry at Henley's ranch. Governor Daniel has long advocated some program conserving the Big Thicket. Senator Yarborough and Governor Daniel treated each other with great cordiality, which was obviously genuine. It was a pleasure for all of us to see these former political foes working together.

We slept at Henley's ranchhouse on the north edge of Liberty County and awoke early the next morning to start the trip. Kennard arrived before daylight. Representative Emmett Lock from Kountze joined us for breakfast and the tour. Emmett Lock has the heart of the Big Thicket for his district. During the last session of the legislature, he was en route to Austin in his Volkswagen late at night when smack dab in the middle of the thicket he ran into a bear. At any event, he said he hit a bear. I know him to be a credible person and would not for a moment suggest that he may have hit a Black Angus yearling. One thing is certain—it cost $200 to repair his Volkswagen. It is also certain that there are lots of bears in the Big Thicket as well as panthers, wildcats, and who knows what.

We were also joined before we left on the tour by Lance Rosier, the man known as Mr. Big Thicket. Reams have been written about Lance. Mary Lasswell, in her book, "I'll Take Texas," devotes a chapter to him. Tolbert has written about him many times in his column in the Dallas News. He is a self-taught naturalist, without any formal education beyond high school level, but he knows the scientific names of the thousands of species and varieties of botanical life in the thicket. He appears to weigh about a hundred pounds and from the picture above you can see that he is quite diminutive. He looks much older than his 62 years, but his conservation and agility seem much younger. He lives in Saratoga in Hardin County, which might be called headquarters of the thicket.

We departed in four vehicles, Scouts and Jeeps, with four-wheel drive. For hours we drove through the most dense part of the thicket in the area known as the tight eye. We traveled down old logging roads. Countless times we stopped to cut brush off the trail or to move a log. A newsreel photographer took a picture of Senator YARBOROUGH hacking away at a tree which had fallen in our path. I was afraid that our senior Senator would sustain a coronary for the sake of the movies, but he survived. In fact, Senator YARBOROUGH obviously enjoyed himself as I have never seen him enjoy himself before. Where the natural beauty of Texas is concerned he is a conservative, as he is dedicated to conserving this beauty. He is determined that the wildlife, animal, and botanical, be preserved. It can either be kept intact by making the thicket a national park, a national forest, or a wilderness area. It was the purpose of this article to tell about a trip, not to propagandize, but one cannot refrain from observing that if the thicket is destroyed our children will perhaps never see any of the wildlife which presently exists nowhere else.

We got stuck several times on the tour even with the four-wheel drives, but fortunately we never stuck all the vehicles at once and were always able to pull each other out. We were the witnesses to incredible beauty, including magnolia trees hundreds of years old.

It would be possible to go on indefinitely describing the Big Thicket, but space is a limiting factor. We saw the Keyser Burnout where troops were flushed by fire in the Civil War. We drove down the ghost road where ghosts have been seen for many years. Lance Rosier told me he had seen the ghosts many times. In fact, you can probably see them yourself if you drive down the road at night. It occurred to me that for a U.S. Senator a daytime appearance could have been arranged but none was forthcoming.

Later in the day, we were picked up by helicopters and looked the thicket over from the air. At 5 o'clock the whirlybirds put us down at the Alabama-Coushatta Indian Reservation, the only Indian reservation in Texas. Regrettably, it was too dark to take pictures when the Indians staged a dance for us.

The Big Thicket is not nearly so forbidding as the Everglades, but it is very, very big and many people have gotten lost there. It is a wonderful place to explore, but take a compass and a snakebite kit. I want to go back to the thicket for a prolonged visit someday. In fact I would like to go there with my grandchildren. I hope it will still be there.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Next meeting of the SENATE
12:00 noon, Monday, February 28

Next meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12:00 noon, Monday, February 28

Saturday, February 26, 1966

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 4007–4009

Resolution Introduced: One resolution was introduced, as follows: S.J. Res. 139. **Pages 4007–4008**

Military Procurement: Senate continued debate of S. 2791, fiscal 1966 supplemental authorizations for military procurement, and agreed to a motion by Senator Russell of Georgia that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of adoption of committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill. **Pages 4008–4009**

Program for Monday: Senate met at 10 a.m. and, after failure to obtain a quorum, adjourned at 10:43 a.m. until noon Monday, February 28, when it will continue on S. 2791, military procurement authorizations. **Page 4009**

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, February 28, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

Appendix

National Gallery of Art March Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following calendar of events at the National Gallery of Art:

THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MARCH 1966

Gallery hours: The Gallery is open weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m..

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 6

Painting of the week:[1] Henri Rousseau, "The Equatorial Jungle" (Chester Dale Collection), gallery 84, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Drawings from the Collection of the National Gallery of Art." Central gallery, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Macchiaioli and the Patch of Color." Guest speaker, Laurence A. Leite, professor of art history, George Washington University, Washington, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Joann Freeman, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 7, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 13

Painting of the week:[1] Goya, "Señora Sabasa Garcia." (Andrew Mellon collection), gallery 50. Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "The Samuel H. Kress Collection." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Romantic Aspects of Florentine Sculpture." Guest speaker, Charles Seymour, Jr., professor of art history, Yale University, New Haven, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor, East Garden Court, 8 (25th anniversary concert).

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, MARCH 14, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 20

Painting of the week: Rubens, "Daniel in the Lions' Den" (Ailsa Mellon Bruce Fund), gallery 41A, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: The Widener collection. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Dreamer or Visionary, A Study of English Romantic Painting (I)." Guest speaker, Lord David Cecil, lecture hall, 4. Fifteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts.

Sunday concert: Alpha Brawner, soprano; Samuel Sanders, pianist. East garden court, 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 21, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 27

Painting of the week: Manet, "Rue Mosnier, Paris, Decorated with Flags on June 30, 1878" (lent by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon.) Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: The Andrew Mellon collection. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Dreamer or Visionary, a Study of English Romantic Painting (II)." Guest speaker: Lord David Cecil, lecture hall, 4. Fifteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts.

Sunday concert: Anastasia Jempelis, violinist; Madeline Ingram, harpsichordist. East garden court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

Twenty-fifth anniversary exhibitions

"French Paintings from the Collections of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon and Mrs. Mellon Bruce." First public showing. Galleries 59 through 68. March 18 through May 1.

"Drawings from the Collection of the National Gallery of Art." Central gallery. Through April 17.

"Twenty-five Years of National Gallery Publications." Central lobby. Open March 18.

Twenty-fifth anniversary publications

Catalog. French paintings from the collections of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon and Mrs. Mellon Bruce, 248 pages, 10 by 7½ inches, with introduction by John Rewald, 20 color plates, and 226 black and white illustrations. Three dollars postpaid.

"A Pageant of Painting from the National Gallery of Art," edited by Huntington Cairns and John Walker; 2 volumes, 518 pages, 255 color plates, 10½ by 14 inches, $35 postpaid.

"Dutch Landscape Painting of the Seventeenth Century," by Wolfgang Stechow; 256 pages, 240 illustrations, 10¼ by 7⅛ inches; $12.50 postpaid. First of the Kress Foundation Studies in the History of European Art.

"John Singleton Copley," by Jules D. Prown; 2 volumes (boxed), each 272 pages; 677 illustrations, 8 by 11 inches; $25 postpaid. First of the Ailsa Mellon Bruce Studies in American Art.

"Summary Catalog of European Paintings and Sculpture" in the National Gallery of Art. One hundred and ninety-two pages, 9 by 6 inches, $2.85 postpaid. For the first time since 1941, a complete checklist in one volume.

On March 20 Lord David Cecil, Goldsmiths' professor of English literature, Oxford University, England, will begin a series of six consecutive Sunday lectures, entitled "Dreamer or Visionary, a Study of English Romantic Painting." Fifteenth annual series of the A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts.

Cafeteria: Open Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sundays 4 to 7 p.m.

---

[1] 11- by 14-inch reproductions with text for sale this month—15 cents each. (If mailed, $1 for 4; orders under $1, 25 cents each, plus 25 cents mailing charge.)

Double "A" Earned on Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a short time ago the daughter of a friend in Spokane, Wash., made one essay do double duty.

I refer to Marianne Williams, the daughter of Marvin Williams, secretary-treasurer of the Washington State Labor Council.

Marianne, a student in the eighth grade at Sacajawea Junior High School, decided to trace the history of a legislative measure.

She picked a subject which interested many of her friends, the matter of girls wearing jeans to school. Fortunately, we have not taken that subject up here—yet.

I would commend Marianne for the account she has given. But I will have to stand in line to do so, because both her history and creative writing teachers already have given her "A's" for her essay.

I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the essay might be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A BILL

(By Marianna Williams)

I was born in the minds of a group of girls attending a high school in La Mesa, Calif. These girls thought it only fair that all girls should be able to wear jeans to school. So they wrote letters and more letters to their Congressman until he consented to suggest me to the House.

It was a cold winter day when we set out for Washington, D.C. It was warmer in the plane but sliding around as I was I felt like I was in a ship on a stormy sea. Our capital is a grand place and I was sorry we didn't get to go sightseeing.

When we got to the clerk's desk I was put into the hopper. You can't imagine what it was like in there with hundreds of bills swarming all over you. You'd think they never cleaned the place out. Everyone was sneezing from the dust. When I thought I couldn't stand it another second, I was taken out, and read before the House. It is humiliating to sit there with everyone making awful comments about you. Even so, some of the more modern minded Representatives thought me a very good and logical bill. But unfortunately the Speaker of the House was not modern minded. He gave me to the Education Committee. He figured it would be hard for me to get through there, and he was absolutely right. But I did have some good points. Finally that breathless moment came, would they kill me or send me to the House for approval. Already many of my friends in the hopper had been sent back. My question was soon answered. I was to go onto the House Calendar. Oh, I was so relieved. At least I'd made it this far.

The House though didn't consider me as important as I thought I was, because it was days before they even seemed to notice me. At length I was again read to the House. A few Representatives (a bit old-fashioned I'd say) though it disgraceful that anyone would even think of such a thing as girls wearing jeans to school. But this time most everyone was convinced that I wasn't so bad after all. After a short discussion I was sent over to the Senate. I was read by the Vice President and he sent me to the Education Committee. They treated me like I was just an unimportant piece of paper even though I was quite important. I guess, though, that they did like me because they gave me their recommendation. I was now read to the Senate. The Senate believes in going over things thoroughly. They turned me inside and out until I didn't think I'd make it at all. But finally they decided for me and I was sent to the President. The President, having a few girls in school, was easily persuaded to sign me.

I was so happy that I'd survived that I didn't even mind his scratching me with one of those things called a pen. There was just one more painful moment. That was when the Secretary of State put what they call the Great Seal of the United States of America on me. I personally think they could be a little bit gentler.

Proposed SBA Transfer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, a great deal is being said about transferring the Small Business Administration to the Department of Commerce.

Speculation grows. So-called leaks spring open. Doubt grows.

The people most concerned—the small businessmen themselves—are beginning now to make known their views on any proposed transfer.

Some want the Small Business Administration moved to the Department of Commerce. They take the initiative. They urge it.

These small businessmen feel that the Department of Commerce is truly and effectively the representative of businesses of all sizes—and big, medium, and little.

They assert that the "old image" of Commerce being "big business" was long ago laid to rest.

Many statements from small businessmen are coming to my office supporting a transfer. These small businessmen no longer want to be "segregated" from the mainstream of American business. They ask for a place in the high Cabinet Council.

Here are three typical statements:

NEWS OF THE HARDWARE INDUSTRY

The National Retail Hardware Association has gone on record to encourage President Johnson to propose a transfer of the Small Business Administration to the Department of Commerce, headed by an Under Secretary.

Managing Director Russell R. Mueller, of NRHA said that such a move would remove the SBA from its present "independent agency" status and afford small businessmen a stronger voice in governmental affairs at a Cabinet level. Mr. Mueller suggested that Mr. Gene Foley, recently transferred to the Commerce Department from the SBA would be an excellent choice as Under Secretary of Commerce in charge of the SBA.

Mr. Mueller said that 95 percent of the Nation's businesses fall in the "tiny" category and are presently inadequately represented at the Cabinet level.

TRANSFER OF SBA TO COMMERCE DEPARTMENT ENDORSED BY ARBA

Transfer of the Small Business Administration to the U.S. Department of Commerce, under the direction of a new Under Secretary of Commerce, was endorsed today by the Associated Retail Bakers of America in a statement issued by the association's President, Walter Dolch of Maquoketa, Iowa.

A stronger voice, at Cabinet level, and better service for small businesses were the prime reasons cited by the association, speaking on behalf of 6,000 neighborhood retail bakeries.

"The idea of a separate, 'independent' agency has not worked out well for small business," Mr. Dolch said. "Headed by an Under Secretary of Commerce, with the prestige and influence of that office, and as part of a regular department in the executive branch, we believe SBA would have a considerable and wholesome influence on the policies and actions of the Department, along with improvement in SBA's effectiveness elsewhere.

"The prime need of small business is not just Government loans. What it needs more is a continuing voice in the highest councils of Government.

"We do not share the fear of some opponents of the proposed transfer that SBA will be submerged in the Department," the retail baker's group added. "Insead, we think it will help to insure that the Department will be truly an agency for all business, and helpful to all business."

The association statement expressed hope that such a reorganization will be favorably considered by Members of Congress, including the Government Operations Committees and the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate.

"More effective consideration and representation of small business in the executive branch," Mr. Dolch said, "will help to supplement the excellent work done by the Senate and House Small Business Committees."

GREATER EMPHASIS ON SBA ENCOURAGED BY USWGA

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 14.—A move to relocate the Small Business Administration as a major unit of the Department of Commerce, with its administrator to hold the position of Under Secretary of Commerce, is being given strong encouragement by the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association.

The association's executive vice president, Harold O. Smith, Jr., reports that the association has been striving for several years to obtain a "home" for SBA that will give it a much needed strong voice at the Cabinet level.

USWGA commends the House and Senate Small Business Committees for their dedicated work over the years in the interest of private enterprise.

Mr. Smith said, "This contemplated action is most encouraging. We are hopeful that transfer of SBA to the Department of Commerce, in a way that will better serve a small business, will receive congressional approval.

Proposed Designation of February as American History Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on February 1, 1966, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 133, and I am pleased that 42 other Senators have joined in sponsoring this bill to designate the month of February as American History Month. I have received many thoughtful comments about this resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the February 17, 1966, edition of the Hancock Clarion, published at Hawesville, Ky., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for today. I call particular attention to the editorial comment on the importance of the study of our history and traditions to the young people of this Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION OF PATRIOTIC REMINDER

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER has introduced in the Congress a resolution to encourage "special recognition of the traditional values we cherish" by designating February as American History Month.

We congratulate Senator COOPER on this high incentive to recognize the importance of February in American history, and to call attention to the high privilege we have to recount what place in our history this month has. Especially do we think this is important at this particular time to revive in all of us a stronger patriotic spirit that has characterized our heritage of the past.

Every loyal citizen of these United States today is regrettably reminded that real patriotism of our people in large numbers is at a low ebb. We are witnessing so many so-called assemblies today, not for the "redress of grievances" as allowed by the Constitution, but seemingly for the sole purpose of causing confusion and strife and to bring our Nation into disrepute among the peoples of the world. Long have those so-called assemblies forgotten the high purpose of this provision in our Constitution that allowed them to circulate, but most of them have appeared only as uncontrolled mobs advocating nothing of worth, but stimulated by a communistic aspect that is foreign to every tenet of our freedom.

With February we need to remember what this month signifies in our American heritage: to recall that this is the month that saw the birth of this Nation's two greatest men: In the lives and character of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln this Nation has the proud distinction of having two of the most outstanding men of all time, recognized by every nation in this world as a personification of freedom and liberty that all mankind has sought through all ages. Their patriotic devotion to that idea that all men were created equal and by that right must be free, is the incentive by which this Nation has lived.

We need to instill in the minds and hearts of the youth of our country that higher patriotism that calls for devotion and loyalty to our Government and to those elected officials to whom we have committed our trust. Such a high patriotism cannot be instilled by mass assemblies with no other purpose than to confuse and hinder the issues that confront our country today. We need to again recall what these two great Americans stood for and what they did to establish freedom and liberty in our Nation that has made our country great, and the privilege we have today to spread abroad that patriotic zeal for liberty and freedom to all peoples of the world.

We need to have the youth of this land given a more comprehensive study of the history of this Nation with the purpose of renewing a greater knowledge of our heritage; to build again what seemingly we have lost by the participation in the ideas of other ideologies that are contrary to our own ideals that we must maintain if we shall continue to be the Nation of people that our forefathers dreamed and what we have maintained through the years. It is the youth of today that are at the crossroads of history that may well mean the loss of every tenet of our history that we hold dear. It is to them that we throw the torch of liberty that must burn in the hearts of every human if man shall remain free.

We have an unbounded faith in our youth and believe that such a commitment will not have been made in vain. We prompt them in every stage of life to be loyal to our Nation and to the rich heritage we enjoy, believing that in them we shall have a "new birth of freedom" as so strongly proclaimed by Lincoln and first brought into being by the immortal Washington. —R.I.D.

Can L.B.J. Afford This Engagement?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, again Mr. Arthur Hoppe, the columnist and outstanding satirist of this age, has produced a most interesting column entitled "Can L.B.J. Afford This Engagement?"

The column, which follows, was published in the San Francisco Chronicle on February 24, 1966:

CAN L.B.J. AFFORD THIS ENGAGEMENT?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

EN ROUTE TO WASHINGTON.—I am rushing to our Nation's Capital in a desperate effort to resolve the uneasy wrangle that threatens to tear our Republic asunder.

Senator FULBRIGHT and Mr. BOBBY KENNEDY have their honest opinions, I'm sure. And the President unquestionably has his. The public is confused and divided. Others may equivocate on this burning issue, but come what may, I have taken my stand and I will stick to it:

Luci and Pat should not live in the White House after they're married.

The crisis arose in that devious way Washington crises usually do: Miss Johnson gave an exclusive interview to McCall's, the magazine of togetherness. It was all about her fiance, Mr. Nugent, and how they planned to live in Washington after they were married.

"Of course we'll live off his income," Miss Johnson told McCall's firmly. "He wouldn't think of it any other way." In the next sentence the magazine said Mr. Nugent now makes $93.90 a month.

While Miss Johnson neither confirmed nor denied the possibility she and Mr. Nugent planned to live in the White House, she did say she wasn't going to go to work herself, because "Paddy," as she calls Mr. Nugent, "wouldn't hear of it." And where else can you live in Washington on $93.90 a month?

So the Nation is divided. There are those who hold that Miss Johnson has every legal and moral right to bring her new husband into the White House if her parents acquiesce. But can a livable arrangement between the two groups be worked out?

From hints dropped to the McCall's interviewer, Miss Johnson seems to lean to this view. For she emphasizes what a big man her father is, how reasonably he behaves, and how much she respects him. But I think even she has her doubts. For though she says Mr. Nugent holds his own with Mr. Johnson, she thoughtfully adds, "as much as anybody else does."

Yet you can see where such a full-scale commitment would lead: Chats at the table about the war on poverty and wiping out poverty pockets making $93.90 a month. And soon it would escalate into who forgot to turn off the lights in the upstairs hall.

Others, of course, feel that Miss Johnson and Mr. Nugent would be wiser to establish a small enclave, perhaps in a groundfloor bedroom easily supplied by window from the local delicatessen when things got rough. But would the American public accept such a shaky compromise?

No, the only solution, I say, is complete withdrawal. Two families—one rich and powerful and the other poor and inexperienced—cannot coooperate as theoretical equals without getting entangled in the most awful mess. So Miss Johnson should pull out of the White House. She will, I'm sure, win the respect and admiration of newlyweds everywhere by admitting the whole idea was an awful mistake.

Thus you can see why I'm so excited to get back to Washington. At last we have a clearcut issue that the American people can really sink their teeth into.

Growth in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am still receiving favorable comment regarding an address delivered before the Marketing Conference sponsored in Portland, Oreg., in mid-February by Portland State College and Portland General Electric Co.

Ordinarily, I would suggest that my colleagues from Oregon enter such an address into the RECORD. But the subject discussed concerned Washington as much, or perhaps more than, Oregon. California was mentioned too.

The speaker was Reed Hunt, chairman of the board of the Crown Zellerbach Corp.

He dug deep into our sectional history. He discussed the present with meaning. Then he looked far into the future.

I like the way Chairman Hunt told so much in so few words, and would ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that his address be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARKETING THE NORTHWEST—OUTLINE OF REMARKS BY REED O. HUNT, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, CROWN ZELLERBACH CORP., PSC-PGE MARKETING CONFERENCE, PORTLAND HILTON, FEBRUARY 15, 1966

It is a great privilege to be invited to take part in this 1966 Marketing Conference sponsored by Portland State College and Portland General Electric Co. The conference is an excellent example of the ways in which people in higher education and business can get together to consider major priorities facing American business management.

Mr. Perkins and Dr. Howard, I would also like to pay tribute to the Kiwanis and Rotary Clubs of Portland for helping to make this luncheon occasion possible and because your two organizations reflect the energy, drive and public service of the Portland business community.

As a result of this Portland initiative, many national corporations noted for their marketing programs are represented here today. The caliber of these men and their contributions to the conference indicate the significance which business itself attaches to this occasion. This is also the kind of meeting that can stimulate economic growth by attracting to the Northwest representatives of business organizations from outside the area.

Now we customarily and rightly associate marketing as a business activity with the individual company or corporation and with the general purpose of "creating consumer satisfaction," the theme of today's conference. Different forms of marketing are also carried out by larger economic groupings, the industrial association for example. In the building materials field, the promotional activities of the American Plywood Association would be well known here in the Northwest.

But we can observe the marketing process exolving at higher economic levels, that of the state or the economic region. Today the regional markets often compete with each other in the thrust for economic development, comparing their rates of growth with other regions and with the national economy.

Since this conference has been arranged by people from both the academic and business worlds, perhaps you will allow me to quote from a university publication, the latest issue of the Harvard Business Review, on this question:

"States and regions," the Harvard Business Review says, "are beginning to act like corporations, bidding for new business, trying to improve their capacities for economic growth, exploring new technologies, and worrying a good deal about their public 'images.' States now compete for companies and industries as companies compete for product markets."

The main point of the Harvard Business Review article is not that States or regions should not promote their own economic development. They should. It is the way they go about it that is important. Pirating companies from other areas, for example, does little to encourage general growth of the economy. The regions, aided by their colleges and universities, would be better advised—and I am still quoting our friends from Massachusetts—if they concentrated on developing their existing resources and on encouraging the development of new technology-based industries by talented entrepreneurs already in the midst. Economic development policies along these lines would jointly benefit national and regional growth.

The Pacific Northwest constitutes one of the most important economic regions of the country, and the States which comprise it are vigorously promoting their own growth as a matter of public policy. They are doing so, at least from my observation, primarily on the basis of making the best use of their own tremendous resources. These naturally include the climate, the amenities and the recreational possibilities of this part of the country. Companies and industries are attracted here fundamentally by the long-term potential of the regional and Pacific coast markets and access to world markets. At the same time it is useful to let the rest of the country know you're around and interested in new business and industry. I think the Pacific Northwest is doing this type of promotion, or marketing if you will, effectively.

Within the four-State area of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and western Montana live 7 million people. They have close economic ties with Alaska and British Columbia. In the Columbia River Basin lies the country's greatest single source of low-cost hydroelectric power, a basic economic reality tied into discussion of the region's future development. Here in Portland, along the lower Columbia and around Puget Sound, the region has well-developed ports for trade with countries of the Pacific Rim and the rest of the world.

Despite all the progress made, however, the Northwest remains a relatively young economic region compared to other parts of the country. When I was a youngster in Gig Harbor on south Puget Sound, and I like to think this was not too long ago, the "store boat" still anchored in the harbor. In effect this was an early marketing method for distributing new household items, "snake oil," and so forth, to families living on the rivers, inlets, and islands of Oregon and Washington. While this floating department store has vanished from the scene it is a reminder even today that the frontier is not as far back in the Northwest as we might sometimes think.

It was natural that the Northwest economy should evolve around its great natural resources, its timber, soil, fisheries, and rivers. The development of the forest industries, agriculture, and hydropower all stemmed from this extraordinary resource base. The farmers and the fishermen brought in the food processors. Lumber, plywood, pulp, and paper attracted the equipment manufacturers. Cheap power facilitated the start of the aluminum industry.

Even today's 707 jet airplane can trace its ancestry back to the Boeing family lumber holdings which provided the necessary economic support during the formative years of the Boeing Co. In fact, the very first Boeing plane built on Lake Union in Seattle back in 1916 was put together out of select spruce cut in a sawmill at Aberdeen.

It is on the broad foundation created by the resource-based industries that the Northwest economy has recently begun to diversify, both within and outside of the basic industries. In pulp and paper, we are not only producing more to keep up with the market; we are also producing a much broader range of products. In 10 years, employment in plywood and veneer in Oregon has moved from 6,500 people to more than 26,000. During this period the number of plywood plants in Oregon has quadrupled. We have seen the beginnings of a silvichemical industry based on pulping wastes and unused parts of the tree.

The forest industries continue to be the dominant factor on the economic landscape, directly or indirectly providing employment to nearly a quarter of a million people. But we have seen one industry after another establish beachheads in the Northwest in recent years, from oil refining in the Puget Sound area 10 years ago to chemicals, and more recently here in Portland, electronics. I think it is fair to say that the forest industries have encouraged this development. Certainly they have welcomed it.

Nor have these newer industries in the area come here at the expense of some other economic region of the country. They came and stayed because they liked what they saw and because they wanted to be positioned for future growth in the regional market.

Economic and population expansion, as we know, tends to occur in waves. The waves, in turn, flow unevenly. More wash up on some places than others. The Pacific Northwest experienced a surge of growth and a large net migration of people between 1940 and 1950, stimulated by the demands of the war and postwar economy. Most of the new arrivals settled in the metropolitan areas of Portland and Seattle. The Northwest countryside remained relatively unpopulated, as it continues to be today.

There was a marked slowdown in the growth rate during the 1950's, and as recently as 1960 some people were leaving the area to seek jobs in California and elsewhere. Now, however, we are witnessing a new development. The growth line of the Northwest is trending up. The situation is beginning to resemble the forties more than the fifties. The 1965 economic indicators of capital spending, personal income and employment were all favorable. Taking Oregon and Washington together, nearly 90,000 new jobs in nonfarm employment opened up last year, a fairly substantial increase over the previous year.

We know that shortages in certain types of skilled manpower have appeared and that employers are reaching outside the region to fill their employment needs. Moreover, the prognosis for 1966, judging from what the regional economists are telling us, is excellent. We know that the regional economy will continue to grow, within the context of growth along the whole Pacific coast, from Vancouver to San Diego. But what is suggested here is that the Pacific Northwest is heading into a new era of growth which could produce some problems as well as significant opportunities.

In Seattle not long ago, Bill Allen, the president of Boeing, was talking to the Seattle Chamber of Commerce on the question of growth targets for the Seattle area. His observations were directed at his own community, but to me they had broader implications as well.

"We are facing a transition," he said, "to a much larger and more important community future. We have to plan like the devil in industry. We need to do the same in our community. We cannot simply expect it to grow up and turn out to be the kind of place we would like."

In your sister State to the south, which has had a massive impact on the economy of the entire Pacific coast, there is as much preoccupation today with the problems of growth as with growth itself.

Now it happens that I am a Puget Sounder who lived many years in the Portland area and who, for one reason or another, has spent the last 20 years or so as a resident of the bay area. The organization I represent also has feet in both camps, as it were, and we can trace our company beginnings back to the start of the pulp and paper industry in both California and the Northwest. Like you, I have seen many changes occur in the American economy, and I expect many more. But what has been taking place in California is fantastic.

Today, California continues to grow at the rate of 1,600 people a day, 50,000 a month, 600,000 a year. This represents the rough equivalent of a new Portland or Seattle, or two new Spokanes from one year to the next. A few weeks ago, the director of the Institute of Population Studies in India told a Berkeley audience that the American population is now growing faster than India's. He added that the California population is rising at a rate double that of the United States. "In 10 years," he said, "California may have 25 million people, and by A.D. 2000 southern California will have 25 million, with 15 million cars to drive them around. As there is not much space, the entire region between Santa Barbara and the Mexican border will be one solid unrelieved metropolitan complex."

This is an observation by a visiting expert from a country with severe population problems of its own. It underscores the point that California is looked on by sociologists, economists and demographers the world over as an international laboratory case of growth and growth problems.

Just last month members of the Interim Committee on Ways and Means of the California State Assembly held hearings on "Potentials for California's Economic Growth."

Two eminent economists from Stanford advised the committee that California's economic expansion during the next 10 years would be enormous, even without active encouragement by the State government.

"The State's main problem," they said, "is not to stimulate indiscriminate growth but rather to attempt to optimize the effect of the flood of new business, and to cope with the many problems that this boom will pose."

Now the expansion of the California market has had significant effects on the economy of the Northwest. Its further growth and development will continue to stimulate business and industrial activity here. No one is seriously suggesting that the lid be put on at this stage, even if that were possible. As Senator TOM KUCHEL said recently, "you can't stop them at the border." It would nonetheless appear that California's experience with growth can be useful to the Northwest, which wants and can profitably utilize much greater economic development. But there are also good indications that Northwesterners, so long as the option is theirs, would prefer order and balance in the development of their economy to mere haphazard growth.

What are the prospects for population and economic expansion in the Pacific Northwest?

The official projections go back to the U.S. census of 1960 and forecast an increase in the population of Oregon and Washington by 1985, 20 years from now, of approximately 2 million people, or a rise of 48 percent and 39 percent respectively for the two States. Some of these new people will obviously come from California in response to population pressures to the south of you.

Much of this future growth, as in the past, will tend to be concentrated in the big metropolitan centers of Portland and Seattle, and there are those who already see the shadows of a long urban strip extending from Vancouver in British Columbia south to Eugene.

But is it not possible that the official projections may prove to be conservative?

The economy of the United States emerged in 1965 as the fastest growing in the world, despite its already substantial base. Our gross national product, already more than $700 billion, appears to be heading toward a trillion dollars in the foreseeable future. It would be difficult to predict with any clarity precisely what the impact of this enormous growth might be on an economic region such as the Northwest, or on a large metropolitan area such as Portland.

Moreover, we live in a contracting society, thanks in part to the contributions of the commercial aircraft industry in Seattle and elsewhere on the Pacific coast. Can't we assume that companies headquartered in highly congested areas might at least consider moving elsewhere to find more congenial surroundings for their people?

The ease and speed of transportation around the country, the general acceleration of communications of all kinds, come close even now to permitting any organization to settle and start operations where it chooses. Why not in the Northwest? Increasing flexibility of movement, not only of people, but of whole organizations and industries is another factor that could upset the forecasts and give meaning to Bill Allen's reference to the need to plan for a much larger community future.

Looking for the moment to the traditional, resource-based industries of the Northwest, we can see much greater growth ahead. These industries will certainly respond to further economic development on the Pacific Coast and in the national economy, and in line with our conference theme today they will also aggressively seek to expand their markets. Moreover, as one of the world's great timber growing regions, the Northwest should be able to keep its forest industries amply supplied with essential raw material, through continued improvements in utilization and intensive timber management.

I would think we could also look for growth in agricultural production in the Northwest as more and more prime farm acreage is withdrawn in California for other uses. Where food is grown in abundant volume, the food processing and chemical industries are sure to come along, as we already know from experience in the region.

One of the most significant unifying elements in the economy of the Northwest and destined to play a fundamental role in its future development, as it has in the past; is the great Columbia River watershed. As one of the great river basins in North America, the Columbia Valley provides water and power for industry, a highway for traffic and irrigation for the land.

Today the Columbia generates 14 million kilowatts of hydroelectric power, approximately as much as the Tennessee Valley Authority produces from its dams and thermal plants. Its potential for hydropower, including the section of the river in British Columbia, is 40 million kilowatts, or so the experts tell us. This is the equivalent of electric power installed and in use in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and all the States of New England, representing a population of more than 45 million people.

Through the Columbia River Treaty with Canada it will be possible over the next several years to build the hydropower generating capacity of the Columbia toward its 40 million kilowatt potential. Three treaty dams on the British Columbia side are under construction, the first of which is scheduled for completion in 1968.

In comparative economic terms, British Columbia and the States of the Northwest are underdeveloped. The Columbia will provide them with power to sell elsewhere. Last year Congress authorized construction of the high voltage intertie with the Pacific Southwest to provide a market for this extra energy. Under the treaty, as we know, Canada will share in the economic benefits from the sale of Columbia River power in the Southwestern market, as will the Northwest itself.

As other dams are completed on this side of the Canadian border, and as lock systems are installed, the Columbia will be opened up to heavy barge traffic as far east as Pasco and Wenatchee. Locks on the Snake River will permit tug-barge combinations to move as far inland as Lewiston, Idaho.

It is in these ways, as well as through flood control measures and irrigation capacity, that the Columbia is built into the economy of the Northwest. The forest industries have been long established on the river. But it was only in 1940 that the first aluminum plant, drawing on Columbia River power, began operations in the Northwest.

During the intervening period, the aluminum industry has gone from one plant to nine, including one now under construction. The capacity of the industry in the Northwest will soon be more than 850,000 tons a year. While the industry has grown elsewhere in the United States during the past 25 years, this still represents more than 30 percent of the country's aluminum capacity.

The economic influence of the Columbia was equally significant in the development of plutonium production at Hanford in the Tri-Cities. It took the flow of the river to cool the Hanford reactors, which produced the material for nuclear weapons under the general direction of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Today great changes are taking place in the tricities. Plutonium production has been cut back and a program has been developed to segment and diversify the Hanford operation. Several companies have moved in to lay the groundwork for what may evolve into a diversified nuclear industry in the tricities. The Batelle Memorial Institute, as one of the country's leading research organizations, has already taken over operation of the big Hanford laboratory. Perhaps another chapter in the economic history of the Northwest is about to unfold.

The development of the Columbia River for the needs of the Northwest has required considerable vision, a willingness to look many years into the future. It is clearly one of the region's great natural assets. To divert the river elsewhere, or to diminish its multipurpose capacity to contribute to the overall growth of the Northwest would not appear to make much economic sense. Sound regional planning in the area, based on firm cooperation of the States and agencies involved, will no doubt firmly establish the wisdom of leaving the Columbia intact so that it can continue to serve effectively the economy of the Northwest and the country.

The Northwest would appear to have a number of significant weapons in its own marketing arsenal for promoting the potentials of the region in other parts of the country and for developing trade abroad.

Marketing an entire economic region is a complicated process, but it can be a useful and constructive activity if it is based on good regional planning, interstate and intercity cooperation, and a general willingness to promote the interests of the area as a whole. There is much evidence, it seems to me, that Portland and the Northwest are determined to plan and control their future growth, to provide economic oportunity and development which balance with livability and recreation.

For these, too, are marketable on the national economic scene. They will become increasingly so as our population expands elsewhere.

The Oregon State Department of Planning and Development is even now working on these problems and seeking solutions that will permit orderly development. What the port of Portland has done at the confluence of the Willamette and the Columbia with the Rivergate development, what the port of St. Helens has done with the purchase of the Beaver Army Terminal, are sound examples of planning for long-term industrial expansion.

As this new era of growth unfolds in Portland, in Oregon, in Washington and throughout the Pacific Northwest, the educational institutions of the region will play an increasingly dynamic part. One vital reason for this will be the fact that student enrollment will be growing at a much more rapid rate than the general population, and the challenges to institutions of higher learning to absorb these young people will be tremendous.

Portland State College has tripled its student enrollment in the last 10 years. In 1955 it had 2,800 students. It has more than 9,000 today. It is expected to have well over 13,000 by 1970. In the 15-year period from 1955 to 1970 the University of Oregon will have gone from an enrollment of 5,000 to 15,000. The University of Washington has 25,000 students today. In 5 years the number may be 32,000. If we are producing more people in the country today, at least we are making sure that they will be better educated.

Here also is great opportunity for economic growth. It is the brainpower aided by colleges such as Portland State and by the other colleges and universities of the Northwest that will help develop the industries and institutions which are already here and the new technologies to come. This argues well for the establishment of a graduate center in Portland, a proposal which already has much community support.

As the level of education moves up and out across the population of the Northwest, others will be attracted to the region to make their own long-term contribution to its economy and welfare.

I am also convinced that in the process, business and higher education will be drawn more closely together, as evidenced by this conference here in Portland today. In collaboration with the appropriate agencies of State and local government, they can make a powerful team for marketing the Northwest throughout the country, and around the world.

To the faculty of Portland State College, the management of Portland General Electric, to the members of Portland Rotary and Portland Kiwanis, may I again express my appreciation to you for including me in your program here today.

Tony Plattner Reports on the Russian SAM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, we in the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota are rightfully proud of a young reporter who writes on the war in Vietnam for Aviation Week & Space Technology. He is C. M. "Tony" Plattner of Walker, Minn., son of Mr. and Mrs. Clemens A. Plattner who edit and publish three excellent newspapers in northern Minnesota.

Tony has been writing a series of articles for Aviation Week that are recognized for their authority due to this young reporter's background as a Marine Corps fighter pilot, and his experience working in an aircraft-desiging section of an aerospace company before joining the magazine.

His articles have been so well received both in and out of the aerospace industry that a recent article led one military officer to note: "The article represents perhaps the best summary and overall picture of the situation that I have yet read, and that includes intelligence summaries of varying classifications."

As an example of the clarity and completeness of Tony Plattner's series, I have permission to insert at this point in the Appendix his article about how U.S. pilots are countering the threat of the growing number of Russian SAM antiaircraft missiles appearing in North Vietnam.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM: SAM'S SPUR

(By C. M. Plattner)

SAIGON.—Emplacement of Soviet-built surface-to-air missiles (SAM) in North Vietnam has brought about sweeping changes in combat tactics and spurred development of new equipment to counter the effectiveness of this threat.

These Russian SA-2 missiles, although directly responsible for downing only 10 U.S. aircraft, registering a kill rate of 5 percent for all missiles fired, have nevertheless forced tactical aircraft to fly at lower altitudes where the probability of being hit by conventional antiaircraft fire is increased.

Since the threat of SAM's in North Vietnam became a reality with the loss of an Air Force/McDonnell F-4C on July 24, the Navy and U.S. Air Force have been working hard to develop means to counter the effectiveness of the missiles.

Both Navy and Air Force were relatively unprepared to meet the SAM threat with equipment and tactics on hand. Among the key lessons learned in the first actual combat situation faced by tactical jet aircraft of either service were:

Navy's Shrike missile developed to knock out enemy radars has been ineffective so far, although a number of them have been fired.

Mobility of SAM batteries exceeds previous estimates. A SAM battery can be dismantled in about 4 hours and set up in about 6 hours. Moving SAM units from one site to another is done routinely by the North Vietnamese, using road and river networks, particularly after a missile is fired at an attacking aircraft.

Electronic countermeasures equipment and tactics for tactical aircraft were badly lacking. Although some SAM avoidance tactics such as the "pop-up maneuver" had been developed previously, few, if any, high-altitude tactics existed. No electronic countermeasures equipment was in use on tactical aircraft and both services rushed into crash programs to develop new equipment.

When the SAM's first were encountered on missions over North Vietnam, the pilots were seriously concerned over the new threat. Later, as they observed repeated misses of the missiles, the pilots changed their attitude. Most now feel that the danger from conventional antiaircraft fire in North Vietnam is greater than from SAM's.

The pilots also initially were impressed by the larger size of the missile as it sped by and described it variously as a Douglas A-4 without wings or as a "flying telephone pole."

Air Force and Navy, however, quickly learned that the SAM batteries were as difficult to find and destroy as the Vietcong in South Vietnam. Early strikes attempted last summer against sites met with little success. Too often the site was there but the missiles and radars were missing.

Camouflage and deception made pinpointing sites more difficult, and in one case an Air Force strike was conducted against a dummy site.

It was not until electronic countermeasures were hastily developed and rushed into use last fall that real-time intelligence information gave attacking aircraft a positive indication of the location of active sites.

Pathfinder aircraft equipped with radar-homing devices began to be used last fall in a "hunter-killer" role. The pathfinders pinpoint in active SAM site by flying over it, and the strike aircraft following it deliver their bombs and rockets on the site.

First aircraft to be used successfully as a pathfinder was the Navy/Douglas A-4. The A-4's were used as pathfinders of both Republic/USAF F-105's as well as Navy trike aircraft. Air Force installed a radar-homing device on the F-105, but it turned out to be ineffective, largely because of limited range. U.S. Air Force then switched to a North American F-100 as a pathfinder.

Conventional bombs and unguided rockets are being used to knock out the SAM sites since the Shrike missile, developed for silencing radar transmitters, has proven relatively ineffective. It is felt that most Shrikes have failed to strike the target, although there were cases where the radar stopped emitting signals. It is not known whether this was a countermeasures move, however, or whether the Shrike had blown up the radar unit.

U.S. military officers have long had a high regard for the quality of Russian radars and have been particularly impressed with the high degree of mobility of their radar and fire control units. It is this high degree of mobility which has permitted the SAM batteries in North Vietnam to be moved frequently and escape strikes from the air.

Two principal types of sites have been identified in North Vietnam:

Permanent, fixed sites with dug-in revetments.

Temporary sites.—These are quickly-prepared locations with little attempt at revetting missiles and radars, normally. Maximum use is made of terrain and natural foliage such as orchards (A.W. & S.T., Nov. 22, 1965, p. 29) for camouflage, although some sites have been laid out in open fields. When these sites are temporarily vacated, the missiles may be either transported to another site along with the fire-control units or concealed at or near the old site.

Only a small number of the sites are permanent. Most of them are temporary. As of last month there were over 40 temporary and permanent sites in North Vietnam.

The mobility of the entire SAM complex in North Vietnam took military officials by surprise. They initially believed that most of the sites were fixed while several highly mobile units moved around from place to place. Experience showed that virtually the entire SAM site complex is mobile and is moved constantly.

There are several highly mobile SAM batteries of later design with missiles mounted on mobile launchers and radar and fire-control systems in truck vans.

Movement of the SAM units from place to place is largely by road and river transportation. Very little is done by railroad.

Although mobility is surprisingly good, accuracy so far has been very poor. Pilots have several times observed 10 to 20 SAM's fired at them on individual raids without scoring a hit.

The following reasons are felt to be principally responsible for the poor accuracy:

Constant movement of the radars and fire control systems makes it difficult to keep them at maximum efficiency. Thus, mobility is gained at the expense of effectiveness.

Defensive tactics have been developed by U.S. airmen to take advantage of the SAM's weak points. These include tactics used while flying at both high and low altitudes.

Track radars and fire control systems until recently were older vintage (S-band) equipment which do not have as high a degree of precision as new Russian C-band radars now being installed in North Vietnam (AW&ST Jan. 10, p. 32). The new radar units are expected to increase the effectiveness of the SAMs in North Vietnam significantly if air operations are resumed.

There is no indication thus far that the more advanced SA-3 missiles are being brought into North Vietnam, but their introduction would undoubtedly increase significantly the hazard to U.S. aircraft. The SA-3 has a longer range and can be fired at lower deflection angles than the SA-2 generation of missiles currently in North Vietnam. It also is equipped with heat-seeking capability which would require developing new countermeasures equipment and tactics.

The large size of the SAMs makes them easy to spot after firing if there is no cloud cover, and they leave a smoke trail which is easily seen during the day. At night the exhaust is seen as a bright glow against a normally black countryside.

SA-2 missiles are guided to their targets from the ground since they do not have an on-board homing capability. General capabilities of SA-2 missiles include the following:

Minimum tracking time from lock-on to fire is less than 45 seconds.

Slant range is less than 25 miles.

SA-2s are generally ineffective against aircraft flying at high speeds at altitudes under 3,000 feet. This makes the use of jet aircraft almost mandatory since slower aircraft such as the Douglas A-1 are easier to hit and consequently are not used inside the SAM envelope.

The basic function of surface-to-air missiles is to defend key areas from enemy aircraft. The SA-2s are assigned the role of protecting major cities in North Vietnam from U.S. aircraft, just as Hawk missiles are deployed in South Vietnam at principal airbases such as Da Nang, Chu Lai, and Cam Ranh Bay as defense against enemy aircraft.

The SAM envelope in North Vietnam is designed to provide maximum protection to Hanoi, Haiphong and the city and port of Thanh Hoa located 70 miles south of Hanoi. At least five sites ring the city of Hanoi itself. These, coupled with outlying sites, stretch the SAM envelope to a radius of 40-70 miles west and north of Hanoi and generally eastward to the coast, forming a wide belt to cover Haiphong also.

SAM sites themselves are normally heavily defended by conventional antiaircraft weapons, including radar-controlled guns. These present the greatest hazard to aircraft attacking SAM sites, since tactics are employed to minimize the vulnerability to missiles.

The U.S. air strikes against the SAM sites in North Vietnam began on July 27, 3 days after the missile scored its first success against an American aircraft, a USAF McDonnell F-4C, when 46 F-105's hit 2 targets 40 miles northwest of Hanoi. One of the sites was listed as destroyed at the time, but officials now say the first completely successful raid against the SAM's did not come until October 17.

The October mission was carried out by four A-4 jet attack aircraft preceded by a Grumman A-6A which served as the pathfinder. The aircraft were from the carrier *Independence*.

The pilots, who counted five or six missiles on their launchers and apparently ready for firing, encountered heavy automatic weapons fire in the immediate vicinity of the site 50 miles northeast of Hanoi. There was no response from the SAM's, however.

The A-6A locked onto the site approximately 3 minutes after the aircraft had penetrated into the general vicinity. The A-4's, flying on the deck, then made single, high-speed passes over the target in rapid succession, dropping high-explosive bombs. Total time over the target was estimated at 1.5 minutes.

The pilots reported that, during the course of the attack, one SAM had cooked off and could be seen snaking its way across the missile site. The missile transporter area and the center of the site itself were in flames.

The low-altitude approach to the target represented a sharp shift in practice from July when the first F-4C was lost. The aircraft was one of four F-4C's flying over North Vietnam at a medium altitude and above a usually protective cirrus cloud cover. Pilots of the other aircraft in the flight later reported that they first became aware that they were under attack when a ball of fire and yellowish smoke appeared around the aircraft's tail section. At about the same time, they noticed another two "telephone poles" climbing toward them at a near vertical angle. They made a sharp break and managed to avoid the missiles, however.

Other recent raids against SAM sites and their results have included:

October 31—Navy A-4's destroyed a SAM site 5 miles from the Kep highway bridge 40 miles northeast of Hanoi.

November 5—A-4's hit a SAM location 45 miles east of Hanoi. One missile launched was destroyed and a secondary explosion was reported.

November 7—USAF F-105's destroyed two sites 31 miles south-southwest of Hanoi. F-4C's struck a SAM installation 22 miles southwest of Hanoi. An undetermined number of missiles and launchers were reported destroyed.

November 22—U.S. aircraft attacked two SAM sites, one located 34 miles west-northwest of Hanoi was listed as destroyed. A radar control van was destroyed at the other location 41 miles northwest of Hanoi.

November 23—F-105's reported that they had destroyed a site 34 miles west-northwest of Hanoi. One missile received a direct hit while on its launcher, and a large secondary explosion was seen.

November 27—F-105's struck the SAM support facility at Dong Em 22 miles southwest of Hanoi. Seventeen buildings were destroyed, another three were damaged.

December 22—U.S. aircraft destroyed a SAM site 58 miles northwest of Hanoi.

Prior to the bombing cessation last December 24, the U.S. strategy in picking bombing targets in North Vietnam was a step-by-step effort striking increasingly important targets closer and closer to Hanoi and Haiphong. The goal was to persuade the Hanoi regime to stop aggression in the south. The bombing of a thermal electric power facility 12 miles north-northeast of Haiphong December 14, one of the last major targets hit prior to the suspension, is a good example of this policy.

To pursue this policy with greatest impunity required neutralization of the SAM missile sites in the assigned target areas. As the SAM missile sites mushroomed last fall, from 9 in August to over 40 in December, it became increasingly important to conduct strike missions specifically against SAM sites and support facilities. As of mid-October, only seven SAM site strikes had been conducted. From that point through early December, an average of two strikes per week were conducted. Two strikes also were flown against the Dong Em SAM support facility located 22 miles west-southwest of Hanoi. The Dong Em complex was identified as a training area and a missile assembly and repair facility serving three active SAM batteries.

In the two strikes on Dong Em, damage estimates included 27 buildings destroyed, 5 buildings damaged, and 2 secondary explosions.

The initial fear of SAM's has been largely allayed by their poor record in hitting U.S. airplanes, but USAF and Navy have been forced to fly at low altitudes on strikes within the SAM envelope.

Both services now frequently use the pop-up maneuver on missions against SAM sites and other heavily defended targets within the SAM envelope. Navy units striking these targets have all but abandoned rolling in on runs from high altitude, a favored technique prior to the advent of the SAM missiles and radar-controlled antiaircraft guns.

The pop-up technique was developed during the Cuban missile crisis in late 1962 but was not widely practiced subsequently. It involves a final run to the target at low level to escape radar detection. A pullup is made just short of the target, and, at the top of the pullup, the aircraft is rolled and pulled through to place the sight on the target, and a normal dive bombing run is completed.

This pop-up maneuver involves precise navigation to the pullup point, which may be directly in line with the target or more often slightly offset, requiring a modified barrel roll or wing over to establish the aircraft in its run.

Acquiring the target is one of the most difficult tasks to master, since the pilot sees the target for the first time during the pullup and has only a short time to become oriented and place his aircraft into an aiming trajectory. This compares with the normal mission in South Vietnam where aircraft approach the target at 7,000 to 10,000 feet and have several minutes during an orbit of the target to identify it clearly.

Flying at low altitude, however, is hazardous because there are extensive light and medium antiaircraft emplacements located in the vicinity of important North Vietnamese targets.

Many new antiaircraft guns have been noted in North Vietnam recently. As one veteran pilot put it, "the guns up there have multiplied like rabbits the last couple of months." Conventional antiaircraft weapons include .50-caliber, 20-, 37-, 57-, 87-, and 100-millimeter. Some of the 57-millimeter and almost all of the 87- and 100-millimeter artillery are radar controlled.

Fire from the small caliber automatic weapons, from 37 millimeters down, has been responsible for downing the large majority of aircraft over North Vietnam. Principal weapons used against SAM sites have been bombs of the 750-pound category or less. Air Force uses 750-pound M-117's frequently, since they are in the supply system. The Navy, which doesn't own any 750-pounders, uses 500- and 250-pound bombs frequently. Both occasionally drop larger bombs in the 1,000- and 2,000-pound class and fire 2.75-inch rockets also.

A typical F-105 load is six 750-pound bombs. Normally, one or more flights of four aircraft are employed per mission. Only one pass is made by each aircraft. The Martin Bullpup air-to-ground guided missiles are not being used against SAM sites because of the prolonged period an aircraft must be in a dive to observe and correct the missile on its flight to the target. This provides enemy radar-controlled antiaircraft, as well as SAM missiles, with sufficient time to track and shoot down the diving aircraft.

SAM site strikes, like all other missions over North Vietnam, normally are planned at White House or commander in chief, Pacific level, with the Pentagon controlling strikes against all major targets. The requests are written into the daily orders issued by U.S. Air Force's 2d Air Division and Navy's Carrier Task Force 77, and include number of aircraft to be used, ordnance to be carried, strike time, routes, and altitudes.

Commanders in Vietnam plan only such things as rendezvous times with tanker aircraft for air-to-air refueling. In the case of joint U.S. Air Force-Navy operation, they iron out minor details of coordination.

Most SAM missiles are transported from Siberian ports to North Vietnam by ship to the main port of Haiphong, located east of Hanoi. Much of the shipping is done in Russian vessels manned by Communist-bloc countries such as Czechoslovakia and Poland.

Russia also supplies the radars for the radar-controlled antiaircraft, although Communist-bloc countries such as Czechoslovakia supply some of the guns. Russia also supplies advisers and technicians to operate and maintain the equipment.

SAM missiles generally have missed to the rear of U.S. aircraft rather than in front. Occasionally, missiles have exploded far in front of attacking aircraft, however, for no apparent reason. Exploding missiles make a "great dirty green-brown glob of smoke," according to one pilot's description.

Proximity fusing was thought to be used initially, but pilots now believe that command detonation via the radar link between ground and missile is being used predominantly. Command detonation is almost always used at low altitudes. SA-2's also are equipped with contact fuses to detonate the warhead on impact.

Layout of SAM sites generally is the same—radar and fire control system in the center of the site and missiles on launchers surrounding the radar. Pilots have noted that adjacent missiles often are 20° to 30° offset in heading.

Although single SAM's are fired occasionally, more often two or three will be fired in close succession, much like a ripple firing. This may be an attempt to increase hits or counter new defensive tactics.

The 150th Anniversary of the AME Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the 150th anniversary celebration of the AME Church as a national organization was celebrated earlier this month at Philadelphia's Mother Bethel AME Church. The Mother Bethel Church is the recognized shrine of AME churchmen all over the Nation and I ask unanimous consent that a story concerning this celebration which appeared in the Philadelphia Independent of February 11, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AME CHURCH SETS 150TH CELEBRATION OF ANNIVERSARY

The 150th anniversary celebration of the founding of the AME Church as a national organization was slated to begin Friday morning, February 11, at 10 at Mother Bethel AME Church, Sixth Street below Pine, with Bishop Carey E. Gibbs, presiding bishop of the AME Church of South Carolina, bringing the morning message.

Listed as afternoon speakers at 2:30 were the Reverend James Curry, field secretary of the Methodist Home for the Aged, talking on "The Role of the Church in the Problem of the Aged," and the greetings from Arlin Adams, Secretary of Health and Welfare for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Winners of annual Richard Allen awards presented during the banquet were J. Blanton Shield of Hartford, Conn.; the Reverend W. L. Freeman, New York City; V. L. White, Concord, Del.; the Reverend V. Byrd, Hamilton, Bermuda; the Reverend L. F. McNair, Judge Clifford Scott Green, L. E. Wilson, contractor; Miss Ida A. Thomas, New York City; Arlin Adams, Harrisburg; the Reverend J. H. Ellis Nawark; the Reverend W. L. Bentley, president of the Baptist Ministers Conference; Raymond Leslie, Philadelphia businessman, Judge Leon Higginbotham and Solfred Maizus, New York.

The awards honor the memory of Richard Allen, founder of African Methodism, who was born here on February 14, 1760, a slave of Benjamin Chew, himself a Quaker lawyer and later chief justice of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Chew sold Richard Allen, his parents, and three other children to a man named Stokeley of nearby Dover, Del. At the age of 17 Richard Allen was converted by the preaching of Freeborn Garretson and joined the Methodist Society in Delaware. He was licensed to preach in 1782.

Richard Allen bought his freedom for $2,000 and in 1783 began traveling and preaching throughout Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. He returned to Philadelphia in 1786 and joined St. George's Church, where he was allowed to preach about 5 in the morning.

As the attendance of Negroes increased, the hostility of the officers and members of

St. George's increased also until an officer attempted to pull one Absalom Jones from his knees while he was at prayer among a group with Richard Allen one Sunday in the fall of 1787, telling the Negro group they could not worship there.

After the prayer the Negro members, led by Richard Allen, Absalom Jones, William White, and Dorus Ginnings withdrew from St. George's. The four men were later appointed to select a lot to build a church upon, and Richard Allen was authorized to arrange for the purchase of the lot upon which Mother Bethel AME Church now stands.

Mother Bethel is the recognized shrine of AME churchmen all over the Nation, and its Richard Allen Museum in the basement annually attracts thousands of visitors of all denominations.

Molly Clowes Named the Editorial Page Editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last week the Louisville Courier-Journal named Miss Molly Clowes, a member of its staff for over 30 years, as editor of its editorial pages. This appointment gives due recognition to the distinct contributions of an outstanding woman on one of the Nation's leading newspapers.

I have known Miss Clowes and her husband, Prof. Willy Walsh, for many years, and I know the regard in which she is held by people of Kentucky and by members of her profession. I understand that she is believed to be the first woman to hold such a position on a major American newspaper, and I know that she will continue to contribute the quality of thought that has been characteristic of her work.

I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of her appointment in the February 17, 1966, issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal, and an article on Miss Clowes from the February 18, 1966, Washington Post be printed in the Appendix of the Record of today.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Molly Clowes Named Courier-Journal Editorial Page Editor

Miss Molly Clowes, a member of the Courier-Journal staff for 30 years, has been named editor of the newspaper's editorial page.

She is believed to be the first woman to hold that position on a major American newspaper. She succeeds Russell Briney, who died February 1.

Barry Bingham, editor and publisher of the newspaper, said yesterday in announcing Miss Clowes' appointment:

"Molly Clowes is regarded by all her associates as a highly competent and experienced journalist. The thought that the Courier-Journal is pioneering in the appointment of a woman in a position of such responsibility is pleasing to me. The plain fact is, however, that Miss Clowes richly qualifies for the job on the grounds of her professional capacities."

Miss Clowes, 60, is the wife of Willy Walsh, who teaches French and history at the University of Louisville. She was born in Birmingham, England.

Her family moved to Louisville in 1923, when she was 17.

Her father, a police sergeant, was brought here by the administration of the late Mayor Huston Quin to set up a "modus operandi" bureau in the Louisville police department. He headed such a bureau, to study criminal methods of operation, in Birmingham.

In the days when there were no personnel departments—"You just drifted in and asked for a job and if they had one they gave it to you"—Miss Clowes became a reporter on The Herald-Post. She also edited a food page.

When The Herald-Post suspended publication in 1936, she joined the Courier-Journal as a reporter. She also contributed occasional editorials, defying the edict that "females do only features."

Herbert Agar, who was then the newspaper's editor, asked her to sit in on editorial conferences and she eventually moved permanently into the editorial department.

Miss Clowes, who educated herself through voracious reading and observing, said, "Nobody ever asked me what journalism school I went to. I just learned the trade over 30 years."

ANNONYMITY AN ADVANTAGE

One of her most interesting assignments was a 3-month tour of Eastern Kentucky in 1940. She wrote a 10-part series called "One Third of Kentucky," taking the title from President Franklin D. Roosevelt's comment about one-third of the Nation being "ill-clothed, ill-housed, ill-fed."

On that tour, Miss Clowes rode in Model A's with social workers up hills and down ravines. "There were problems (in Eastern Kentucky) then as now," she said.

Miss Clowes said she misses reporting but enjoys the anonymity of the editorial page. "I can sneak into a meeting and they don't know me from Adam," she said. She does that occasionally just to keep her hand in and keep up with what's going on.

Miss Clowes has been an American citizen for more than 20 years. Her husband, a native of France, also is naturalized.

They live at 547 Dover Road where Miss Clowes cooks "Frenchish" things, bakes her own bread, makes "horrible spasmodic stabs at gardening," and reads.

The last hour before she goes to sleep she reads detective stories. "It's like being addicted to sleeping pills," she said.

Having a French husband has helped her learn that language and she reads French newspapers occasionally.

Miss Clowes has three stepsons, two of whom live in France, and 11 step-grandchildren.

The only feminine appurtenances in her office are potted plants and a completely equipped teacart.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1966]

She Stayed To Win a Plum

(By John Ed Pearce)

Louisville, Ky., February 17.—Molly Clowes, a native of England married to a college professor who is a native of France, has been named editor of the editorial page of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

In announcing her appointment, Barry Bingham, president and publisher of the Courier-Journal, said he believes Miss Clowes is the first woman to head the editorial page of a major American newspaper.

Miss Clowes, 60, the wife of Willy Walsh, professor of French history at the University of Louisville, was born in Birmingham, England. Her family moved to this country in 1923 when her father, a police sergeant, was brought to Louisville to establish a bureau to study criminal methods of operation.

The mayor at that time was interested in modernizing his law-enforcement agencies and experimenting with police techniques new to this country but already familiar in England.

Her entry into the newspaper world, she says, was "enormously casual."

"There were no personnel departments in those days," she says, speaking of her employment by the Louisville Herald-Post, now defunct. "You just drifted in and hung around and if they had a job, they gave it to you."

After 2 years of reporting, she was named editor of the food page in 1934.

When the Herald-Post failed in 1963, Miss Clowes joined the Courier-Journal as general assignment reporter.

One of her earlier assignments, and one she still recalls as one of her most interesting, was a 3-month tour through the impoverished mountain areas of eastern Kentucky. This tour produced a widely reprinted series entitled, "One Third of Kentucky."

She took the title from President Roosevelt's reference to the ill-housed and ill-fed one third of the Nation.

By 1941, she was contributing editorials, and in that year, Herbert Agar, then the newspaper's editor, asked her to sit in on editorial conferences. She gradually transferred full time to that department.

"I miss reporting," she says now, "but enjoy the anonymity of the editorial page. I can speak to a meeting and they will not know me from Adam."

Her sex is not the only way in which the new editor changes the customary pattern. She is not a journalism graduate. In fact, she did not attend college.

"No one ever asked me what journalism school I attended," she says. "I just learned the trade over 30 years."

In 1943, Miss Clowes met and married Willy Walsh, then employed by the Office of War Information and later press and information officer for the French provisional government. Walsh, a former racing driver who was decorated during World War II for antisubmarine action as a French pilot, and fled from France before the Nazi invasion.

She has learned, Miss Clowes admits, to cook "a few Frenchish things" for her husband. She also bakes her own bread, and makes "horrible, spasmodic stabs at gardening." She and her husband have one pet, a rotund reddish dachshund, Tristan, who she admits is badly spoiled and badly overweight.

Graying and of medium height, Miss Clowes lends a feminine touch to the editorial department she heads by brewing tea each afternoon for her fellow editorialists, "although I may delegate that duty now."

The staff which she will head is an all-male one. She anticipates, she says, no difficulty along this line.

Representative Cramer Makes Highly Important Speech on Nation's Highway Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, at the recent annual convention of the American Road Builder's Association in Denver, Colo., the gentleman from Florida, Representative William C. Cramer, made a very timely and highly important address on the Federal-aid highway programs of our Nation.

As the ranking Republican on the Committee on Public Works and as the ranking Republican on both the Subcommittee on Roads and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program of that committee, Representative Cramer is eminently qualified to discuss in open frankness the problems confronting the highway programs of this Nation and the States.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this important speech, "Storm Clouds," in the Record. I commend it to the attention of all Members of the Congress.

Storm Clouds

(Address by Hon. William C. Cramer, Member of Congress, at the annual convention of the American Road Builders' Association, Denver, Colo., February 23, 1966)

It is a real pleasure to meet with the leaders of the Nation's roadbuilding industry in this mile high city, nestled among the towering, snow-clad peaks of the Rockies. The view from my hotel window is one of scenic grandeur, but it also impresses me with the formidable task of highway construction in rugged terrain. Should you desire a change from this brisk and invigorating climate, I invite you to enjoy the perpetual sunshine, the warm, balmy days and nights, and the garden-like countryside of Florida.

The American Road Builders' Association is to be commended for the leadership you have shown in the past, and are taking now, to assure that the people of this great country have a modern and safe highway system. Your association can take pride in the accomplishments of the Federal-aid highway program now underway. This construction program is unequalled in history, and its existence is due in large measure to your valiant efforts.

I know that I express the views of every member of the House Committee on public Works in saying that we are indebted to General Prentiss, and to his good right arm, Burt Miller, for the sound advice and counsel which they always provide with respect to highway legislation. And I trust that your association will continue to advise the Congress on highway matters, for we are facing critical decisions which will have tremendous impact upon the future of highway transportation in this country.

Already, there are dark, ominous storm clouds gathering overhead, and others are forming on the horizon. Unless these storms are weathered through proper legislative and administrative action, the traveling public will suffer.

INTERSTATE IN TROUBLE

Of most concern is the completion of construction of the presently designated 41,000-mile Interstate System. As you know, the 1965 interstate cost estimate, submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Commerce over a year ago, shows that construction of the Interstate System will cost $46.8 billion; which is $5.8 billion more than the 1961 cost estimate. Of this $5.8 billion increase, the Federal share is $5 billion. Mr. Rex Whitton, the Federal Highway Administrator, testified before the committee last year that $1.9 billion of this additional $5 billion Federal cost could be financed by revenues to the highway trust fund from present highway user taxes, thereby leaving a deficit of $3.1 billion to be financed from other sources. If this were the entire story, the situation might not be too bleak, but there is much more to it.

Rather than the increased Federal cost of the Interstate System being $5 billion, it now looks as though it may be as much as $10 billion, with a corresponding increase in the States' 10-percent share. This greater cost is attributable to a number of things.

A substantial amount of the anticipated increased cost, over and above the 1965 estimate, will be caused by rising unit prices for work yet to be performed. The 1965 cost estimate was based upon calendar year 1963 prices. Since then, unit prices have been increasing from 2 to 2½ percent per year, and the rate of increase is becoming greater with the passage of time. During the first 9 months of 1965, unit prices increased 3½ percent over the previous year. This is something over which the State highway departments have no control, and it is reflective of the rising costs of doing business, particularly rising labor costs. Based upon actual price rises since 1963, and reasonable projections thereof through 1973, it appears that the Federal share of the cost of completing the system will increase from $3 to $4 billion because of higher unit prices alone.

Design changes will add another one-half to $1 billion. With the passage of time from one estimate to another, conditions change, forecast traffic volumes increase, and technology and concepts advance, all of which result in constant upgrading of standards. There will be additional costs to provide for such things as full widths of shoulders across long bridges where traffic volumes require, more traffic lanes, and additional interchanges.

There is continuing pressure to add ramps to simple grade separation structures, to convert them into interchanges so as to meet the needs of increasing traffic and growing communities. The 1965 cost estimate provides for 754 more interchanges than were included in the 1961 estimate, and undoubtedly the cost estimate to be submitted to Congress in 1968 will include still additional interchanges. The average distance between interchanges on the Interstate System, included in the 1965 estimate, is 1.1 miles in urban areas and 4.4 miles in rural areas. As communities grow and urban limits expand, more interchanges are demanded. If the approximately 1,400 miles of two-lane highways on the Interstate System are to be made four-lane divided highways in the interest of safety, which we are hearing so much about of late, another $270 to $300 million will be added to the cost of the system. All of these additional construction features cost money.

BEAUTIFICATION BEFORE BUILDING

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 provides financing from the general funds of the Treasury for the first 2 years for the control of advertising and junkyards adjacent to Interstate and Federal-aid primary highways, and for landscaping and scenic enhancement along all Federal-aid highways. This act expressly prohibits the use of moneys in the highway trust fund for these purposes. However, the President has recommended, in his budget for fiscal year 1967, that the Highway Beautification Act be financed from the highway trust fund, at an average rate of more than $200 million a year for the Interstate System alone.

No one knows what the cost will be for beautification of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways. Apparently the President intends that beautification of these highways be financed from regular A–B–C authorizations. If the authorizations continue at the present annual level, such financing would not add to the financial deficit of the trust fund; however, all money spent for beautification would be taken away from construction, and less miles of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways, and their urban extensions, will be improved. I find it most difficult to understand why the President thinks it is more important to beautify these roads than to construct them or to make them safe and adequate for travel by the public. If highway beautification is justified, and I would fully support a properly conceived and administered law, it should be separately financed and not carried on at the expense of highway construction. With highway fatalities reaching 49,000 in 1965, and still going up, in addition to some 1.8 million people disabled, this is not the time to divert construction money, that could be used to increase the capacity and safety of highways, to the less essential purpose of beautification.

As distinguished from the A–B–C program, the President's proposal to finance beautificiation of the Interstate System from the highway trust fund will not only add to the cost of completing that system but it will add to the already growing deficit of the trust fund. It has been estimated that the cost of the Highway Beautification Act attributable to the Interstate System alone will be at least $1.5 billion. Putting beauty before building and to assign it a higher priority is foolhardy.

TRUST FUND RAIDS CONTINUE

Not only are we faced with some $10 billion additional Federal cost to complete the Interstate System, with a trust fund deficit of about $8 billion, but the President wants to take money from the trust fund for still other purposes. He has recommended, in the 1967 budget, that forest highways and public lands highways be financed out of the trust fund, at a cost of about $272 million during the remaining life of the trust fund. These highways have always been financed out of the general funds of the Treasury, heretofore. The President also wants to take the 2-cents-per-gallon aviation gas tax from the highway trust fund, which would amount to some $74 million over the next 7 years.

In addition to these new drains on the trust fund, the President has recommended that a future highway safety program, which he proposes to send to Congress this year, be financed from the trust fund. No one knows what this program will ultimately cost, but it is reported $500 million is the starter.

It is true that the President has recommended some measures to add revenue to the highway trust fund. These consist of extending the life of the trust fund through February 1973, transferring 1 percentage point of the existing automobile excise taxes from the general fund to the trust fund to be earmarked for highway beautification, and imposing certain additional taxes on trucks. However, if all of the President's recommendations should be enacted by Congress, which is highly unlikely, there would still be a trust fund deficit of about $4 billion.

The administration, which has the means for making estimates of costs and revenues, should come forward with realistic figures and practical proposals for getting the job done. Some $8 billion of additional revenues must be obtained if the Interstate System is to be completed. This could be accomplished in a number of ways, such as by stretching out the program (which I oppose), transferring existing taxes to the trust fund, imposing new taxes, borrowing from the general fund, or a combination of these methods. For example, the ABC program could be continued at its present level and, to indicate the magnitude of the problem, $6 billion more must be provided for completion of the Interstate System, and even if the life of the highway trust fund were extended for a year and a half, until March 31, 1974, there would have to be transferred to the trust fund an amount equal to 2 percentage points of the automobile excise tax over the life of the trust fund to complete the job by 1974. We have already observed that at least a 1-year construction stretchout appears inevitable because of lack of push from the administration; however, if necessary to keep construction going, money could be borrowed from the general fund and later paid back with interest from trust fund receipts.

Unless we are going to be like the ostrich that buries its head in the sand and refuses to face reality, we must take into consideration known additional costs, which are not included in the 1965 cost estimate, and known deficits in the trust fund. This has not been done by the administration. All of the administration's recommendations to date have been based upon the 1965 cost estimate, which is so out of date as to be of little use in the authorization of funds or in providing needed revenue. If the administration does not submit realistic recommendations for legislation, I hope that the Congress will take the initiative to provide funds in the amounts actually needed for completion of the system.

Much has been said during the past several year about the desirability of completing the Interstate System on schedule in 1972. If necessary funds had been provided last year, and this program given its proper priority, this goal could have been reached, except for a few isolated projects in some large metropolitan centers. However, the administration has waited too long to meet this completion date. If all needed funds were made available as fast as they could be used, with only 6 years remaining for construction, the annual levels of authorizations would be so high that the required rapid acceleration of construction, probably followed by a sudden deceleration, would be most difficult for the State highway departments and the construction industry to absorb in an orderly and economic fashion. I think the administration must admit that it has gone too long at too slow a pace to complete the system on schedule. It appears that at least a one-year construction stretch-out, until 1973, is inevitable. And unless action is taken soon to provide necessary funds, the Interstate System may not be completed until 1975, or even later.

TOLL ROADS INVESTIGATED

There are some 3,772 miles of toll roads in operation in the United States, and about 2,320 miles of toll roads, bridges, and tunnels are on the Interstate System. Additional toll facilities are now being constructed or considered in a number of States, and we must give thought to coordinating them with future free highways.

For more than a year, the staff of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program has been studying and compiling information on existing and proposed toll highway facilities. Public hearings will be held soon on the relationship between toll highway facilities and the Federal-aid highway program, and the Public Works Committee will attempt to find solutions to the many problems which have concerned me for years, and with respect to which I have introduced legislation in every Congress since 1961.

Among the problems to be considered are (1) the delay in construction of free sections of the Interstate System and other toll-free highways which would compete with existing toll roads, (2) the construction of new toll facilities on all of the Federal-aid highway system, many of which facilities appear to be nothing more than toll traps that add to highway users' cost of travel, (3) the interspersing of short sections of free Federal-aid highways between short sections of toll roads, and (4) limitations contained in Federal and State laws which impede the construction of interchange connections between toll roads and major Federal-air highways.

My own State of Florida, as well as other States, experienced this last problem. The Sunshine State Parkway, a toll road, crosses Interstate Highway 4 near Orlando; however, amazingly, there is no connection between these two major roads. Federal-aid funds cannot participate in constructing ramps to connect the two highways, and thereby convert the present grade separation structure into an interchange, because of limitations in the Federal law concerning the use of Federal funds for facilities that will serve only toll traffic. The turnpike authority felt that the ramps do not meet economic justification criteria which governs expenditure of its funds, and the State road board apparently does not have money to finance the construction. As a result, travelers who wish to go from one highway to the other must use widely separated interchanges and travel several miles over heavily congested city streets. Fortunately, however, I am informed that new private developments, including a proposed new Disneyland, have led the turnpike authority to decide recently that an interchange can be economically justified, and it is planning now to construct one with its own funds—someday.

I hope that the planned hearings will point the way to solutions of problems relating to toll facilities.

JANUARY 1968 REPORT ON THE FUTURE

We should not become so engrossed in the problems already upon us, that we fail to plan to meet the continuing highway needs of the future. A law enacted last year directs the Secretary of Commerce to report to Congress in January of 1968, and every 2 years thereafter, his estimates of the highway needs of the Nation. The Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments are now actively engaged in making a detailed study of future highway needs and in developing an appropriate highway construction program to be commenced upon completion of the current program.

There are more than 90 million vehicles on the Nation's highways today, and it is estimated that during 1966 these vehicles will travel some 900 billion miles. Our ever-growing population is demanding more and more mobility, and it is axiomatic that the number of vehicles and miles traveled will continue to increase. With constant usage and the passage of time, the 3,600,000 miles of highways, roads and streets in the United States are gradually wearing out and becoming functionally obsolete. There must be a continuing highway program for the construction and improvement of existing roads and for the construction of new roads to safely and efficiently accommodate the ever-increasing volumes of traffic.

All levels of government, Federal, State, and local, have vital interests in and responsibilities for providing these arteries of commerce and communication, which are essential to our very existence. This community of interest was the basis of recommendations to the Congress which are embodied in the present highway program that was commenced in 1956. Recommendations for any future highway program likewise should be developed cooperatively by the Secretary of Commerce and the State highway departments, with the latter working closely with local governments. This was clearly the intention of the House of Representatives last year when it directed the Secretary of Commerce to report to the Congress on the highway needs of the Nation.

HIGHWAYS TO BE DOWNGRADED IN FUTURE?

There are disturbing rumors circulating about Washington, which I hope are proven to be false, that the Secretary does not intend to permit the State to participate in the formulation of recommendations for the so-called "after 1972" highway program. But, rather, that the future highway program will be predicated upon a role to be assigned to highways, as a part of an integrated transportation system to be devised by the Secretary, without regard to actual highway needs. These rumors may be an outgrowth of comments which have appeared in the press, and elsewhere, of late, that the administration is writing a new national transportation policy which will have as its goal a coordinated, integrated transportation system throughout the country. Such a policy concept may have merit, but not if it forces the subordination of one mode of transportation to another contrary to the desires of the public in exercising their freedom of movement.

Ninety-two percent of all intercity passenger travel and over 300 billion ton-miles of freight a year move over highways. Highways are the principal mode of transportation in the United States today, and, in my opinion, they will continue to be in the foreseeable future. No other mode of transportation offers such diversification of travel patterns and flexibility in travel. The public should be able to determine the extent to which they want to use highways and not be forced to use other forms of transportation against their wishes.

It has been suggested that the $90 million demonstration high-speed transportation system which the Secretary of Commerce is now undertaking between Boston and Washington, involving rail transportation principally, may be a forerunner of the administration's new transportation policy. However, the unique transportation problems of the densely populated northeastern corridor of the United States are not common to the rest of the country. And the solutions to these peculiar problems should not dictate the transportation policy for 90 percent, or more, of the geographical area of the Nation, which is not similarly situated.

I sincerely hope that there will be no heavy handed attempt by the Federal Government to arbitrarily assign to highways a role in an integrated transportation system that is not commensurate with the desires of the public to use highways. To the contrary, such future public desires, determined cooperately by the States and the Secretary of Commerce and translated into terms of highway needs, should be the basis of any future highway construction program.

Furthermore, highway funds should not be diverted to finance other forms of transportation when those funds are needed so badly for highway construction. There are bills now before Congress to authorize the use of moneys in the highway trust fund to finance mass transit facilities.

We need take only a short additional step to convert the highway trust fund into a transportation fund as a source of financing for all forms of transportation. It may be sheer speculation, but there are some who fear that the new transportation policy, now being written by the administration, may contemplate such a diversion of highway funds.

Time has not permitted a detailed discussion of the several matters which I have touched upon this afternoon, but they are exceedingly important to the future well-being of our country and will bear watching. Continued vigilance by your association will do much to assure a well balanced transportation system, with highway transportation playing its proper role.

Puget Sound: What It Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer written by Don Page, entitled "Puget Sound: What It Is," who analyzes this great area where I come from.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Puget Sound: What It Is

(By Don Page)

We're back on the beat after a month or more with the savants and titans of the underwater world, finding out about Puget Sound's impressive stake in oceanography. We hope you're reading the series that resulted. The writing may not be any great shucks, but the things we talk about there are exciting.

One thing you won't read in the oceanography series but one that impressed us is a general summary of Puget Sound. It's taken from a UW survey of more than a decade ago. The language is technical in places, but the information is solid.

We got it from Dr. Richard Fleming, of the UW Oceanographic Department. We're passing excerpts of it along to you here. It's basic information. We think you'll find it interesting. Here it is:

"Puget Sound includes the inland waterways extending southward into the State of Washington from the eastern end of the Strait of Juan de Fuca. These channels, sounds, and inelts are long and narrow and occupy a basin roughly 90 miles north and south, 40 miles east and west. Mountain ranges surround three-quarters of the area. The water area at mean higher high water is 767 square nautical miles."

Going on to more technical descriptions of shapes and bottoms, the summary tells how glaciers formed the Puget Sound Basin:

"Glacier-borne sedimentary materials deposited in a basin between the Olympic Mountains and the Cascade Mountains during the early part of the Pleistocene epoch were deeply entrenched by stream and glacial action in the latter part of the Pleistocene. The resulting steep-sided valleys, one of which had not been subsequently filled with sedimentary debris, now forms Puget Sound.

"The mainland and island coastlines are irregular and backed by cliffs. The beaches are narrow and confined to embayments, except for tidal flats on the river deltas.

"Submerged shallow shelves are extremely narrow or entirely lacking, and in most areas the sea bottom slopes steeply to depths of 300 to 600 feet.

"The greatest depth of 930 feet is located just north of Seattle. Puget Sound contains several elongated basins that are partially separated from the Strait of Juan de Fuca and from each other by shallow ridges or sills, such as those located in Admiralty Inlet, Tacoma Narrows, and the entrance to Hood Canal, where the depths range from 150 to 200 feet.

"Material on the sea floor varies from rock outcrops through boulders and cobbles in areas of strong tidal currents, to sand and mud on the slopes. In some areas firm clay and compact glacia till are exposed on the slopes. The bottoms of the deeper portions of the basins are covered with soft mud.

"The tides in Puget Sound are of the mixed type showing a large daily inequality between the heights of succeeding low tides. The average daily range at Seattle is 11.3 feet.

"The maximum range of spring tides rarely exceeds 16 feet. There is a general increase in range as the tide progresses from the Strait of Juan de Fuca to the heads of the inlets, with a delay in time of high water of about 1 hour.

"Due to the large area of Puget Sound and its narrow entrances, tidal currents have exceptionally strong tropic velocities, attaining 4.7 knots in Admiralty Inlet, 5.1 knots in Tacoma Narrows and 7.2 knots in Deception Pass. Elsewhere in Puget Sound the tidal currents are generally less than 1 knot.

"Water temperatures in Puget Sound are relatively uniform throughout the year. Because of the mixing produced by the tidal currents, surface temperatures rarely fall below 44 degrees even in winter, except in the headwaters of Puget Sound where the accumulation of cold river waters and relatively quiet conditions will permit the formation of ice during extreme cold weather.

"The same mixing processes tend to maintain relatively low surface temperatures during the summer, and except in shallow and isolated areas surface temperatures above 60 degrees are rare."

The summary goes on to tell how such streams as the Skagit, Stillaquamish and Snohomish spill an average of 40,000 cubic feet of fresh water per second into the sound. The spillage varies from 14,000 to 37,000 cubic feet per second according to the season. But its busy tides and current keep the sound's salinity level relatively high.

That's Puget Sound as it looks to the scientists. We hope you enjoyed this profile of an old friend and either learned a few new facts about it or were reminded of some you'd forgotten.

Is Confusion a U.S. Secret Weapon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting that Carl T. Rowan, formerly on the White House staff under President Johnson, should now write a column about the confusion existing in the policies of this administration. In his column, published in the Washington Star on Friday, February 25, he asks the question "Is Confusion a U.S. Secret Weapon?" Certainly no writer has a more intimate knowledge of the White House policymaking machinery than has Mr. Rowan. His column follows:

Is Confusion a U.S. Secret Weapon?

(By Carl T. Rowan)

In 1928, the Italian dictator, Benito Mussolini, made this caustic comment about American Government:

"Democracy is talking itself to death. The people do not know what they want; they do not know what is best for them. There is too much foolishness, too much lost motion. I have stopped the talk and the nonsense. I am a man of action. Democracy is beautiful in theory; in practice it is a fallacy. You in America will see that some day."

Dictator Mussolini is dead and American democracy probably never was more alive—yet the dictator's warning seems particularly pertinent these days.

The country may not be talking itself to death insofar as the Vietnam war is concerned but it sure has talked up so much confusion that the American people do not know what they want or what is best for them.

I left government 5 months ago thinking I knew what U.S. policy in Vietnam was. Today I haven't the remotest idea.

Lt. Gen. James Gavin went before a congressional committee to urge an "enclave" theory that administration spokesmen already had assailed for days.

The President then was quoted as saying that Gavin was more or less in agreement with his policies.

Robert F. Kennedy, in what almost everyone interpreted as a major break with the administration, urged that the Communist Vietcong be offered a share in a coalition government in South Vietnam.

The displeasure of the Johnson administration seems emphasized by the speed with which the Kennedy proposal was denounced by Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Under Secretary of State George Ball and McGeorge Bundy, the President's special assistant for national security affairs.

Then up pops a story quoting Gen. Maxwell Taylor as saying that Kennedy's views are "very, very close" to his own and to those of the administration.

Taylor is former Ambassador to Saigon, presently a key adviser to the President and the man Johnson counted on to defend the administration against attacks from Senator J. William Fulbright and other members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

During the committee hearings, Taylor and Fulbright seemed to have diametrically opposed views on Vietnam. Well, wonder of wonders. The New York Times of February 22 has a page 1 headline saying ,"Fulbright Backs Kennedy on Role for the Vietcong" and the New York Herald Tribune has a page 1 headline saying, "Taylor Siding With Kennedy on Viet Plan."

A White House spokesman first told me that Taylor's remarks had been misconstrued. Newsmen later quoted Taylor as saying that Kennedy's remarks had been misconstrued.

So Kennedy's staff and White House officials spent the better part of the day explaining that Kennedy didn't mean exactly what he originally said; and if he didn't advocate what the White House thought he advocated, well, Kennedy wasn't in as big a quarrel with the White House as anybody thought.

But this is only a fraction of the confusion, the contradictions, the ambivalence that permeates the American scene.

The President launches a high-powered "peace offensive." His emissaries roam the world and his Secretary of State says he would "be in Geneva tomorrow if I thought there would be anyone there to talk to."

But a few days later a militant President speaks scornfully of "special pleaders who counsel retreat in Vietnam," calling them "a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope."

The Vice President is sent abroad on a moment's notice, purportedly to light a fire under those engaged in the civilian side of the struggle, those trying to build a "great society" in southeast Asia. But the journey draws to a close with talk of more troops from Korea, of fighting men from the Philippines and remarks giving the impression that we expect to fight our way out of our Asian dilemma.

Maybe all this doesn't add up to the "foolishness," the "lost motion," that Mussolini spoke of. Maybe it's supposed to be confusing.

Maybe time will prove that it's all a new dimension of psychological warfare in which we get Hanoi, Peiping, the Soviet Union, and our allies so confused that everybody gives up.

Freedom Foundation Award to Dr. James W. Turpin, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on the anniversary of Washington's birthday this year, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., made seven special awards for "Freedom Leadership," and one of the individuals cited was Dr. James W. Turpin, of Ashland, Ky.

I call attention to his citation for "courageous and compassionate answer to the challenges of the time" through his organization Project Concern, Inc. Originally, Dr. Turpin's project had the objective of helping Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and it has grown to aiding mountain tribesmen under siege in South Vietnam.

Dr. Turpin's efforts have resulted in the creation of hospitals, clinics and self-help medical training programs in South Vietnam to which he has given unselfishly of his time and work after leaving his own private medical practice.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record for today an article from the February 22, 1966, edition of the Ashland Daily Independent, published in Dr. Turpin's hometown, as well as an article from the Lexington Leader of that day, and I call attention to this outstanding work and to the other Kentuckians cited by the Freedoms Foundation this year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Ashland (Ky.) Daily Independent, Feb. 22, 1966]

Freedom Leadership Medal Awarded Dr. James Turpin

Dr. James W. Turpin, a native of Ashland, today was awarded the "Freedom Leadership Medal" by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa.

The award was one of seven special awards made to six individuals and one city.

The U.S. Armed Forces and Department of Defense were given the coveted "George Washington Award," the foundation's highest.

Dr. Turpin, of Coronado, Calif., won the award for his work in establishing, through Project Concern, Inc., the medical mission clinics in South Vietnam.

The citation read:

"For his courageous and compassionate answer to the challenges of the time through 'Project Concern,' a voluntary medical mission to the people of Vietnam.

"For his indefatigable personal efforts in creating hospitals, clinics, and intensive self-help medical training programs in the jungles and villages, and his resourcefulness in the face of Communist aggression.

"For correlating the teaching of the ideas of freedom to the physical healing activities in the clinics.

"For his personification of America's spirit of concern for others through personal initiative, individual enterprise, and self-reliance."

Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president of Freedoms Foundation, released a list of more than 1,200 awards to American organizations, schools, and individuals from all walks of life throughout the Nation who are being honored in the foundation's 17th annual national and school awards program for their contributions toward a better understanding and a greater appreciation of the American way of life.

Another "Freedom Leadership Medal" went to Army Capt. Roger H. C. Donlon, Fort Bragg, N.C., a Medal of Honor winner whose inspiration was the sight of the American flag flying on U.S. ships during daily trips to the beaches of South Vietnam—Old Glory cannot be flown in that nation.

Joseph A. Brunton, Jr., New Brunswick, N.J., chief executive of the Boy Scouts of America, received the "American Patriots Medal."

Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., New York City, won the "Free Enterprise Exemplar Medal"; he is a corporation executive.

The other four honors were "National Recognition Awards." Recipients were:

Marie Davis Hunt, Worcester, Mass., for leadership in the establishment of "The Isaac Davis Trail" as national memorial and the role she played in the observance of "Patriots Day" each April 19, to commemorate the first shot in the Revoluntionary War in 1775.

Mattie Coney, Indianapolis, Ind., for leadership in "Citizens Forum" a community organization teaching citizenship in inner-city neighborhoods.

Mail Call Viet Nam of Bryn Mawr, Pa., a letter writing campaign initiated by Dr. and Mrs. Ornsteen to boost the morale of servicemen.

Maj. Gen. H. Nickerson, Jr., USMC, Camp LeJeune, N.C., for starting instruction in citizenship so soldiers would realize the call to military duty did not lay aside the citizen.

For Dr. Turpin, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Turpin of 2419 S. Belmont Street, who are in Valley Forge with their son, it was the second time in 2 years he had been honored nationally. The U.S. Jaycees named him one of the Nation's 10 outstanding young men.

Three years ago, Dr. Turpin left Coronado and a lucrative medical practice with his wife, four children, $6,000 and a dream.

The 38-year-old made his dream a reality by establishing Project Concern, a nonprofit organization incorporated in California.

He went to Hong Kong where he established a floating clinic to which thousands of harbor dwellers who live on sampans and junks flocked. More than 40,000 Chinese are superstitious that ill fate awaits them if they ever leave their floating homes.

About 500 are treated daily and 1,000 children are given subsistence rations to ward off disease and sickness. For most, it is their only meal.

Later, Dr. Turpin moved to Vietnam, set up an 18-bed hospital in the village of DaMpao in the Montagnard County 150 miles northeast of Saigon, and worked only a short distance from the Ho Chi Minh trail known as a Vietcong artery for moving men and supplies southward.

More than 100 doctors, nurses, and village medical officers trained by Dr. Turpin and his staff serve the Hong King and Vietnam clinics.

The dream is still alive and eager as the "need to be needed" continues. Dr. Turpin's next goals are clinics in the Vietnamese province of Phubon and into northern Thailand.

Twelve other individuals and groups from Kentucky were selected for 1965 Freedom Awards by the foundation. They include:

Beechmont School; Holy Rosary; Hugh Haynie, editorial cartoonist, the Courier-Journal, and Martin J. Robards, editor of the Louisville & Nashville magazine, all of Louisville.

Sp5c. Virgil T. Elam, U.S. Army, Belfry; Sp4c. Kenneth D. Proffitt, U.S. Army, London.

Pfc. John M. Kroll and Pfc. Melvin L. O'Neill, U.S. Army, and GMT-2 Douglas F. Synder, U.S. Navy, Ft. Campbell.

Sp5c. Robert D. Brown, Maj. Frances K. Smith, and 2d Lt. John A. Under, all U.S. Army, Ft. Knox.

Kentucky Court of Appeals Judge Morris C. Montgomery, Lawrenceburg, was one of the jurists to be recognized.

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Leader, Feb. 22, 1966]

Kentuckian Wins Top Freedom Award for Medical Aid to Southeast Asia

Valley Forge, Pa.—A Kentuckian who quit a lucrative medical practice to establish medical-aid missions in southeast Asia was among 39 Americans named to receive the Freedom Foundation's highest awards today.

The award ceremonies are held annually on George Washington's birthday.

Dr. James W. Turpin, 38, of Ashland, Ky., organized "Project Concern, Inc." after leaving his California practice. Project Concern spread from its original objective of helping Chinese refugees in Hong Kong to aiding mountain tribesmen in South Vietnam.

The 39 awards are given for the recipients' contributions "toward a better understanding and a greater appreciation of the American way of life."

The foundation's highest single honor, the George Washington Award, was awarded to the Defense Department and U.S. military servicemen in Vietnam and around the world.

Twelve other individuals and groups from Kentucky were selected for 1965 Freedom Awards by the foundation. They include:

Beechmont School; Holy Rosary; Hugh Haynie, editorial cartoonist, the Courier-Journal, and Martin J. Robards, editor of the Louisville & Nashville magazine, all of Louisville.

Sp5c. Virgil T. Elam, U.S. Army, Belfry; Sp4c. Kenneth D. Proffitt, U.S. Army, London.

Pfc. John M. Kroll and Pfc. Melvin I. O'Neill, U.S. Army, and GMT-2 Douglas F. Snyder, U.S. Navy, Ft. Campbell.

Sp5c. Robert D. Brown, Maj. Frances K. Smith, and 2d Lt. John A. Under, all U.S. Army, Ft. Knox.

Kentucky Court of Appeals Judge Morris C. Montgomery, Lawrenceburg, was one of the jurists to be recognized.

The Congress and the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the following "Editorial Of The Air," which was presented by Mr. William Freehoff on radio station WKPT in Kingsport, Tenn., discusses the legislation that would require the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation be made with the advice and consent of the Senate.

As the station's policy states, "We ask only that you think about it;" and therefore, I recommend this thoughtful presentation to my colleagues and the readers of the Record:

The Senate Should Have a Say

(By William Freehoff)

Within a few years, John Edgar Hoover will retire from active service with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

A successor will have to be named and that—we suggest—is a matter of extreme importance to the security of this Nation.

No appointment will be of greater importance than that of a Director for the FBI—the only Federal agency the Communists have been unable to penetrate.

Yet, the choice of a Director is up to the Attorney General alone. The advice and consent of the Senate is not required.

It should be for the Director of the FBI has become a key position in our Government.

And, since the security of the Nation is involved in this matter, the Senate should have a hand in picking the Director as the Senate has a hand in the choice of the heads of the executive departments and—in fact—the commissioned officers of the armed services.

The Senate agrees, for the Senate has passed a bill to the effect but the matter has been stalled in the House and is bottled up in the House Judiciary Committee.

That bill should be called out of committee, taken to the floor of the House and approved.

It is conceivable that some future Attorney General could appoint—as Director of the FBI—a man who might not share Edgar Hoover's concern about communism.

If that should happen, and the FBI should fall heir to the same, careless kind of security that has marked the State Department, then, indeed, the security of this Nation would be in peril.

Think about it.

Criticism of British Shipping to North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times about the free world ships entering the port of Haiphong. I have placed in the RECORD the statistics on this shipping.

My good friend, Bo CALLAWAY, in a speech before the Atlanta Rotary Club, quoted these figures and "incurred the wrath" of the British Consul General.

I place in the RECORD an article from the February 15, 1966, Atlanta Constitution and a copy of a letter Congressman CALLAWAY wrote the Consul General. I agree wholeheartedly with Bo CALLAWAY.

The material follows:

BRITISH CONSUL CRITICIZES CALLAWAY'S TRADE BLAST

Criticism of British shipping to North Vietnam by Representative HOWARD (Bo) CALLAWAY touched off an exchange between the Congressman and British Consul General Thomas Sharman Monday.

In a speech before the Atlanta Rotary Club, CALLAWAY said the United States must blockade the port of Haiphong to end the war and criticized Washington's refusal to ask our allies to stop commercial shipping to North Vietnam.

Then he said most of the ships entering Haiphong are British and added, "We're not even getting our British allies to stop shipping. How can we back our troops?"

After his talk, Consul Sharman was among members of the audience who gathered around to talk to CALLAWAY. When the two came together, Sharman began gesturing and seemed to speak in angry tones.

He ended the conversation with a brisk, "Good day, sir," and walked quickly from the room.

Later he said in a prepared statement that he had told Representative CALLAWAY that he thought his comments had given an "unfair and unbalanced impression" of the actual situation in Vietnam shipping.

CALLAWAY had said "that in 1964, some 400 free ships, mostly British, entered the Haiphong port, and in 1965 there were 200, again mostly British."

In his statement, Sharman said:

"I told Mr. CALLAWAY at the end of the meeting that I thought he had given an unfair and unbalanced impression in speaking only of free world shipping, mainly British, carrying materials into Haiphong and in not having mentioned the giant Russian planes delivering supplies to the North Vietnam Government. Such British shipping as goes into Haiphong does not carry strategic materials."

Sharman quoted a statement by Secretary of State Dean Rusk saying he was not aware of any munitions supplied by the British by ship to the Vietcong and citing drastic reductions in free world shipping to North Vietnam.

ONLY $500,000

Exports and imports together between the United Kingdom and North Vietnam last year came to only half a million dollars, the Atlanta-based consul general added.

CALLAWAY said he stood by his speech.

Speaking to newsmen on other topics, CALLAWAY predicted a 2-percent increase in corporate taxes and an increase in personal income taxes from the administration.

Mr. THOMAS SHARMAN,
Consul General, the British Consulate,
Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MR. SHARMAN: I sincerely regret that your abrupt departure on Monday at the Atlanta Rotary prevented our discussing further the matter of allied shipping to North Vietnam.

From what you said to me, and your followup statement to the press, I understand your position to be that British shipping to North Vietnam is nonstrategic; that it has been substantially reduced; and, that my criticism of British shipping without mentioning Russian aircraft deliveries gave an unfair impression of the situation.

Mr. Sharman, I find your position utterly indefensible, for the obvious reason that any nation—and especially a nation at war—expects more from its allies than it does from its enemies. I am totally at a loss to understand why Britain, as a long-standing friend, would insist that its actions be judged identically to the actions of a longstanding and present enemy. To do so, I feel, would insult our friendship, and therefore, I choose not to make such a comparison. Instead, my colleagues and I ask Britain to let its actions stand on their own merits or demerits, and to answer to them in that light.

Certainly we feel that British shipping to North Vietnam is entirely unjustified, if for no other reason than that free world shipping of nonstrategic goods frees Communist shippers to carry the instruments of war. But more important than this is the principle involved: that as long as our enemy is engaged in a war effort against America and American men, we cannot condone our friends supplying even so much as a spool of thread to that effort. I do not find our position unreasonable, but I would never have believed that we would have to express it to a friend of such long standing, and worse, that it would be rebuffed.

My colleagues in the Congress and I have and shall continue to press for a cessation of free world shipping to our enemy, and I can promise you that our exchange has only added to my determination that this be done.

Sincerely,

HOWARD H. CALLAWAY.

Residence of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include statistics prepared by the Office of the Veterans' Administration Controller on the State of residence of veterans at the time of separation as of December 31, 1965:

State of residence at separation from the Armed Forces[1] of estimated number of cold war veterans[2] in civil life, Dec. 31, 1965

(In thousands)

State of residence at separation [1]	Number
Total	3,825
United States	3,780
Alabama	61
Alaska	4
Arizona	29
Arkansas	36
California	328
Colorado	41
Connecticut	51
Delaware	10
District of Columbia	16
Florida	96
Georgia	72
Hawaii	15
Idaho	18
Illinois	206
Indiana	101
Iowa	60
Kansas	41
Kentucky	70
Louisiana	66
Maine	27
Maryland	62
Massachusetts	106
Michigan	177
Minnesota	80
Mississippi	36
Missouri	92
Montana	14
Nebraska	32
Nevada	8
New Hampshire	15
New Jersey	116
New Mexico	22
New York	320
North Carolina	85
North Dakota	18
Ohio	202
Oklahoma	56
Oregon	46
Pennsylvania	261
Rhode Island	17
South Carolina	44
South Dakota	14
Tennessee	78
Texas	198
Utah	18
Vermont	9
Virginia	77
Washington	69
West Virginia	58
Wisconsin	95
Wyoming	7
Outside United States	45

[1] Based on "permanent address after discharge" as recorded at time of separation on DD Form 214: Armed Forces of the United States Report of Transfer or Discharge. State estimates are based on a randomly selected 1-percent sample of these reports.

[2] Persons who served in the Armed Forces only after Jan. 31, 1955. Excludes men who served under the 6-month Reserve training program.

Taylor-Made Bridge Falls Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, Joseph C. Harsch has written a penetrating analysis of the current Washington scene in a recent article of the Christian Science Monitor. There is much logic and credibility in his statement:

TAYLOR-MADE BRIDGE FALLS SHORT

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson has attempted to bridge the gap between himself and the Vietnam war rebels in his own party. He sent highly respected Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor to the witness stand of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to tell the rebels that the purpose, the means, and the weapons in the war are all strictly "limited."

At the end of 6½ hours of ordeal for the general, the Senate rebels were not convinced that the gap was not closed.

LIMITS QUESTIONED

Then it was Dean Rusk's turn. As the Johnson administration's chief foreign-policy spokesman, the Secretary of State pointed out that American policy in Vietnam has been repeatedly reaffirmed by Presidents and by Congress. He also referred to the solemn obligations of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization treaty as the legal basis for the U.S. commitment in Vietnam.

Mr. Rusk then invited Congress to vote again on Vietnam war policy "if there is any doubt about it," and contended that the whole structure of world peace was at stake in Vietnam. These two statements drew fire respectively from Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon and Senator J. W. Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, the committee chairman. Senator Fulbright contended the Vietnam conflict does not involve the vital interests of the United States but might nonetheless become "a trigger for world war."

The rebellion in the President's party is precisely over the issue of how limited the Vietnam war is intended to be. Among his critics, the suspicion is lively that the American involvement is "open ended" and could eventually "escalate" into a major war with Communist China and conceivably even a world war involving the Soviet Union.

General Taylor's assignment had been to end the rebellion by satisfying the desire for reassurance about the plans and purposes of the White House. According to the general, the strategic purpose is limited because it consists solely of applying just enough military force to North Vietnam to cause it to desist from its aggression in South Vietnam.

But he was unable to be precise about the amount of force which would be necessary to achieve this purpose. Would it be 600,000 men against the present 200,000? The general agreed that there probably would be some increase in the number of American troops sent to Vietnam, but could not say what the limit might be.

CONGRESS NOT SATISFIED

The weapons used are limited, according to the general, because of U.S. unwillingness to employ nuclear weapons.

The geographic area of the war is limited because bombing outside of South Vietnam is confined to strictly military targets in North Vietnam.

But all this failed to quench the rebellion because it identifies limits presently put upon the policy but fails to provide assurance against the lifiting of limits to higher ones at another time.

The Congress is left at the end of the second week of the hearings still unhappy about the course of the Vietnam war and in a state of unsettled friction with the White House.

The President is left in the position of many a general in the past who found himself reluctantly involved in a battle at a time and place not of his own choosing.

PERSONAL ISSUE AT BASE?

How it all started is a matter for some future historian to sort out in detail. Existing information would suggest, at least superficially, that a simple personal issue between the President and Senator J. W. Fulbright provided the original spark.

The Senator wrote a report on the intervention in the Dominican Republic which was highly critical of the administration. The President countered by cutting the Senator off the White House guest list. The feud was on.

Everything since has seemed to make it worse. Slighting remarks the President is alleged to have made about the Senator, and others, in private conversations have been reported back. The Honolulu trip may or may not have been intended to take headlines away from the Senate hearings, but Senator Fulbright and his colleagues believed that it did.

DEPRESSION CLIMATE RECALLED

It has become one of those issues which will go down in history. It has altered the President's relations with the Congress sharply, and perhaps permanently. The air in Washington is different. For veterans with long memories there is a similarity to the mood of Washington in the days just after the great depression of 1929 broke. Herbert Hoover the great engineer, suddenly became a highly vulnerable political target.

Today, as in the last part of the Hoover administration, many a member of the President's party is wondering whether the Vietnam war may not turn out to be as bad for Democrats in 1966, and conceivably 1968, as the depression was bad for Republicans from 1932 down to World War II.

As for the outside world, it is left in a state of necessary uncertainty about the future course of American policy. The President has made one concession to his critics. He has had General Taylor declare that policy and purpose are all strictly "limited." But there is still no official proof that today's limits will not be raised tomorrow, or the day after.

Democracy—What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the winner of the VFW Voice of Democracy contest from the State of Maine is a constituent of mine, Miss Diane Louise LeBlond, a student at St. Joseph High School in Biddeford, Maine. Her essay "Democracy—What It Means to Me," is a moving statement from a concerned young American and I make her remarks a part of the Record so that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read them:

"DEMOCRACY—WHAT IT MEANS TO ME"

(By Diane Louise LeBlond, St. Joseph High School, Biddeford, Maine.)

"To some generations, much is given; of some generations, much is expected." These words were uttered by Franklin Delano Roosevelt at the 1936 National Democratic Convention. But where do we, the teenage population of America 1965 fit in? What is our role in the march of democracy today?

Certainly no other generation has been blessed with the same opportunities we have. A greater percentage of young people is attending college now than ever before and the number is increasing steadily every year. New and interesting careers are being opened to our generation because of the immense strides the United States has made in scientific fields in recent years. We hold the rights our forebears struggled for so many years to assure us. Above all, we live in a democracy—the most powerful, respected democracy on the face of the earth. All of this has been handed to us on a silver platter, and, consequently, we too often take these gifts for granted.

We are very quick to claim all of these privileges and very voluble indeed in our protests whenever we feel our rights are being encroached upon. But I fear that too many among us would be very surprised and even offended if told that our rights are accompanied by duties and that unless these duties are discharged, we have no rights at all.

What, then, is expected of us as the civic, social, and moral leaders of a tomorrow that looms large and near? These great expectations can be summed up in two words—education and involvement.

We owe it to ourselves and to our country's future to obtain the finest and most complete education we possibly can. To be a completely educated individual means to be a moral, tolerant human being. One is not tolerant who refuses to share a lunch counter, or a bus, or even a drinking fountain with a person whose skin color merely happens to differ from his own. One is not moral who would allow a fellow human being to be harmed, even killed in his presence without even taking the trouble to call the police. One cannot call himself educated who does not develop an interest in current events, who does not bother to form sound opinions concerning current issues. And one is not educated who is a follower of the crowd, unconvinced of its principles but never daring to be different, never attempting to stand up and be counted according to his real beliefs.

Once we are well educated concerning the facts and the issues, we are ready for the second step—involvement. We are ready to act as teenagers all over the country are acting, crusading for worthwhile causes. Teenagers are crusading for civil rights. They are supporting their chosen political parties, joining Teenage Republicans, Teen Dems, organizing get-out-the-vote drives, alerting their elders to the issues, to the candidates and to the importance of informed, intelligent voting. They are doing volunteer work with orphans, with dropouts, with retarded children. All over the country, teens are our strongest Peace Corps boosters, our most militant war-on-poverty workers.

They are today's responsible, dedicated teenage generation laying a solid foundation, striving to become tomorrow's better educated, moral, tolerant, and democratic society. They are realizing that with every right comes a duty. Moreover, they are coming to see that the satisfaction derived from performing these duties is so great as to be its own reward. They are summoning each and every one of us to carry the torch that has been passed to a new generation—our generation. And it is only when we become illuminated with this fire of devotion to our country and to our fellow man that we will come to know the true meaning of democracy.

Resolution of Lithuanian-American Council, Lake County, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1966, the Lithuanian-American Council of Lake County, Ind., held a mass meeting and banquet commemorating the anniversary of the declaration of independence in Lithuania. The following resolution was unanimously adopted, which was duly signed by Albert G. Vinick, president, 4227 Euclid Avenue, East Chicago, Ind., and Peter Indreika, secretary, 3946 Parrish Avenue, East Chicago, Ind.:

> Whereas the United States of America has been in the forefront of the United Nations' activities ending foreign colonialism in numerous Asiatic, African, and European country's; and
>
> Whereas the Soviet Union has been and still is striving in many devious ways to win official recognition by the free world of its rapacious and illegal occupation of Lithuania, and the other two Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia; and
>
> Whereas despite the fact that many former colonial territories have been liberated and admitted into the United Nations as sovereign states in the last 20 years, the Soviiet Union, while speaking out strongly for the abolition of all colonialism, has in actuality made Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the newest colonies in the Soviet Russian empire: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That we again express our gratitude to our Government for the firm and unwavering policy of nonrecognition of the illegal Soviet occupation of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, and request our Government to use every opportunity to raise the question of the liberation of these nations; and
>
> That our Government refuse to ratify the Counsular Convention with the U.S.S.R., which would only be the means for the Soviet Communists to establish more espionage centers for subversive activities in our country; and
>
> That this resolution be esnt to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Senators, and Members of Congress from our States, and to the press.

The President's Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, there is an apparent, and I might add, unfortunate, lack of understanding of U.S. objectives in Vietnam.

Once again, our President enunciated these objectives in clear, unmistakable language last week in New York. In commenting on this speech, the Chicago Sun-Times said the President's reiteration of our aims "should be sufficient to end the current debate" over U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I commend this editorial and insert it in the Record:

THE PRESIDENT'S ANSWER

President Johnson has answered the criticism raised against the administration's Vietnam policy in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings.

The President explained, again, that the U.S. course of conflict in Vietnam is limited in its objective to stopping Communist aggression. The U.S. purpose, he said, is "not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination." He said that the United States does not threaten Red China.

These are familiar points. To them Mr. Johnson added another. In answer to those who debate whether the Communists should have a share of the Government of South Vietnam he said, "We stand for self-determination—for free elections—and we will honor their results."

No free elections can be held in South Vietnam so long as the Communist terror tactics of brutal torture and wholesale assassination of village leaders hold much of the countryside in thrall. Safety, enforced by military means, and hope, in the form of agricultural and industrial aid and education, must be brought to those who have suffered through more than 20 years of war. That is the reason for and the objective of the U.S. course in Vietnam, and the reiteration of those aims should be sufficient to end the current debate.

The Greatest Danger on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting at this time that Columnist David Lawrence should point out to the American people his views on "The Greatest Danger on Vietnam." His column was published in the Washington Star on February 25, and follows:

THE GREATEST DANGER ON VIETNAM

(By David Lawrence)

"This is it"—few people are making such a comment out loud about Vietnam, but many are thinking it to themselves. For more and more it is beginning to be realized that the United States is passing through its biggest crisis since World War II. The conflict in Vietnam is no small or isolated affair. It has become worldwide in its significance, and it could turn into a larger war if the American people are misled into thinking that "peace at any price" is worthwhile.

The greatest danger is not in Vietnam but in this country, where well-meaning but confused and uninformed persons are unwittingly engaged in helping to bring on the very calamity they profess to be against—a major war.

The fallacies being spread are numerous. It is being assumed, for instance, that the President alone is making the policies. Actually, he is surrounded by advisers of the highest rank in civilian and military positions. They are not partisan in their thinking—they are conscientious and patriotic Americans anxious to assure the safety of this country. Republican leaders, too, are openly supporting the policies of the Government.

Nobody, of course, wishes to see a large war precipitated, but this is certain to happen if the enemy begins to take seriously the demonstrations and speeches inside the United States which give an impression of cravenness and weakness. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, in his report to Congress this week, said:

"If we and our free world allies fail to meet the Chinese Communists' challenge in southeast Asia, we will inevitably have to confront it later under even more disadvantageous conditions. The road ahead will be difficult and sacrifices will be required of our people, both in money and in lives. But we have no other reasonable alternative if we are to preserve the kind of world we want to live in—a world in which each nation is free to develop in its own way, unmolested by its neighbors, free of armed attack from the more powerful nations."

Today, the Communist-controlled government in North Vietnam doesn't want to talk peace. When negotiations are mentioned, it is insisted that the Vietcong—the Communist faction in South Vietnam—must be recognized as the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people.

President Johnson's role has been exceedingly difficult as well as delicate. It would be safer for his planning tactics if he didn't have to make any public statements about the future course of the war. The enemy should be left guessing. But the President understandably finds it necessary, in order to quiet fears at home, to deny publicly that he means deliberately to "escalate" the war or to engage in hostilities with Communist China, the chief backer of the North Vietnamese Armies. The President said in a speech this week:

"If the aggressor persists in Vietnam, the struggle may be long. Our men in battle know and accept this hard fact. We who are at home can do as much. There's no computer that can tell the hour and day of peace, but we do know that it will come only to the steadfast—never to the weak in heart."

Johnson was first accused of not wanting to negotiate peace, but he has sent many ambassadors and recently Vice President Hubert Humphrey around the world to make it clear to all countries that America wishes peace. This, however, has been construed abroad as a sign of weakness, and Johnson is finding it desirable to repeat frequently that American policy is not weakening.

Actually, as the President has just said, the tide of battle has turned. There is evidence of a desire throughout the world to reinforce the American military effort in Vietnam. South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand have already sent forces there. Other nations are giving more and more indications of their support.

The Vietnam war, indeed, has taken on a worldwide meaning and is clearly being defined as a struggle between the free world and the Communist revolutionaries who seek to impose their will on helpless peoples. There's really only one way to shorten the war, and that is to bring about a united America and to put in proper perspective the utterances of the misguided persons in public and private life who don't seem to understand the kind of enemy the United States is fighting in Vietnam.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the partial text of a speech I delivered at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Republican Party of Brown County, Wis., in Green Bay on February 22, 1966:

Lincoln has many messages for modern-day Americans. He spoke eternal truths which will long serve to guide us in our affairs. There is one message he addressed particularly to Republicans. He said:

"It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace, and in harmony one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper."

I think this is wise party policy for Republicans at any time but particularly now when our Nation faces such critical problems, both at home and abroad.

We must reserve our ourselves the right to dissent; no free nation can long remain free without it. But we know that the right of dissent, like every other right, carriers with it a responsibility. That responsibility is to make sure that our dissent is not frivolous, self-serving, or, at worst, harmful to the national security. It should not spring, as Lincoln advised, from "passion or ill temper." It ought to be considered and constructive.

The Republican Party has met this test with flying colors during the continuing crisis in Vietnam.

We are not, as are some members of his own party, stabbing the Commander in Chief in the back with criticisms which impugn the motives of our country and give aid and comfort to the enemy. We have criticized, certainly. But I think the record is clear that our criticism, because it is aimed at the support of the American effort, has given no ammunition to the Communist propaganda machines.

Republican criticism stems from a deep concern. It is a concern for the future of this Republic.

We are concerned that the sacrifices being made in Vietnam shall not be made in vain—that we do not lose what our troops are fighting so valiantly to preserve. We fear that, if we make the wrong choices, freedom throughout the world will be gravely endangered.

It so happens that I strongly agree with the bipartisan policy which finds us fighting on the side of the Vietnamese in order to prevent their enslavement by communism through the use of force and terrorism. Freedom in this world is a lost cause, it seems to me, unless someone is willing to stand up and fight to prevent its permanent disappearance. If we deny freedom its chance in Vietnam, freedom is in danger throughout the world. If successful in Vietnam, the so-called Communist wars of liberation—the modern method of aggression—will continue. Eventually and inevitably this Nation will be forced to take a stand at another place. The costs then—in lives and treasure—could make the Vietnam war look like a minor skirmish.

I fervently hope this Nation has not forgotten the lessons of two world wars. The first lesson we learned is that the aggressor—whether he be Kaiser Wilhelm or Adolph Hitler, or Mao Tse-tung—will continue his aggression just as long as it remains profitable. The second lesson is that the United States, if it wants to save itself, must act to stop the aggression sooner or later. And the third lesson is that the longer we wait, and the more courage and power we allow the aggressor to achieve, the bloodier and more costly is the final struggle, with the outcome more and more in doubt.

If Communist aggression in the Far East continues to be profitable, if it is allowed to succeed at little cost, that aggression will continue. Those who want us to get out of Vietnam owe it to us, I believe, to tell us where they believe we should make the next stand. If they say that the success of Communist aggression in Vietnam means the end of Communist aggression in south Asia, then I must say that every logic and every lesson of history is dead against them.

I do not believe Americans will accept that kind of advice. On the contrary, I believe Americans generally are in strong agreement with the policy which finds us in Vietnam—the policy that says the United States, in its own self-interest, cannot allow piecemeal Communist aggression to succeed and become profitable.

Yet, one can feel across the land an uneasiness among our people over our position in Vietnam. I submit, however, it is not the basic policy which concerns Americans. It is the conduct of that policy.

This uneasiness over the conduct of our policy in Vietnam strengthens the position of those who advocate, either directly or indirectly, abandonment of south Asia to the tender mercies of the Communists. It would be a great tragedy if they prevail. It is for that reason that Republicans feel a deep obligation to point out the errors of omission and commission which are threatening a policy essential to the preservation of freedom and our own security.

I suggest that we greatly need two things from the President and his administration. The first is candor and facts. The second is a clear-cut decision. The President is reputed to be a great politician, but I think he underestimates the capacity of the American people to support difficult decisions once they are given possession of the critical facts. It is high time that we started getting the unvarnished truth about Vietnam. The administration's record of playing square with the American people on Vietnam is an extremely poor one.

The President misled the people in the 1964 campaign. He gave the country, as we Republicans well remember, the impression that there would be no enlargement of our military activities there. The American people were not told, in 1964, the seriousness of the situation in Vietnam. We now know that the Communists were close to winning the war in the 1964 and early 1965 period.

We have been consistently misled by administration officials. Secretary of State Rusk told us in April 1963, that the corner had been turned. In October of that year, Secretary of Defense McNamara predicted that, by the end of 1965, the major part of the American military aid program could be ended. Yet only a short time ago, he would only go so far as to say "we have stopped losing the war."

Very often, in addition, the President's actions in regard to Vietnam seem more to confuse than to enlighten; they give the impression of an administration either thoroughly uncertain about its objective or more interested in creating some kind of effect upon public opinion than in actual results.

Thus, we have the hastily arranged Honolulu conference with its emphasis upon economic progress in Vietnam; we have the hastily arranged Humphrey visit promising new programs and more American gold at every stop; we have the sudden presentation of the Vietnam issue to the U.N. Security Council, a matter in which we have apparently since lost interest.

It is no wonder that Washington is talking about, and Americans are feeling, a "crisis of credibility." That is what Ambassador Goldberg calls it, and really, it's just a fancy way of saying that people are getting in the habit of not believing their Government is telling the whole truth.

The first thing we need, then, is some old-fashioned candor from the administration. We ought not to have to guess the factual situation in Vietnam and the Far East; we ought to be kept fully advised. We ought not be kept in the dark as to what our real objective is in Vietnam; we ought to be told and Hanoi should be told. We ought not be flimflammed as to the kind of sacrifices that will be required to reach our objective; we ought to be informed. Above all, recognizing that for security's sake, we cannot be told everything, we ought not to be misled by either false optimism or pessimism as to the true situation.

When the people have been given the facts, this administration needs to make a national decision. It has to decide whether it is fighting a war in Vietnam or whether it is not. I do not say this facetiously; I say it in all seriousness, and I say it again, and underline my words.

We are engaged in a war in Vietnam but this nation has not yet made a decision that it will fight a war in Vietnam. On the contrary, the administration has avoided that decision. Instead it has been trying to find a consensus rather than to create a consensus.

War is a serious business which ought not be undertaken without having success as a goal. Successful war requires knowing what one is fighting for in specific terms, in military terms, if you will. It requires a willingness to commit power to achieve those objectives. It requires sacrifices and it requires, if public support is to be kept as it must be kept, that those sacrifices be shared as equally as possible. War requires resources and, unless it is a very small war indeed, it requires a nation to pass up temporarily its less urgent needs in order to fill the immediate critical ones. War requires dedication and concentration of effort.

We are committing hundreds of thousands of men and billions of dollars to armed conflict in Vietnam without fulfilling any of these requirements. The people do not know what our military objectives are in Vietnam. We have not been willing to commit the power needed to achieve whatever those objectives are; we are instead holding back power. We are not cutting back domestic programs to pay for the war; we are, in fact, adding new ones and enlarging others. We are not concentrating our efforts on the war; we are simultaneously engaged in every kind of activity under the sun, including the greatest roadbuilding program, the most costly exploration program and the most expensive foreign aid program in the history of the world.

We are, in short, engaged in war in Vietnam with all that means in terms of death and privation for our fighting men, without having decided to fight a war, with all that means in terms of hardship, sacrifice and risk for the people back home.

I, for one, do not believe this situation can long prevail. The first kind of war cannot be successful without the second. The American people will, I believe, either be summoned to join in a national decision that we mean business in Vietnam, or the American people will one day reject the mounting costs and casualties of a half-hearted war being fought by a nation that can't make up its mind what it's fighting for. If that happens, if this Nation sneaks out of Vietnam in abandonment of both principle and the friendship and trust of a free people, then I fear indeed that we will have set the stage for an eventual vast world conflict we are all trying so desperately to avoid.

How can we as a people, how can our fightingmen, how can Hanoi or Peiping be convinced we have really determined to fight this war when they see some of the things going on here at home—on the domestic front?

Look at the budget—the financial plan of this Nation—which has been presented to us by the President.

In a time of war, particularly one which comes when the economy is booming, when shortages are appearing, when the demand for manpower is intensifying, a nation needs to adopt a budget of restraint. It needs to adopt a budget which says, "Let's proceed with caution; there is possible trouble ahead." It should shun like the plague an expansionary budget in an already greatly expanded economy, lest it supply those last few breaths of air which cause the balloon finally to burst.

Yet, how would you characterize a budget which proposes that this Nation not only undertake all its normal expenditures while paying the heavy costs of the war, but proposes to increase domestic spending for new programs just enacted and, on top of everything else, proposes new programs which will cost still more money?

This is not a war budget: it is the kind of budget you would propose if you wanted to stimulate a depressed economy in peacetime. It is potentially a very dangerous budget: it can bring on economic dislocations, miserable in themselves, but exceedingly harmful to any war effort.

This is a budget which proposes to spend the fantastic amount of $112.8 billion in 1 year—more than this Nation has ever spent in any other year, including the World War II years. But that amount understates actual spending; $6 billion from the sale of assets has been used to reduce the spending estimate; actual expenditures will be almost $119 billion and will be kept that low if, and it's a big if, Congress is able and willing to go along with a great number of phony cuts in the budget.

There has been a $37 billion a year increase in the level of spending since 1961 and don't think this has been all because of the war. Only a third of that increase can be attributed to Vietnam.

While the administration was trying last year to convince Hanoi of our seriousness in Vietnam, the administration was prodding the last session of Congress to turn out the largest program of domestic spending this Nation has ever seen. It is difficult to blame anyone for thinking that this Nation was more concerned with its domestic affairs than with fighting a serious war.

As a result of that program enacted last year, as the result of continuing large-scale appropriations for new programs, look at what our people, our fighting men, and our enemy can read in the newspapers. Here are three items I came across within the last few days.

Remember we are a nation at war—an extremely costly war.

Item No. 1. From the Washington Evening Star. "Washington is receiving a Federal beautification grant of $483,000 for landscaping around buildings. Other cities who are receiving grants are Pittsburgh which will get about $465,000 and New Haven, about $325,000."

Item No. 2. From the newsletter of the National Education Association. "The U.S. Office of Education is concerned lest some of the nearly $1 billion Congress made available under title I of the (education) act go down the drain because local school districts haven't yet figured out how to use it properly."

Item No. 3. From the Washington Daily News. "The Baltimore Health Department has requested a Federal grant of $300,000 to conduct an antismoking campaign—in the fifth grade of the city's public schools."

Does this sound like an administration which has decided to make the hard decisions required by the kind of war in which the Nation is engaged?

We did not act like a nation at war in 1964, nor in 1965, nor are we doing so today and as a consequence, the war drags on. We apparently will not act like a nation seriously at war during fiscal 1967—if we are to enjoy all of the luxuries which we will lavish on ourselves under the President's budget.

What about the period beyond that? After all, we are told we will be heavily engaged for a long time in Vietnam—some high officials even talk about a generation of conflict.

But, Hanoi and Peiping, if they look at the budget closely, will conclude that we must be planning to get out, because we will be in a frightful fiscal situation if the heavy costs of the war continue into the next fiscal period. That is so because this budget is being financed with future revenues. We are selling assets; we are taking advantage of windfalls; we are speeding up tax collections to reduce this year's deficit. There will come a time, and soon, when those wells will run dry, and then we will either have colossal deficits, or colossal tax increases, or both, plus Federal controls, if the war continues. A nation which has made a decision to fight a bitter war to a successful conclusion would not dare take such a grave risk.

Abraham Lincoln, to preserve the Union, and in defense of freedom, summoned up the entire energies of the Nation to fight a brutal war, brother against brother. "The man," he said, "does not live who is more devoted to peace than I am, none who would do more to preserve it, but it may be necessary to put the foot down firmly."

I think America is now waiting for the foot to be put down firmly. It is waiting for the national decision which sooner or later must be made. It is waiting for a decision, not to prolong a bitter war, but to shorten and end it; it is waiting for a decision which, in the long run, will enable us to prevent a major war which would set the world aflame.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Tablet of Thursday, February 10, 1966, and the Bridgeport Post of Monday, February 14, 1966:

[From the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet, Feb. 10, 1966]

JAMES FARLEY RINGS THE BELL

(By Patrick F. Scanlan)

We have read many articles and speeches and have witnessed considerable debates and lectures on the situation in Vietnam, but no speaker has said as much as James A Farley in an address he delivered in Dubuque, Iowa, last week. Mr. Farley speaking:

"President Johnson did not adopt a war policy. He had war thrust upon him. Our position in South Vietnam is not like a Normandy beachhead. It is more like a Dunkirk. The President is in the same position as Winston Churchill in 1940. He is a receiver in bankruptcy of the policy of appeasement. Appeasement has brought our affairs in Asia to this sad state. Continued appeasement will not only lose Vietnam, it will lose us our Asiatic allies and greatly impair our Atlantic Alliance.

"The President, like Churchill, can only offer us blood, sweat and tears; but if we attempt to run away, the pressure will increase every time. The fact is that had the policy of the President been adopted in 1946, instead of 1966, there would be peace in the Pacific right now."

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, Feb. 14, 1966]

POLICY OF APPEASEMENT

Former Postmaster General James A. Farley has voiced an interesting view on the war in Vietnam. Speaking at a dinner in Dubuque, Iowa, the onetime National Democratic chairman said:

"President Johnson did not adopt a war policy. He had war thrust upon him. Our position in South Vietnam is not like a Normandy beachhead. It is more like a Dunkirk. The President is in the same position as Winston Churchill in 1940. He is a receiver in bankruptcy of the policy of appeasement. Appeasement has brought our affairs in Asia to this sad state. Continued appeasement will not only lose Vietnam, it will lose us our Asiatic allies and greatly impair our Atlantic Alliance.

"The President, like Churchill, can only offer us blood, sweat, and tears; but if we attempt to run away the pressure will increase every time. The fact is that had the policy of the President been adopted in 1946, instead of 1966, there would be peace in the Pacific right now."

Statements like this are making the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur a greater man all the time.

Protection for Americans in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note in a recent issue of the Washington Post, an editorial devoted to the late Newcomb Mott, of Sheffield, Mass., and to the events and circumstances of his tragic and shocking death in Soviet Russia.

The editorial stresses a point I have made consistently throughout the now famous Mott case. It was a point I made at the time of his trial and sentencing last fall, and again when the news of his death came as such a blow to the free world.

That point is, of course, that we must take every step in an effort to prevent such a thing ever happening again. I made the point, and I continue to believe, that an improved consular treaty with the Soviets would provide both nations with the means to avoid an irrevocable action, to expedite notification procedures, and to permit certain steps to be taken on behalf of the individual involved before the inexorable machinery of the Soviet Government is set in motion.

I have speculated in the past that Newcomb Mott might be alive and free today if such a treaty had been in force last summer when young Mott was arrested for illegally crossing the Red border. I happen to believe this very strongly, although it is hardly constructive to be able to say, "I told you so."

What is constructive, however, and what is vitally more important is that we take steps to prevent another Mott tragedy. We must take the initiative in providing safeguards for Americans traveling not only in Russia but anywhere behind the Iron Curtain where the fingers of the secret police can reach with impunity.

We who have been closest to the Mott case, the Massachusetts congressional delegation, have repeatedly called for a full and complete investigation of the circumstances of young Mott's death. Since this implies full cooperation of the Soviets, however, it is unlikely that we will ever really know the truth.

Nevertheless, we have insisted that the State Department exploit every possible means to learn the truth. We have called upon the administration to act in this regard.

The consular treaty is quite another matter, of course, and, as I have said, it is a far more important matter. Here the burden of action is upon us, upon the legislative branch rather than the executive. More specifically, it is upon the Senate.

The proposed Soviet-American Consular Treaty would hold the Soviet Union to reasonable standards in notifying the American Embassy of a U.S. citizen's detention. It would also permit access to him during the initial period of his detention, rather than only at the time of his trial as in the Mott case.

In spite of these and other important provisions which would work to the obvious advantage of all U.S. travelers in Russia or elsewhere in the Soviet orbit, the treaty has been bottled up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It has been the victim of opposition from those who fear what the Soviets might have to gain, rather than optimism for what the United States might gain. It has been opposed by those who would safeguard American security by raising the Iron Curtain a little higher and making it more opaque. It has been opposed by those who would prefer to risk further sacrifice of men like Newcomb Mott than to concede that protection for Americans abroad can best be achieved through bilateral agreements. Their solution is to advise Americans to stay out of Soviet countries.

It is my hope that the Members of the other body will soon see the error in their judgment and will take action on this vitally important instrument. I would remind them that by turning their backs on this treaty they are serving only the forces of hatred, prejudice, and international tension and misunderstanding which, more than anything else, were the direct causes of Newcomb Mott's ordeal.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial which I have already mentioned contains these and other points which I feel are worthy of attention by the Congress. I have unanimous consent that the editorial appear at this point in the Record:

Editorial From Washington Post

The erratic performance of the Soviet Government, in the Mott case and others, gives the State Department no choice but to warn American tourists of the hazards they may encounter in Russia. Ordinarily the Department would have no business intervening in a citizen's plans to visit a country with which diplomatic relations are maintained. It would be derelict, however, not to warn that tourists who inadvertently run afoul of Russian laws may be treated with undue harshness for political reasons.

If the warning costs Moscow some American tourist dollars, then the Russians are lucky because they have it entirely within their power to resume fair treatment of tourists and render the warning obsolete. Doubtless this will be a matter for intense private discussion between Intourist, the official travel agency, and the KGB, the secret police. Almost certainly the Mott case and others like it are the work of the KGB.

Lest one forget, an effective partial recourse is available in the Soviet-American consular treaty, which has yet to be ratified. It would hold Soviet authorities to reasonable standards in notifying the American Embassy of an American's detention and in permitting access to him. It would thereby remove much of the arbitrariness from the Soviet handling of American prisoners and much of the grounds for apprehension from Americans contemplating travel in Russia.

The consular treaty remains lodged in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee largely because its opponents conjured up the specter of a threat to American security. The tragic death of Newcomb Mott, while a Soviet prisoner, should make clear the advantages of protection to Americans which the treaty would provide.

Stay in and Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the administration's firm but cautious stand in Vietnam was given backing by the newspapermen in Colorado.

The Denver Post reports:

> Ten Colorado newspapermen interviewed by this paper unanimously agreed the United States shouldn't get out of Vietnam. The editors and publishers declared to the last man that America was in the fight to win, and shouldn't pull out.

Because many of my colleagues will be interested in this survey taken at the 88th annual convention of the Colorado Press Association, I am making the article available for the Record, where it may be read in its entirety:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Feb. 18, 1966]

Stay in and Win—Ten Editors Agree on Viet Issue

(By Donna Logan)

Ten Colorado newspapermen interviewed Friday by the Denver Post unanimously agreed the United States shouldn't get out of Vietnam.

The editors and publishers declared to the last man that America was in the fight to win, and shouldn't pull out.

They were questioned at the Brown Palace Hotel where newspaper executives from throughout the State are attending the 88th annual convention of the Colorado Press Association.

The editors were asked: "Should the United States get out of Vietnam?" Their answers:

Fred Pottorf, editor and publisher, Holly Chieftain, Holly, Colo.: "No. We ought to strengthen our position in southeast Asia as well as strengthen the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). We should stay over there and destroy their supply routes and win the war."

Dick Hilker, editor, Jefferson Sentinel, Lakewood: "No, I don't think we should get out. We might as well fight there as someplace else, even though Vietnam may not be the easiest place to defend. We've made a commitment there and we might as well keep it."

R. W. Cook, Meeker Herald, Meeker, Colo.: "I'd say not. I think the Government is pursuing the correct course and they have all the facts and know what they're doing. I think it's the right thing."

Dewey Brown, publisher, Montezuma Valley Journal and Cortez Sentinel, Cortez, Colo: "No, I don't think so. A year ago I thought the United States was playing footsie in Vietnam, but I don't think so now and I think we should continue our efforts there. It isn't just a matter of saving face. We're too far committed to get out now."

Preston Walker, editor, Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, Grand Junction, Colo.: "No, I agree with the President's position and I think if we get into a fight we ought to stay in it until we win. The pacifists and demonstrators here are weakening our position. I'm with the President in supporting our policy there."

Fred Betz, Jr., copublisher, Tri-State Daily News, Lamar, Colo.: "No. I think we are committed there. We should push for investigation and discussion of the war in the United Nations—that's the best answer. But until then I think a harder effort on our part is needed. I'm sorry the issue didn't get before the U.N. sooner."

Chuck Leckenby, editor, Steamboat Springs Pilot, Steamboat Springs, Colo.: "I don't think we should have gotten involved in the first place, but now that we're there we would lose prestige by getting out. We should negotiate for a cease-fire and try to develop the country economically because the longer there's fighting the worse it will be on the country."

Chuck Stoddard, editor, Craig Empire Courier, Craig, Colo.: "No. We ought to work even harder on their supply lines and blockade the Communists. We can't win the war in the jungle without losing thousands of American lives, so I think we should concentrate on knocking out their supply routes."

F. G. (Doc) Kirby, editor, Alamosa Valley Courier, Alamosa, Colo.: "No. It's a matter of principle and a matter of stopping communism. We would suffer a loss of prestige if we got out now. We're pledged to defend the people there and that's what we should do."

Joe Payton, editor and publisher, Wet Mountain Tribune, Westcliffe, Colo.: "No. We shouldn't get out until we win. Absolutely."

Allegiance Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, February 22 was Allegiance Day in my home State, South Carolina. I am advised that the people of my State responded in tremendous numbers to the Allegiance Day celebrations conducted in every county seat in South Carolina. I believe this date was chosen appropriately, since on that date we also observe the birthday of our first President, George Washington.

In stressing this occasion in South Carolina we wish to publicly proclaim our feeling of confidence in the policy of the administration to assist Vietnam, or any other Communist-threatened nation. The ultimate question to be resolved is whether or not the United States will deter Communist aggression, infiltration, and domination of Vietnam, or possibly, the entire area of southeast Asia. I believe the United States has chosen wisely in its determination to fight for liberty and freedom for all people rather than permit Communist aggression to spread throughout the world.

The following concurrent resolution was adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly on February 22, 1966. This resolution reveals the dedication of the people of South Carolina to the cause of worldwide freedom. I have respectfully requested that it be printed in the RECORD:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION DECLARING FEBRUARY 22, 1966, ALLEGIANCE DAY

Whereas in recent months we have seen throughout our Nation very unpleasant sights such as draft card burning, peace marches and other demonstrations generated by a small and determined minority against the position taken by our country's leaders in defending the principles upon which this Nation was founded; and

Whereas while we all recognize the right which freedom guarantees each of us to disagree with the principles of our Government, we do not believe that public demonstrations in the streets against our policy in Vietnam while American lives are being lost to defend our Nation and to preserve freedom throughout the world should be held and are detested and unsupported by an overwhelming majority of patriotic citizens; and

Whereas the Greenville Jaycees, the South Carolina Jaycees, and the Municipal Association of South Carolina are promoting February 22. 1966, as Allegiance Day and encouraging the observation of Allegiance Day throughout the State of South Carolina and the entire Nation with brief ceremonies on February 22, which is the birthday of the Father of our Country, George Washington, during which ceremonies we shall all rededicate ourselves and our communities to the principles upon which this Nation was founded and for which it stands today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (*the senate concurring*), That February 22, 1966, is hereby declared to be Allegiance Day.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives and concurred in by the senate.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

Lal Bahadur Shastri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was a profound shock to learn of the sudden death at Tashkent of India's Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri. All the world joins the people of India in mourning the passing of this great statesman.

Because of its relevance, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Gazette of India Extraordinary on January 14, 1966. The editorial follows:

The sudden demise at Tashkent of Lal Bahadur Shastri in the early hours of Tuesday, January 11, 1966, has plunged the nation into deep distress and grief. Lal Bahadur Shastri went to Tashkent in the cause of peace and it is a great tragedy that just when his persistent efforts towards settlement for an honorable and enduring peace in this subcontinent achieved fruition, fate delivered a cruel blow and removed him from our midst.

Born in 1904 at Mughalsarai in Uttar Pradesh, Lal Bahadur Shastri lost his father while he was still an infant. How this infant, born in a modest environment, rose to the highest political office in this country, is an inspiring saga of noble endeavor, unwavering sincerity of purpose and a high sense of patriotism and integrity in public life.

Lal Bahadur Shastri was only 17 years old when the call came from Mahatma Gandhi and without hesitation he plunged himself in the freedom struggle. He was imprisoned. On release, he entered Kashi Vidyapeeth at Varanasi and came under the influence of the savant, Dr. Bhagwan Dass. He took the Shastri degree from the Vidyapeeth (University) and reentered active politics.

At the age of 23, Shastri was married to Shrimati Lalita Devi, who has always stood by him as a steadfast companion, to the very end of his life of sacrifice and devotion to the nation.

Lal Bahadur Shastri had participated in all mass movements launched during India's fight for freedom and was imprisoned as many as seven times. In 1946, he was elected to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly and was appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the Chief Minister. Subsequently, he was appointed Minister for Police and Transport. This portfolio he held for nearly 5 years.

In 1952, when the first general elections were held in India after attainment of independence, Lal Bahadur Shastri was entrusted by the Congress Party with the task of organizing the election campaign; the great success which the party secured at the polls in those elections was in no small measure due to his organizing capacity.

Lal Bahadur Shastri became a member of the Rajya Sabha (Upper House of Parliament) in the first session of Parliament. He was appointed the Union Minister for Transport and Railways in 1952. Four years later, he resigned his ministership because he felt he was constitutionally responsible for a railway accident in which many lives had been lost. This was symbolic of his stanch faith in and sincere endeavor to live up to the highest traditions of parliamentary democracy. Expressing his deep appreciation of this step in Parliament, late Prime Minister Nehru described Lal Bahadur Shastri as a man of the highest integrity with devotion to high ideals.

The call to assume responsibility of high public office came to Lal Bahadur Shastri again in 1957 when he was elected to the Lok Sabha (Lower House of Parliament) and was assigned the portfolio of Transport and Communications in the Union Cabinet. In March 1958, he became Minister for Commerce and Industry. Later, on the death of Gobind Ballabh Pant in April 1961, the important portfolio of Home Affairs was entrusted to him.

As Minister for Home Affairs, Lal Bahadur Shastri brought into play his gifts as an able administrator and he handled a number of complex and intricate political and administrative problems with sagacity and skill. He had a great capacity for resolving differences and brought to bear, on disputes and discords, the healing tough of his great personal charm, gentle persuasion and deep understanding. One of the difficult problems which he solved soon after his assumption of the office of Home Minister was the language issue in Assam. Amongst important matters which received his special attention during his tenure as Home Minister was a promotion of emotional integration amongst the people of India, a matter which always remained uppermost in his mind.

In August 1963, Lal Bahadur Shastri resigned from the office of Home Minister to devote himself to the task of revitalization of the Congress Organization. Soon after, he was called upon to join the Union Cabinet as Minister without portfolio. In that capacity, he lightened the burden of the heavy responsibilities of the late Prime Minister and on passing away of Jawaharlal Nehru, the mantle of the great leader fell on Lal Bahadur Shastri.

The smoothness with which the changeover took place was a measure of the nation's confidence in Lal Bahadur Shastri's capacity to direct the affairs of the country. And the nation was soon to find that its trust in him was fully justified. Onerous responsibilities of the high office unfolded his great qualities of leadership. In terms of time, the tenure of Lal Bahadur Shastri was a short one.

However, during the span of the 19 months that Lal Bahadur Shastri was Prime Minister, the country passed through a period of such severe stress and strain as would test the mettle of the highest leadership. During a crucial phase of our history, bristling with serious internal as well as external problems, he guided the destinies of the nation with strength, determination, wisdom and farsighted statesmanship. A man of genuine humbleness of spirit and of unfailing courtesy, Lal Bahadur Shastri was essentially a man of peace. He sought peace in the country, peace with her neighbors and peace throughout the world. His concept of peace, however, was one of peace with honor and, behind his modesty and gentle exterior, lay a firmness of purpose and a resolute will.

When, therefore, challenge came a few months ago, it found Lal Bahadur Shastri the firm sentinel of the country's honor, freedom and territorial integrity. In this hour of crisis, he provided the nation with determined and inspiring leadership under which the entire nation rose as one man to meet effectively the threat of aggression. These hostilities, which were not of India's seeking, however, did not deflect Lal Bahadur Shastri from his quest for peace and good neighborliness: The Tashkent agreement was his finest hour and a measure of his sincere effort in the direction of peace.

Lal Bahadur Shastri was a man of the people. Both as an individual and as a leader, he endeared himself to the people. His life was one of complete dedication to the service of the nation. Even in frail health, he did not permit himself rest or respite. His tragic end, which came in the wake of his vigorous pursuit of the Tashkent talks in complete disregard of mental and physical strain, was characteristic of his devotion to service of the country and to the cause of peace.

The country has lost Lal Bahadur Shastri when it had great need for his services and the people had discovered, in true measure, his great qualities of character and leadership. It is for the people of this country to prove worthy of the legacy which Lal Bahadur Shastri has left behind and to strive wholeheartedly and unitedly for fulfillment of the great tasks to which he addressed himself and for which he lived and died.

On the eve of his death, he said to the Defense Minister: "We have now to fight for peace with the same courage and determination as we fought against aggression." The nation can never forget these words which sum up his message to India and to the world.

Alaska's National Guardsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to a recent article by Mr. Bill Fox, a staff writer for the Anchorage Times, Anchorage, Alaska, entitled “Famed Alaska Scouts Protect 49th State Full Time on Part-Time Pay.’ In the concluding paragraph of his story, Mr. Fox states:

> The scouts are in a class of their own and none of the regular guardsmen or servicemen in other branches of the Armed Forces will dispute it.

I am sure that anyone who reads the following article will agree with his conclusion:

FAMED ALASKA SCOUTS PROTECT 49TH STATE FULL TIME ON PART-TIME PAY

(By Bill Fox)

About 1,200 of Alaska's proudest National Guardsmen are currently attending their annual 2-week field training session at Camp Denali at Fort Richardson.

The 1st and 2d Scout Battalions of the National Guard, composed almost entirely of Indians and Eskimos from remote areas of the State, arrived at Fort Richardson Sunday and will remain there for 15 days of rigorous training exercises.

Members of the scout battalions are unique in that they perform nearly a full-time job on part-time pay. This, however, is not the only characteristic which sets this group aside from all other National Guard units across the lower 49 States.

Unlike other States, the guardsmen in Alaska convene for their annual tour of active duty in midwinter. The scout battalions are trained for combat in arctic and subarctic temperatures and thus their training is conducted in a period which properly prepares them for emergencies which might arise in their own villages.

The 1st Battalion, commanded by Maj. Bill Caldwell, has headquarters in Nome and covers an area stretching from Barter Island in the northeast to Stebbins and St. Michael along Norton Sound. In addition, the 1st Battalion maintains outposts on Little Diomede and St. Lawrence Island.

The 2d Battalion has its headquarters at Bethel and is commanded by Maj. Joe Pike, an American Cree Indian. This battalion maintains 29 units in towns and villages from Kotlik on Norton Sound to Dillingham on the shores of Bristol Bay. The 2d Battalion, mostly made up of Athabascan Indians, has a unit at Mekoryuk on Nunivak Island, as well.

Although men in both battalions are required to meet in their own units just 48 times in a year, many convene as many as 90 or more times. Being a member of a scout battalion carries as much status as being a member of the village council in some Eskimo communities. The scouts are extremely proud of their uniforms and the money which they receive for attending training sessions is an important factor in the economic growth of their home villages.

The scout battalions are trained to maintain a constant surveillance over an assigned geographical area, its adjacent waters, and offshore islands. The battalions can report any information which they obtain by way of radio and in most cases a native Eskimo dialect is much more effective for transmitting secret information than any standard type of voice code.

Each battalion contains slightly over 600 men, but is broken down by units within a village. The heaviest concentration of scouts exist in Point Barrow where there are about 90.

Although many of the scouts can understand and speak English, they are often reluctant to discuss their roles as scouts. One platoon sergeant from a small village on the northern coast of Alaska said most of his winters were spent hunting and most of his summers devoted to fishing. He said he maintained a dog team and added that it took about 800 pounds of fish to feed his dogs each year.

Most of the scout officers have attended training school outside of Alaska.

Many of the scouts prefer to wear their own mukluks while they are snowshoeing, rather than the regular Army-issued boots. One Eskimo said the Army boots were too stiff and made his feet sore.

The enthusiasm and pride of these scouts is so great that they carry their work far beyond the call of duty in many instances. Some of the units in the far Northwest have been responsible for recovering Soviet weather balloons which have enabled U.S. officials to determine just how advanced the Russians have become in their weather-probing operations.

Other units have made heroic rescues and still others have successfully guided unfamiliar units through the arctic wilds of northern Alaska.

The cost of conducting an annual encampment to bring battalions together is expensive, but worth while. Operation of Camp Denali for the 15-day period runs in the vicinity of $3,500. Rations for the more than 1,200 men are about $25,000. Transportation is $95,000 and payrolls amount to $165,000. In addition, $1,500 worth of petroleum, oil and lubricants is consumed and clothing and field supplies for each scout amounts to about $350.

Often, the process of bringing a scout from his home village to Camp Denali is a major operation and in some cases it is never completed. Last year 80 men were left waiting in their villages for 9 days before they were finally notified that the weather was too poor to permit air flights into their territory. Their active tour of duty was canceled.

This year about 40 men, who became restless and tired of waiting for a bush plane to fly them out to one of the key pickup points, boarded five snow vehicles and a dozen dog teams and traveled into Bethel from Kwethluk and Akiachiak.

One colonel suggested that perhaps the extra enthusiasm displayed by Eskimo Scouts was a symbol of their gratitude for being given the opportunity to learn their work as guardsmen and to travel around the State and into the southern 49 States.

In any case, the Scouts are truly in a class of their and none of the regular guardsmen or servicemen in other branches of the Armed Forces will dispute it.

Tony Plattner and the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that one of my constituents is throwing welcome light on what is happening in Vietnam by writing a series of in-depth articles for Aviation Week and Space Technology, the aerospace journal. He is C. M. “Tony” Plattner, of Walker, Minn., son of Mr. and Mrs. Clemens A. Plattner, the husband and wife team who edit and publish three newspapers in our State—the Walker Pilot, the Cass County Independent, and the Crow Wing County Review.

Tony flew fighter planes while a pilot in the Marine Corps from 1952 to 1956 after graduating as a mathematics major from Carleton College in Northfield, Minn. He attended the University of Minnesota School of Journalism after serving in the Marines, and then worked as an associate engineer for the Marquardt Corp.

Combining his practical flying experience with his technical training, Tony joined Aviation Week as a reporter specializing in aircraft engineering stories. He recently went to Vietnam for 2 months to report the air war there firsthand, flying missions ranging from B–52 bombing raids to light-plane spotter missions in a Bird Dog aircraft. His series on U.S. air tactics in Vietnam set a new high watermark in the reporting on that confusing war.

If there is no objection, I would like to insert an editorial from the January 3, issue of Aviation Week about how Tony is covering the Vietnam war.

THE LONG WAR

The Vietnam war is now in another pause that hopefully might lead to meaningful negotiations but more likely is simply a prelude to a greater escalation of that conflict. In addition to increasing in intensity and fury in Vietnam, the next phase of the struggle for a favorable balance of power in Asia is likely to spread into other areas of the southeastern peninsula, such as Laos and Thailand.

Main reason that the current pause is unlikely to produce significant negotiations is that the United States has not yet changed the basic strategic balance in Vietnam, despite an air bombing campaign against North Vietnam and a major increase in ground and air strength in South Vietnam. Notwithstanding the major increases in land, air, and sea forces in southeast Asia during the past 6 months, the strategy with which they have been employed has failed to achieve the desired U.S. goals. In the air, the limited and sporadic campaign of interdiction against Communist supply lines feeding the Vietcong in South Vietnam has proved ineffective because of the nature of the terrain involved and the limited scale of the air effort employed. On the ground the “sweep and clear” tactics have produced some bloody battles, but the Vietcong usually reoccupy the areas after the fighting ends.

The Communist forces in South Vietnam are now more numerous, aggressive, and better supplied than they were last spring before the U.S. ground force buildup and air interdiction campaigns accelerated. It is clear that not only will additional military forces be required in southeast Asia, but also that a radically different strategy for their use will be necessary to achieve a relatively swift and enduring decision.

The scale of the war in southeast Asia has been escalating steadily since President Johnson's inaugural 1 year ago this month. It is now reaching the stage where it will require major changes in American life if it continues much longer on a further escalated scale. The American people and the aerospace industry could be faced with the prospect of a long, bloody, and fruitless war that would make Korea fade into a minor skirmish by comparison.

Against this background Aviation Week & Space Technology again brings its readers a series (the third since 1964) of special reports from the combat zones of southeast Asia, written by a specially qualified staff member. The series that begins in this issue on page 16 is the result of 2 months of travel in southeast Asia by C. M. "Tony" Plattner, a member of this magazine's Los Angeles bureau who has an unusual set of qualifications for this task.

"Tony" Plattner served 4 years' active duty as a Marine Corps fighter pilot flying Vought F4U Corsairs and Grumman F9F-5's and is now a captain in the Marine Air Reserve flying Douglas A-4E jet attack aircraft. His 2,000 hours of flying time also include many pilot report assignments for A.W. & S.T. in a wide variety of aircraft. His latest before leaving for Vietnam last fall was a chock-to-chock exercise in the lefthand seat of the Douglas DC-9 (A.W. & S.T. Nov. 1, p. 37). He was educated as a mathematician and worked as an engineer in the aerospace industry and as a newspaper reporter before joining the staff of this magazine 3 years ago.

During his 2 months in southeast Asia he covered every form of air operations from the Strategic Air Command Boeing B-52 strikes based on Guam to the Cessna O-1E light plane spotter missions. He traveled over 1,500 miles in the combat theater visiting USAF, Army, and Marine air squadrons and flew combat missions as an observer in three types of McDonnell Phantom 2 strike fighters, a Bell UH-1D helicopter, a North American F-100F, and a Grumman OV-1A Mohawk Army reconnaissance aircraft. He also went on board Navy carriers operating off the Vietnam coast to report on their operations.

His series will provide A.W. & S.T. readers the same type of accurate detailed technical information on the aerospace equipment deployed in southeast Asia, its operational effectiveness and its future requirements, as did the 17-part series written by National Editor Cecil Brownlow after a similar assignment in Vietnam last spring.

The urgent need for this type of information was amply demonstrated by over 8,000 requests for reprints of the Brownlow Vietnam series received from industry and military organizations all over the world.

Editorial coverage from combat zones is both dangerous and costly. But the aerospace industry has come to depend on Aviation Week & Space Technology to provide it with this type of information that it so vitally needs. We will not shirk this responsibility in Vietnam or any other portion of this troubled globe.—ROBERT HOTZ.

Mrs. Robert McNamara: Wife of a Man Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MRS. ROBERT MCNAMARA: WIFE OF A MAN UNDER FIRE

(By Lloyd Shearer)

Ladies of America. How would you like to pick up your newspaper each morning and read that your husband was cold, aloof, distant, unfeeling, and withdrawn * * * arrogant, austere, and strict * * * prudish, precise, and straitlaced * * * stiff, stern, rigid, and humorless * * * a walking encyclopedia * * * a man whose bloodstream consists of computers instead of cells * * * an inflexible automaton, stubborn and unyielding in the face of error * * * the second most powerful man in the Nation responsible for the war in Vietnam, the confusion in U.S. foreign policy, the Selective Service Act, the black market in Saigon, and the fate of this country? Also a lot of other downright distortions.

How would you like each day to have your husband sniped at by the press, the public, and the prima donnas of Congress?

How would you like to have him criticized, insulted, accused, condemned, disparaged, vilified, and lampooned? Especially when you knew from 25 years of marriage with this able, brilliant, dedicated, versatile man that practically all the criticism was incorrect.

This, in large measure, is the position Margaret McNamara, wife of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, has found herself in these past 5 years.

A lovely, gracious, blue-eyed, shapely, petite brunette (5 feet 3, 116 pounds), a onetime California high school teacher (biology and physical education at Alameda and Sausalito), intelligent, well read, au courant with the latest events, Margaret McNamara comes well equipped to refute the criticism leveled at her husband. But she has never succumbed to the temptation.

I HAVE TO STRIKE BACK

"The only time I really get angry," she admits, "is when they accuse Robert of being dishonest. He may commit an occasional error in judgment—which one of us does not?—but dishonesty is so foreign to his character that I just have to strike back. Usually I write a nasty letter, get rid of my resentment that way, then tear the letter up.

"When someone you love has become the national sitting duck," she explains, "the constant target of criticim, it's only natural for his wife to become defensive. But over the years I've learned not to let it affect me too much. The antidote to falsehood, frequently born of jealousy, power struggles, superficial first impressions but rarely of knowledge, is truth. When you know what the truth is about your husband, the deep, verified-by-living-with-him truth, then when something isn't true, you don't let it bother you.

"'I'm sure the wives of Senators and Congressmen and other in Government service—someone like the President's wife, Mrs. Johnson, who's an old Washington hand—have learned the art of living with criticism—but it does take time, patience, and frequently great understanding.

"You see," Margaret McNamara adds, the voice soft, sincere, and friendly feminine, "there's always the problem of children. Our three are young, sensitive, easily hurt, and when their hard-working father gets 'blasted' as they put it, they wonder why. It seems so unfair to them.

"Take Margy, our eldest, 24 (a graduate student in anthropology at Washington University in St. Louis). Some of the boys she's dated have been classified 1A, and I'm sure they've let her know that they think her dad responsible, which of course, he's not. Before we left Ann Arbor for Washington, before Bob accepted President Kennedy's offer to join his Cabinet we'd all read Kennedy's book, 'Profiles in Courage.' We learned that the experiences of many people in Government aren't particularly easy. If a man believes he's right, if he's running against the tide, if he's breaking down old and established customs, Government service is no bed of roses. And when someone like Robert, for what he considers the benefit of the entire country, cancels contracts and shuts down unneeded installations after the most careful and thorough research, well, the hue and cry from the local level can become a deafening roar.

"But like us, the children have learned to roll with the punches, to understand what personal participation in Government entails. As President Truman said, 'If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.' I guess we've learned to take it."

Before Robert Strange McNamara moved his family to Washington in early 1961, he worked his way up in less than 15 years at the Ford Motor Co. from administrative executive to controller (1949) to vice president in charge of all cars and trucks (1957) to president (1960). In 1959 his salary and bonuses came to $410,833. Had he remained as president in 1961 instead of resigning to accept the Defense position in Kennedy's Cabinet at $25,000 per year, his annual compensation would have topped the $500,000 mark. In addition he would have been able to exercise options on 60,000 shares of Ford stock, half at $23.71, half at $33 in a bull market which zoomed the stock to $117 a share.

When Henry Ford was asked recently what it cost Bob McNamara to leave Ford for Washington, he said, "We figure about $500,000 a year in salary and supplemental compensation plus about $3½ million in stock."

When McNamara worked for Ford he lived a peaceful life with free weekends in the college town of Ann Arbor, Mich. He attended the First Presbyterian Church, took a leading role with his wife in civic enterprises—they were among the first residents to sign a covenant designed to end racial discrimination in the sale of local real estate—and contributed independently to candidates of both political parties. He rose early, about 6, worked long and hard, frequently putting in 12-hour days, but he went skiing with his family in winter, climbed mountains with them in summer, lived the good and modest life devoid of status symbols. (The McNamaras still own and drive a 1960 Ford, a 1961 Falcon, buy their clothes off the rack.)

In a materialistic society where money is equated with power and success, it seems incredible, but the truth is—and this is fundamental to any true understanding of their philosophy—the McNamaras give scant though to the financial sacrifice or prestige involved in Government service.

"When Sargent Shriver came out to see my husband in 1960," Mrs. McNamara explains, "and told him that President Kennedy wanted him to serve in his Cabinet either as Secretary of Defense or Secretary of the Treasury, Bob was truly surprised. He'd only just been promoted to president at Ford the previous month, and his first reaction was to question his own qualifications for such high Government office. He quickly turned down the Treasury job because he said he hadn't had enough banking and fiscal experience.

"Later when he spoke to President Kennedy directly, he told him that his experience in defense was very limited. Bob had served as an officer in the Air Force during World War II but that was a good 15 years back. He recommended several other men and told the President in all honesty that he wasn't the man for the job. He just didn't have enough experience.

"The President said he wasn't aware that any training school existed either for Presidents or Cabinet members. And I think it was after that remark, perhaps a little later, that Bob asked President Kennedy if he himself had really written "Profiles in Courage." The President said yes, and Bob was most pleased, but he kept insisting that Kennedy was making a mistake in offering him a Cabinet membership.

"I can honestly say," Margaret McNamara declares, "that we never really thought about or discussed the difference in salary levels between Government and private employment. We had always thought—Bob had always thought—that at some time he'd like to give his time and effort to the Government when asked, never realizing that he would be asked as soon as he was. But when you're asked, you don't say no, not at least when you feel as strongly as he does, I guess as we all do in our family, about making some contribution to good government."

MIDDLE CLASS AMERICANS

Where and how the McNamaras developed their dedication to public service and their high quotient of idealism is difficult to determine. Neither comes from a family with any considerable history of government service. Both spring from the heart of the white collar American middle class.

Margaret McKinstry Craig (Mrs. McNamara's maiden name) was born in the State of Washington in 1915. Her family moved to California when she was a child, and she was raised in Alameda across the bay from San Francisco where her dad sold insurance.

Robert Strange McNamara (Strange is his mother's family name) was also raised with a sister, Peggy, in the San Francisco Bay area. They were children of a wholesale shoe company executive. The elder McNamara was 25 years older than his wife, and people who knew him describe the gentleman as "a stiff, dignified, businesslike man." It is entirely possible Robert McNamara inherited his devotion to hard work, his power of great concentration, his proven organizational genius, and his reserved manner from his father.

SWEET NOT SACCHARINE

Margaret Craig of Alameda High School and Robert McNamara of Piedmont High both attended the University of California at Berkeley, class of 1937. She was in Alpha Phi, pretty, vivacious, bright, naturally at ease with people. "If you ask me for one adjective to describe Margy," says a friend of long standing, "I would use the word 'sweet'—not in the cloying, saccharine sense, but in the sense of her being thoughtful and unselfish, the very feminine qualities you find in a well-bred young girl. She is still the sweetest, most considerate woman I know."

McNamara was a Phi Gamma Delta, popular, serious, brilliant, industrious. He made Phi Beta Kappa in his junior year, was a big man on campus. Both attended many of the same classes, but they never dated. In those years McNamara saw a great deal of Annie Lee Whitmore, an attractive coed at Stanford.

It was only after he'd returned from 2 years at Harvard Business School and worked as an accountant for Price Waterhouse & Co. that he and Margy began dating. Their courtship was relatively short and to the point. "We started going around together," Mrs. McNamara recalls, "in May 1940. About 4 months later we were married in the Episcopal Church in Alameda. It was on August 13. That same day we held our wedding reception on the docks. Then we caught a boat which took us through the Panama Canal to New York. That boat trip was our honeymoon."

When she examines her marriage, now in its 26th year, Margaret McNamara finds it full, exciting, constantly growing. "I'm so glad I married Bob," she confessed to a college classmate not long ago. "If I'd married someone else I'd probably be a happy bay area housewife today, living in a typical suburban world. But being the kind of man he is, interested in everything—art, music, literature, science, nature—Bob has made a wonderful life for his family. He's taught us all so much."

Subsequently a reporter asked Mrs. McNamara if living with a former college professor and corporation president, an expert on budgets, statistical controls, and quantitative analyses, hadn't given her an inferiority complex. "Your husband," he declared, "supervises a budget of more than $50 billion in the Defense Department. Who makes the budget in your household? Who makes the family decisions?"

Margaret McNamara quickly laughed. She likes to laugh, likes to smile. "I don't suffer from any inferiority complex," she said. "At least I don't think I do. Family decisions with us have always been a joint effort. Over the years I've become a little better organized, but I've also learned that sometimes Bob enjoys a little family disorganization. Then he straightens things out.

"As for the budget, we set that out together. Then I try to keep it. But it doesn't always work. I have a sliding rule I call accrual. That's my expansion program beyond the set budget."

What she has learned most from her husband, she believes, is the important technique of decisionmaking, of first realizing what is most important, then setting a goal, then implementing the method of achieving that goal. "Decisiveness," she admits, "was not one of my outstanding qualities when I first got married. But I've learned over the long pull to make decisions after giving them the best possible thought, the best possible care, and then not to worry about them but to go on to the next goal."

If admittedly her husband has taught her much, what has Margaret McNamara contributed to the marriage? In addition to three bright, well-raised children, Margy 24, Kathleen 21, a student at Chatham College in Pittsburgh, and Craig 15, at St. Paul's School in New Hampshire—she has contributed a well-run household, and atmosphere of love, loyalty, and livability, an always available companionship, a calm, friendly, supporting disposition, and what a doctor friend aptly terms "the contagion of consideration." She makes relatively few demands of her husband.

Secretary of Defense is a mankilling job. It drove James Forrestal to suicide years ago, and it is amazing that Robert McNamara can maintain the pace he does, 12- to 18-hour days, 6 days per week, flights to Europe, Texas, Vietnam, periodic appearances before congressional committees, constantly spouting impressive quantities of knowledge, constantly replenishing the source of energy which drives him inexhaustibly on.

One reason he's able to continue this furious regimen, and still maintain good humor, unharried manner, excellent physical condition, and admirable emotional balance is that his wife is cheerfully willing to go along with the almost superhuman goals he sets for himself.

KEEPS BOB AT EASE

In her scheme of marriage, she is primarily a wife and mother, in that order. "What I try to do," she says, "is keep Bob at ease. He generally gets up at 6, and so do I. I make him his breakfast about 6:30, and he leaves for the Pentagon about 6:50. This gives me a chance to read two newspapers (the Washington Post and the New York Times). Since the children have all gone off to school I've taken on some local community action projects in Washington, because I feel very strongly about home rule. Citizen participation at the local level is terribly needed in the city of Washington. I also spend time on the poverty program, visiting Women's Job Corps, and I'm also interested in the nationwide beautification program. That's why when the President's wife asked me recently to represent her at the Governor's conference on beautification in California, which I consider my home State, I couldn't turn her down."

Another reason the McNamaras accomplish a great deal is that they are not particularly social creatures. They seem too inner-directed for that—she less than he—so that very rarely do they ride the Washington, D.C., cocktail circuit. A certain amount of socializing especially with other Cabinet members is necessary, but their idea of an evening well spent is to retire after dinner and read in bed. A few weeks ago the following reading matter lay beside their bed: "Report to Greco" by Nikos Kazantzakis, the Kennedy books by Schlesinger and Sorensen, "History of the Sierra Nevada" by Francis Farquhar (the McNamaras and their children have climbed the Sierras for years), issues of the New Yorker magazine containing the serialization of Truman Capote's "In Cold Blood."

Except for an occasional high-level meeting and weekend interruptions Secretary McNamara does no work at home. "He leaves everything packaged right on his office desk," Mrs. McNamara reveals. "He doesn't want to rehash or re-do it or go through it all again. Home to him is a place where he can relax and recharge his batteries. And I try to keep it that way. We have a cook and a woman who comes in to clean a few days per week. And that's about all. Bob returns home from work anywhere from 7 p.m. to 9, earlier on Saturdays, and I always wait to eat with him. He's a man who enjoys overworking himself, and I don't mind the long hours he puts in. It's just that the pressures keep mounting. That's what brings on fatigue, and that's what worries me."

By nature, however, Margy McNamara is no worrywart. She is one of those delightfully optimistic women who soar through life giving strength by giving love and understanding. Of the oftrepeated charge leveled against her husband that he is "a human I.B.M. machine," she says: "Ask the people who've met and talked with him. They'll tell you he's got a marvelous sense of humor. It's true that he suffers fools badly especially if they impede his work, but he's a friendly, polite, decent human being, a marvelous father who smiles with and at his children, who helps them with their homework, especially math—really he's a good man.

"I think this image of his being distant and interested only in computerized judgments springs from many factors. To begin with he's easy to caricature especially by cartoonists. He wears glasses. He's tall. He parts his hair neatly and cleanly a little to the left of center: There is very little that's humorous about the problems he faces or the decisions he must make. They don't lend themselves to the emotional approach but their effect on people is very emotional and very serious. So those who don't know him regard him as forbidding. But ask the people who've hiked and skiied with him. He's a man who enjoys much more than work."

In discussing his life with the man she calls "Kip," Margaret McNamara makes her marriage sound like a carefree, memorable picnic from its very inception. She glosses over the early years of World War II when her husband, rejected for service by the Navy because of his eyes, went to England, was there commissioned a captain in the Air Force. She says relatively little of her duty tour as a GI bride, of moving 13 times with an infant during the course of the war, of living in a basement in Salina, Kans., of contracting infantile paralysis along with her husband and of being hospitalized for 9 months. She says nothing about the months of waiting when McNamara was shipped overseas to Calcutta and she found herself traveling from Boston to Alameda to Kansas City to Washington.

LUCKIER THAN MOST

"Compared to most young brides with husbands in the service," she declares, "I was lucky."

Reporters who've covered McNamara since he arrived in Washington more than 5 years ago, say he's much more diplomatic now in handling people, particularly low I.Q. Con-

gressmen, than he's ever been before. He's always made it a point to send boxes of Christmas chocolates to the White House telephone operators, whom he admires very much. But this past Christmas he delivered the gifts personally. In 1964 when he vacationed in Zermatt, Switzerland, with his family, the Swiss townspeople found him so friendly and likable that on the day of his departure the local band turned out to play him farewell at the railway station.

Some frineds attribute McNamara's improvement in tactical human relations to his wife. "I don't know for sure," one colleague confided, "but I think it's safe to say that he has intellectualized her, and she has tenderized him."

Same War, New Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. J. PICKLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William Crook, Regional Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for an eight-State area with headquarters in Austin, Tex., last month made a speech to the Texas Press Association which, in my opinion, was a most challenging analysis of the war on poverty.

Dr. Crook pulled no punches in presenting the problem which faces the Nation and makes an appeal to the press and to the public to understand that the best way to protect our free enterprise system is to wage a war on poverty.

This speech had such an effect on the audience and those who read about it that Dr. Crook has been asked for hundreds of copies. I am hopeful that every Member of this House can read this speech, which is as follows:

SAME WAR, NEW FRONT

(Address by William H. Crook to Texas Press Association, in San Antonio, Tex., January 29, 1966)

Nothing so tempts a man to phoniness as an appointment with the press. The mere announcement by my secretary that a reporter is on the line or waiting in the reception room, brings on a crisis in my self-confidence—is my deodorant really "as good as a shower every hour"? I ask myself.

Taken singly, paired with a photographer, or in numbers, you ladies and gentlemen of the press are a thoroughly intimidating, if not downright mean, assortment. I cannot speak for the stouthearted few who develop an admirable immunity to you, but in speaking for myself—for a guy with a slight chicken quality—I can tell you that my first inclination in any given confrontation with the press is to sell out—lock, stock, and character. And why not? Who else has your power?

Who eles, at whim, can turn a ballpoint pen into a stiletto—or, at whim, into a wand for a Midas touch? You interrogate—with poker faces—and I respond. With mounting terror, my eyes are fixed upon your pen. I speak passionately of cause and motivation; brilliantly of plan and method; disarmingly of self and sacrifice; and at last your pen writes.

My destiny is in the word you write. From where I sit across the desk, it looks like fink—or schnook. And I know you're on to me. In fact, I've come to count on it—to count on your cynicism as the one constant in your character.

And not only to count on it, to depend on it, and to commend it. Only a cynical press is a healthy press. In a time when a man can order up an image like a suit of clothes, author a book someone else has written, or champion a cause he's never believed in, it's necessary for the security and safety of the country that the inscrutable and esoteric order of free journalism keep the tongue in cheek as its sign and symbol.

As I said a moment ago, I have come to anticipate your cynicism and to count on it—even to take comfort in it, and, as tonight, to use the knowledge of it as a discipline to help me be as little phony as possible in addressing you on a subject that I believe in and want you to believe in too. Which brings us to the other side of the coin—sincerity, the only defense against too much cynicism. But sincerity is not something one has or has not; it is rather a quality of trueness one strives for, and never with more success than in a confrontation with conflicting doubt, skepticism or open hostility. It is in this spirit of candid confrontation that I interrogate the interrogators tonight and ask you, the press of Texas, a question.

A question which cannot be, nor should be, either in the name of courtesy or honesty, softened by a syllable. The question is this: Why are you so hostile to the war on poverty? Why should this most civilized of all undertakings meet with such inexplicable responses—such contempt and ridicule? Am I unfair? Is there no substance in the charge that if a dozen boys at a Job Corps camp get into a fight, the headlines make it a riot or a race war? But if 45 boys from a Job Corps camp spend a cold and tired night looking for a lost child in the hill country of San Marcos, we at the OEO have to [illegible] this news upon you?

It is true that the public buys [illegible] and it's also true that more [illegible] of the public believes that [illegible] because they are shiftless, w[illegible] are content in their poverty. [illegible] true that 85 percent of Americ[illegible] that the war on poverty will be [illegible] give me credit, gentlemen, for not believing your propaganda that circulation is your sole or even your main motivation in printing papers—a pretense and a fabrication that I suspect you enjoy and hide behind. No, I think there are some facts to face head on. One is that there is something about this poverty bit that irritates all of us.

There is also an irrational delight in reading and, I suppose, reporting the goofs and setbacks of the effort. Commentators are hard pressed to conceal their pleasure in predicting scandals and "giant boondoggles." There is gleeful anticipation on the part of many as they contemplate the failure and defeat of Sargent Shriver and his Office of Economic Opportunity. The question I ask then, is why? Why does this war evoke such a peculiar response? Would a war against any other enemy have the same effect? To reduce auto casualties? To halt heart attacks?

I do not know the answer, but I have a suspicion or two.

Could it be that this war, having to do with poverty, produces an emotional reaction in us all that reflects our personal and national attitude toward the state of poverty itself—the condition of poverty? Is it possible that the American people suffer from a "poverty anxiety" without knowing it? Certainly the antipathy toward the war on poverty is not due to a stinginess in the nature of Americans.

Repeatedly through national welfare programs, international plans and acts of mercy and restoration, this country has demonstrated the must munificent spirit in the chronicle of man. To be sure, some of our citizens are indifferent, some are callous. There are some whose interests are vested in the poverty cycle; there are some who profit from the misery and ignorance and fear of the destitute—but the great majority of Americans, I am convinced, would be happy to see poverty eradicated. What then is their problem? Why the hostility and opposition?

Perhaps a hint of the cause can be found in a letter I received recently suggesting that my office take a more positive approach to the public; that we stop talking so much about poverty and talk more about opportunity because, the writer said, people are disturbed by all this talk of poverty. Exactly. We are disturbed by it. It vaguely disturbs us. It threatens us. Poverty, with its bitter connotations and anxieties, is a painful part of the national memory. Most of us came from poverty, and some of us quite recently. We have our roots in poverty.

As immigrants, we left the poverty of the old country for the poverty of the colonies, the poverty of the frontier, the poverty of the farms and cities and city slum. Then, cruelly, just as we were sloughing off our poverty and beginning to experience prosperity, the depression made us poor again. We've had our share of poverty and its been enough. We can't be blamed for not wanting our noses rubbed in it. For not wanting to hear that there are 35 million people who are still locked in desperate straits. We can't be blamed for developing attitudes which help us escape from both the reality and the causes of poverty. "The poor are dumb; the poor are inferior; the poor enjoy their poverty; the poor are dangerous; the poor cannot be helped."

We can't be blamed for the engineering and architectural conspiracy that has hidden the poor from us under freeways, in slums, on [illegible] roads and behind housing units. [illegible]t be blamed for turning poverty over [illegible]ocial workers and welfare agencies. [illegible]hsome stench and sound and sight [illegible] is a nostalgia we can't do without. [illegible]be blamed. Or can we?

[illegible]tional state of malaise is bearable [illegible]s we can ease our conscience by [illegible]wledge that part of our tax dollar goes to welfare. We can master our guilt as long as we give to the United Fund or deliver a grocery basket at Christmas. But when an all-out attack is mounted and a proud and prosperous nation is traumatized by the pulling back of an ugly scab to reveal an even uglier sore—when in short, the anatomy of our Nation is not as free from disease and blemish as we have been taught, and in turn taught our children to believe—then it is predictable and not surprising if our reactions are extreme.

We are just learning to relax and enjoy our new prosperity—and suddenly comes the President with his concern and his legislative programs. And now comes the Congress with the Economic Opportunity Act and its "it is the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty." And here comes Shriver and his poverty bores and their figures and facts and pictures and stories and plans and causes: Headstart, Upward Bound, Job Corps, Community Action, VISTA; all designed to remind the Nation that its incomparable success is not without failure and that the one luxury that a prosperous people dare not indulge is the luxury of an insensitive conscience.

Misunderstanding, guilt, fear, suspicion, resentment, insecurity—these, and not the press—these, and certainly not the American citizen, are the real obstacles to a successful conducting and winning of the struggle for equal economic opportunity. And these traits and attitudes, unworthy of a great people and of the news profession, are I fear, the emotional and mental blocks that really threaten this most civilized of all civilized undertakings. These are the root causes of the opposition, the only explanation of a hostility incongruous and contrary to the American nature. I believe that a poverty anxiety does exist in the Nation.

But what is it that I am asking you to commit yourselves to? And what assurance can I give you that the poverty battle is a sound, practical, and hard-headed strategy? Assurance enough. This program is as sound as the premise it is built on, and that premise is not less than the American free enterprise system. If the system of free enterprise has lifted 170 million people out of poverty, it follows that this is the best possible method of lifting up the other 35 million. And while little has been made of it, this is precisely the thesis on which the Office of Economic Opportunity proceeds.

The whole poverty effort is sensitively geared to the economy—the stronger and healthier that economy becomes, the greater the possibility for a successful conclusion of the war on poverty. Frankly, if that economy should falter or suffer a setback, quick revisions would have to be made in our present program. Not only the program itself, but the methodology of the program as well, constitute a vote of confidence in the free enterprise system.

OEO is not attempting to manipulate that system. To the contrary. OEO is rather directing its attention to those people who have fallen out of that system or who have never been a part of it. There are 35 million of them. Half of these are children and minors. They must be reached early in life and educated and prepared to enter the mainstream of productive living. For these children we have planned Headstart, day care nurseries, clinics, food programs.

A significant number of them are teenage boys and girls. For them we have Job Corps, Work Experience, Neighborhood Youth Corps, work-study programs, and Upward Bound. The largest part of the OEO dollar is concentrated on the 50 percent who are children or teenagers. This is long-range planning for sure, but in my opinion it is sensible planning. So obvious is the need for breaking the poverty cycle at this point that I believe that if anyone were entrusted, be he liberal or conservative, with the designing of a program to combat poverty in America, he would come forward with the priority that the program begin with the youth of the land. But there are programs for adults too.

All of the central policies of OEO are grounded in reason and practicality. One of the most common criticisms that we receive concerns the participation of the poor on community action boards. What better way to learn the needs of the poor than to ask the poor themselves?

What better way to motivate the poor than to give them the incentives of participation and leadership? For the man who says, "If the poor had anything to offer, they wouldn't be poor," I reply with an invitation for that man to sit in on board meetings where the poor are beginning to find their voices—beginning to tell us how they too have resented handouts and paternalism. How they have been gutted with the shame of dependence upon welfare checks. How they have waited long for a time when someone would listen to them and give them a chance to recapture their dignity and declare their desires—to stand erect, carry their own load, provide for their families and become, in President Johnson's word, "Taxpayers instead of taxeaters."

What do the poor want? They want what everybody else wants. The same kind of security, and the same kind of challenge. They want the same number of children that the middle class man wants or the upper class man. They want the same chance to learn and the same chance to express their talents and their creativity. in short, the poor want opportunity, economic and every other kind of opportunity.

And it is the determination of the President and the Congress and of the OEO to give them a toehold on that opportunity.

What we are attempting is both reasonable and right—it is a thoroughly civilized thing, but more than that, the poverty war represents one of the great moral breakthroughs in the contemporary world. At last, after too many wars, we are beginning to recognize our real enemy. When the President declined to sacrifice the war on poverty to the war in Vietnam, he was revealing a wisdom which I hope will soon become obvious to every schoolchild. He was saying, "It's all the same war, waged on two different fronts."

The policy of the United States to eliminate poverty in the midst of plenty is as civilized as it is unprecedented. It constitutes the discovery and development of a whole new dimension in man's historic struggle for purpose and dignity. It is a new front in the old war—the only front and the only kind of combat that makes sense in today's world. Only as this war on this front is escalated, will tragic wars on other fronts subside. Only as this long war is pursued with determination and success, will America fulfill the promise of her beginnings and secure the right to opportunity for all her people.

Ladies and gentlemen of the press, in this as in any war, you can play a strategic if not determinative role. No one wants you to silence your guns. Your reporting, your criticism, can be helpful. But please, gentlemen, elevate your artillery.

The enemy is out there. Zero in on poverty. And if, by zeroing in on the target you should define that target to the public, you will have performed a service that you and only you can perform. Zero in on poverty. Prove, to yourselves first if necessary, and then to your readers, that the enemy does exist, that poverty is as cruel and as ugly and as menacing as has been reported—but that it can be conquered. And if in so proving you help us as a people to face up to ourselves, our fears and suspicions and guilt, you will have contributed not only to the passing of a horror and the inauguration of a better day, you will have assisted a nation toward maturity and health.

Statement by Judge J. Earl Major

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the January 1966, edition of the American Bar Association Journal there appeared an article on mandatory retirement of Federal judges written by J. Earl Major, senior judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Due to increasing interest in this matter, I believe Judge Major's article would be of interest to my colleagues.

His statement follows:

In the mid-1940's I attended the Judicial Conference of the United States as a substitute for the late Chief Judge Evan A. Evans, of the Seventh Circuit, and I was appalled at the decrepit condition of some of its members, lovable old men as they were, with distinguished records on the bench. At that time a judge became chief judge and a member of the judicial conference solely through seniority. What I learned on that occasion made me resolve to retire at the first opportunity. This resolution was strengthened and confirmed by my association with and observation of the judiciary in the years that followed.

In 1954 I voluntarily relinquished chief judgeship of the Seventh Circuit and, on March 23, 1956, at the age of 69 and while in good health, I voluntarily retired. It is interesting to note that Congress finally took cognizance of the unwholesome situation resulting from the age factor as it pertains to chief judges and provided, effective August 6, 1958, that no judge should be or become a chief judge after attaining the age of 70.

After more than 30 years on the Federal bench, almost the last 10 years in retirement, I suggest, as I did on numerous occasions during my active service, that retirement be made mandatory at age 70 (65 would be better). This discussion has to do with only the inferior Federal courts, as a different constitutional question may arise insofar as the U.S. Supreme Court is concerned.

I realize from experience that advocacy of compulsory retirement is not the high road to popularity. Too often some aging brother imagines that he is the target, which is a false notion because my proposal relates not only to those now eligible to retire but to all others who, if they live long enough, are certain to become eligible.

Article III, section 1, of the United States Constitution provides:

> The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior, and shall ,at stated times, receive for their services, a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

Thus, the Supreme Court is a creature of the Constitution and all other Federal courts, designated as "inferior courts," are ordained and established by Congress. The sole constitutional protection afforded Federal judges is that they "shall hold their offices during good behavior" and that they shall receive for their services "a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office."

Title 28, United States Code, section 371(b) provides: "Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior may retain his office but retire from regular active service after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years continuously or otherwise, or after attaining the age of 65 years and after serving at least 15 years continuously or otherwise. He shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary of the office. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a successor to a justice or judge who retires."

In *Booth* v. *United States*, 291 U.S. 339, 350 (1934), the Supreme Court in discussing this provision states:

> "By retiring pursuant to the statute a judge does not relinquish his office. The language is that he may retire from regular active service. The purpose is, however, that he shall continue, so far as his age and his health permit, to perform judicial service, and it is common knowledge that retired judges have, in fact, discharged a large measure of the duties which would be incumbent on them, if still in regular active service. He does not surrender his commission, but continues to act under it. He loses his seniority in office, but that fact, in itself, attests that he remains in office."

So far as I am aware, Congress has made this generous proposal to no other class of officeholders. To be a retired judge and remain a judge, without severance of the employment relationship and with the constitutional guarantee of no diminution in compensation, is a status unknown to others.

The fact is that, in ordinary parlance or by any dictionary definition, the word "retired" as used with respect to a Federal judge is a misnomer.

After retirement he acquires, while retaining his office, the rare privilege of working or not as he chooses. This must be the nearest approach to utopia yet devised. Contrast his situation with that of millions of employees, in Government service as well as in private employment, compelled to retire generally at 65, to sever all relationship with their jobs and to spend their remaining days with retirement benefits they helped create and that usually are no more than a fraction of the compensation they received while employed.

I have never heard a valid reason why a judge should not voluntarily retire when eligible, but many excuses are offered, usually based on self-interest, with little regard for the courts' welfare. In my younger and bolder days, I often asked a judge, "Why don't you retire?" One judge, more than 80 years old, stated that he was holding on in order to protect his longtime law clerk, who at 60 was too old to get another job; another stated that he would not retire because he enjoyed the prestige of being a judge; one told me it was rumored that so-and-so would be appointed to his place and he did not intend to permit that; and another refused to retire because his wife's position in society would be jeopardized.

Some stay because of the unfounded fear that good men will not be found to take their places, and others refuse to retire until their own political party comes to power. The excuse perhaps most often heard and the most feeble is, "I don't know what I would do if I retired." A better excuse would be, "I am afraid to retire lest I be called upon to do too much work." I can testify that a retired judge who is willing must early learn to say "no" to some of the many requests he will receive. Otherwise, he will have no leisure time.

No doubt the main congressional purpose in enacting the liberal retirement provision was to induce judges to retire voluntarily, but the record shows that they seldom do. I know that the decision is a tough one to make, and it is ironical that the judge, with his self-interest, is the only person who can make it. It is perhaps the only decision made during his judicial career in which he is an interested party.

When Mr. Justice Stanley Reed retired from the Supreme Court, he was asked why. He was quoted as stating, with much commonsense, "I am retiring simply because I am 72 years old." I have often been asked why I retired. In the first place, I realized that I had reached or was closely approaching the time when I could not carry my former load. Moreover, I had long advocated compulsory retirement and considered that I was morally obligated to do voluntarily what I thought all judges should be required by law to do. I had a strong feeling that after 20 years it was for the good of the court that I step aside and make room for a younger person.

Subsequent events confirm the soundness of that decision. I have the great satisfaction of knowing that my successor, John S. Hastings, has done a far greater amount of work than I could have done had I remained an active member.

There is a marked contrast between the duties of a judge in active and in retired status. The former is ever under pressure; the latter may work at his pleasure. Many of my assignments have been to Florida and other southern points, and I admit it is no mere coincidence that most of them have been during the winter months. Through the kindness of the chief judge and other members of my own court, I occasionally sit with them. When I do, I am assigned 3 or 4 cases in which to write opinions—sometimes an easy case, but not often. With the briefs and records I return to the country, where the environment is more suitable to my way of life, with the comforting thought that I am not crowded for time.

I have read the complete record in more cases since I retired than ever before. After familiarizing myself with the briefs and the record, if I am in doubt, as I usually am, I repair to the garden for about 2 hours with hoe in hand. Here I commune with nature, cut a few weeds, consider the issues and resolve the doubt. I suppose that an opinion resulting from this process might be characterized as of the garden variety. Even so, worse things could be said. Moreover, this process need not be employed by all retired judges, as each is free to proceed according to his own bent.

A report filed June 1, 1965, by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, entitled "A study of the Federal Judicial System," is pertinent. Near the conclusion is a paragraph headed "Retirement Status of U.S. District and Circuit Judges." The report states: "When the need for additional judges is considered, attention must be directed to the number of district and circuit judges eligible for retirement as of December 31, 1964." After pointing out that as of the date mentioned there were 60 judges eligible to retire, the report concludes: "In other words, it is possible that 60 new district and circuit judges could be added to the Federal judiciary immediately without the necessity of additional legislation." Thus, the committee recognizes the problem but suggests no remedy. Compulsory retirement is the only solution.

It has been argued that compulsory retirement would deprive the courts of the services of experienced judges. Those who so argue are prone to call the roll of names of a score of men who have rendered distinguished service to their country, some long after they reached 70. It must be remembered, however, that these men are rare exceptions to the universal rule that men at that age have reached the point (or soon will) when they are on the downgrade. The complete answer to this argument is that a judge, if willing, can render the same service after retirement as he did while active.

It has been asserted, without any logical basis, that compulsory retirement would be unconstitutional because a judge loses his right to seniority and the authority to perform judicial duties in his own district except on assignment by the chief judge. Both these provisions are enactments of Congress, the creator of the inferior courts, which possesses a broad power over their operation and activities. Neither provision impinges upon their constitutional rights relative to tenure and salary; in fact, such rights are expressly safeguarded in the retirement provision.

It is doubtful if section 294(d) is applicable to retired judges. It has been held that a retired judge needs no assignment to sit on his own court. There is no reason, however, to extend the discussion on this point because, assuming that an assignment is required, as in my opinion it should be, no constitutional question is involved; it is no more than a limitation that Congress is empowered to impose.

During the past fiscal year (my ninth in retirement) I wrote 14 opinions (13 for my own court and 1 for the ninth circuit). If the 60 judges eligible to retire had done so, it is reasonable to assume that they would have rendered at least an equal amount of service, or the equivalent of 840 opinions, in 1 year. Even more important, as my own experience shows, younger men appointed as their successors on the average would render a greatly increased amount of service.

In my judgment, compulsory retirement would sharply increase the manpower of the Federal courts without legal harm to judges now eligible to retire or to those who will become eligible, thereby diminishing, if not obviating, the need for additional judgeships.

McGeorge Bundy: The End of an Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 27, 1966]

MCGEORGE BUNDY: THE END OF AN ERA

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

It is, as they say, the end of an era. Tomorrow when Mac Bundy leaves, the last of the Kennedy White House will have gone. We were, for better or worse, a distinctive group. Kennedy always wanted to bring together the world of power and the world of ideas, and he turned more systematically than any other President to the universities. Bundy suited his theory and his needs perfectly.

The dean of the faculty of arts and sciences at Harvard combined the wide-ranging and imaginative mind of a professional intellectual with the instinct for hard judgment of an administrator who had become a top lion in the academic jungle. I think, too, it amused the President to enlist a man who was not only a Boston Brahmin by a representative of the Stimson-Lovett-McCloy mob in New York, for which Democratic Presidents have always had an amiable weakness.

Bundy, at once so spirited and so realistic, fitted superbly into Kennedy's mode of operation. He knew everybody, feared nobody, respected the President's power of decision, stated each side of an argument better than the protagonists and was always cool, swift, lucid, precise, and funny. He had, too, the indestructible personal vitality Kennedy enjoyed so much. Nothing seems to tire him. It used to madden Mike Forrestal and me, hardly able after a late night to drag ourselves to his morning staff meetings, to watch Bundy, who had been working or relaxing as long as we had and, in addition, had played an hour of tennis before breakfast, bounce into the room, pink-faced and merry, emitting a rapid fire of bulletins, instructions, questions, and jokes.

Not everyone liked Bundy. He was very charming and very tough. People resented his air of confidence and impregnability and thought him cold and ambitious. Though warm and thoughtful in private relations, he could be ice in official contacts, and his wit sometimes declined into sarcasm in dealings with the press and the public. Like his mentors in the New York establishment, he united his commitment to public service with an evident appetite for power.

But these traits, real or fancied, hardly decreased his effectiveness. He served two Presidents brilliantly and faithfully, giving them the assistance they needed to retain their personal control over foreign and defense policy in the age when policy out of control could mean the end of the world. He brought them a wider range of alternatives than the traditional departments were ready to propose, a trenchant and fertile intelligence and a deep sense of responsibility to history. He was a great public servant.

Trend Disturbs Friends Pastor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was born and raised a member of the Society of Friends, generally called Quakers, and of this I am very proud. In recent months I have become quite concerned over some rather controversial statements and proposals by members of that church, and organizations within the church. Some few of these members who are especially vocal brag of being Marxists and make proposals that at least border on treason.

Quakers, like all denominations, have room in their ranks for dissent and differing opinions. In fact, there is no religious group that gives more encouragement to a member to follow the dictates of his individual conscience than do Quakers. The Friends Church is in no sense a monolithic structure and no one member, no matter how vocal, nor no one Quaker organization, no matter how well-known, can possibly speak for all of us.

Rev. Frank Surber, pastor of the Amo, Ind. Evangelical Friends Church, has made that very clear in a letter to the editor of the Indianapolis News, which appeared in that paper on February 21, 1966. I wish to commend him for his letter, I do not question those whose conscience causes them to pursue other courses, but I am sure his sentiments are much closer to those held by the great majority of American Quakers today than those held by some who have used the media of the press, radio, television and other public forums, as well as demonstrations, to make their views known to the world:

Trend Disturbs Friends Pastor

To the Editor of the News:

Due to the recent proclamation from segments of the Society of Friends (Quaker) Organization, as mentioned in Ross Hermann's column, "U.S. Foreign Aid to Red China," on January 11, we, the people of the Amo Meeting of Friends, wish to state and clarify that all members of Friends churches do not agree with the present trend of our fellow church members. We believe:

Each individual must follow the dictates of his own conscience in the matter of bearing arms. Should a person feel he could not kill the enemy, he could protect his right to the freedom of worship by aiding the wounded or by serving in one of the many other jobs necessary to assist the fighting men. We oppose draft card burners who show their lack of appreciation for the rights which were purchased by the lives of their dedicated forefathers.

We also believe and feel it should be understood that the United States has at no time fired upon another country unless the free world first has been fired upon.

We believe not necessarily the views of the President, but that he has been elected by the people and while he holds this position should expect the support of the people. We, the Amo Evangelical Friends Church, plead with fellow Christians to support in prayer and in work the fulfillment of free democracy supporting whoever the people's choice might be, and if in disagreement do something about it on election day. Do not be like the henpecked husband, keeping your mouth shut when you should speak and speaking when you should keep your mouth shut.

We oppose the peace marches and other demonstrations which are mainly inspired and provoked into being by Communist leaders who step out of view once the riot has been incited. (Reference: Readers Digest, January 1966, "Behind Those Campus Demonstrations," by Eugene H. Methvin.)

We are aware that Communists are infiltrating influential organizations and that religious groups are vulnerable to those pleading for peace. We are disturbed with the views of a few segments of our organization and do not wish to be considered a supporter of such actions. After discussing these issues with members of a large number of other churches, we find them also sympathetic to this letter.

Peaceful coexistence is impossible with peoples who know no peace in their hearts. If you attempt to feed a rattlesnake, you surely expect to get bitten.

We wish to warn fellow Christians that communism can and is being mistaken as Christianism. Through innocence you may find yourself supporting and aiding the Communists by literally tearing away the patriotic fibers of this Nation. Are you doing as much for your Nation as you are doing for other nations? No one under constant criticism can be successful, not even the President of the United States.

"Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's": Matthew 22: 21.

Frank Surber,
Pastor, Amo Evangelical Friends Church.
Amo.

Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Albert Thomas leaves a void in this House that can hardly be filled. He served for 30 years, and his presence here cast a long shadow over this Chamber. He was honored and respected by all who knew him.

To me I feel that I have lost a personal friend. Indeed few men who have served in this body could count quite as many friends among colleagues as was true with Albert. His friendly, pleasant, and positive attitude served to command a following and wield an influence on the issues of the day.

Albert was a very knowledgeable man. He was an expert in many fields. He did his homework well, and good reason to armed with facts and good reason to support his position. His colleagues learned they could depend upon his judgment and upon his recitation of facts which related to an issue.

It was upon this record of ability, integrity, and sincerety that Albert built an enviable reputation in this body. He became widely recognized as one of the most effective and powerful legislators who has served here in many years.

To the family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Patriotism Found in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Southwest Messenger Press, an independent newspaper chain serving southwest suburban Cook County, in its February 24 issue inspired its readers with a very timely and effective patriotic message which I place in the Record at this point:

Patriotism Found in History

For a definition of the word patriotism one should not go to a dictionary, but rather to an American history book. From the shores of Tripoli to the sands of Iwo Jima, from George Washington to General MacArthur the pages are brimming with deeds of patriotism.

The fathers of our country were restless. They had the blood of freedom flowing through their veins. They became the bankers, the merchants, shipbuilders, farmers, and blacksmiths. Inspired by Washington's courage, they forged on, despite the never-ending hardships, to ultimate victory. A victory that will not easily be forgotten. Truly this must have been patriotism.

What was in Americans that made them continually stand up for their country during wars and conflicts? Patriotism. What preserved our country during two world wars? Patriotism. Why is our country an oasis of freedom? Patriotism. What will keep our country together? Patriotism. This is the challenge as President Kennedy put it, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

We should make a pledge of allegiance to our country by leading lives of sincere dedication to country and active service of others. Each of us has a clear call to patriotism. For some of us it simply may be to prepare ourselves for tomorrow's competitive and complicated world. For if our country wishes to succeed the leaders, scientists, professors, etc., must keep on coming.

To do this we all must learn to know and love our country. To know it we must become a part of it. This doesn't necessarily mean for us to go out and run for office. But we should form our own opinions on public issues and participate in civic affairs. For instance we could become a part of the many civic clubs and youth programs in our Nation. We should read the papers and learn all we can about our community, Nation, and important issues. We should also gain a knowledge of our country's history for the past shapes the future.

To prove our love for it we must be self-sacrificing and ready to help her in time of need. We will never be too young to help our country. Youth is not made for pleasure but for heroism.

Too often we think of our work as above us or below us. We fall into the class of do nothings. How many of us are doing something about the slums in our city, or dropouts in schools?

We have been granted many freedoms, but if we wish to keep them cherished in our hearts and those of future Americans, we must have a sense of responsibility to our Government.

Let America's finest hour be when her problems won't be problems because of her countrymen's effort for a better world.

A New Bid To Sink the Drug Pirates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a recent column written for the Chicago Daily News by Mr. John M. Johnston places into perspective the problem of the U.S. Government purchasing products from foreign firms which have pirated U.S. patents or production techniques.

Mr. Johnston's column follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News]

A New Bid To Sink the Drug Pirates

(By John M. Johnston)

Back in 1960, when the late Senator Estes Kefauver was trying to get the drug industry to hold still while he fitted it for a pillory, he sternly forbade any nasty cracks about Italian pharmaceutical manufacturers at the hearings. Lyman Duncan, general manager of American Cyanamide's Lederle Laboratories, had referred to some Italian competitors as "a nest of pirates."

Any such conclusions would have run counter to Senator Kefauver's thesis, which was that unjustified prices by American drugmakers were robbing the people, whose friend and protector he was and hoped ever to remain.

The Senator's position is still shared in other Government circles, which consider foreign drugs a bargain. Senator Harrison A. Williams, Democrat, of New Jersey, is trying to block such purchases by a law that would prohibit the Government from buying drugs made in violation of patents.

The total of such Government purchases has been placed at upwards of $27 million, although as far back as 1962, Dr. Edward Annis, president of the American Medical Association, was complaining of Defense Department purchases of tetracycline in Italy after it was known that the cultures from which this antibiotic was made were stolen in the United States.

Well, time and events grind on, and a few days ago a U.S. court in New York handed out prison sentences to six men involved in the multimillion-dollar conspiracy by which trusted employees of Lederle sold manufacturing secrets and "wonder drug" cultures to Italian firms.

Lederle asserted that it spent more than $30 million in the development of tetracycline and other antibiotics. It cost additional millions to design and perfect the production facilities. It is not astonishing that a manufacturer who could buy all this know-how from thieves for $100,000 could and did undersell American manufacturers and earn the praise of Senator Kefauver.

The Defense Department is free of blame for its purchases of foreign drugs. It is bound by a 1958 ruling of the Comptroller General that drugs for the military and veterans hospitals must be bought for the lowest possible price, patent pirating being none of its business.

The "wonder drugs" involved were Aureomycin, Achrómycin, and Declomycin—all of the tetracycline family—and Aristocort, a steroid used to treat arthritis. The tetracyclines are used against bacterial diseases—pneumonia, typhus, meningitis, gonorrhea, and are said to be the most widely prescribed drugs in the world.

The present Congress will see another attempt to pass Senator Williams' bill to forbid Government purchase of products made from pirated U.S. patents or production techniques. Representative R. L. Roudebush, Republican, of Indiana, points out that such thefts have caused losses in the tens of millions to U.S. pharmaceutical companies, in addition to lost wages and lost taxes to State and Federal Governments.

Efforts have been made, particularly since formation of the Common Market, to persuade the Italians to join in the patent protection generally afforded for such discoveries. Self-interest has kept them aloof, although some Italian concerns, having some developments of their own, have indicated that they might like protection.

Until there is international respect for such property rights, it is clear that U.S. self-interest lies in the direction of the Harrison-Roudebush bill.

Investment in Federal Reclamation Is Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Sacramento Bee cites the progress of Federal reclamation projects in the Western States and rightfully calls them sound investments.

The editorial points out that nearly 90 percent of the total Federal investment in reclamation projects in 17 Western States will eventually be returned to the Federal Treasury from revenues received for electric power and water.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Feb. 21, 1966]

INVESTMENT IN FEDERAL RECLAMATION IS SOUND

The significant role large multipurpose Federal water projects have played in building the West was illustrated by a recent announcement by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall. He pointed out the contracts under which water and power users repay the Government for their share of construction costs have passed the $1.5 billion mark.

The good faith of the beneficiaries of these projects has been demonstrated clearly because the delinquency rate under the contracts is less than one-half of 1 percent. The contracts are with water user districts, individual farmers, cities and industries and they number more than 2,000.

The range from the largest single water contract with the Westlands Water District in California—where the $157 million cost of building an entire irrigation system will be repaid—to a small farmer in Oregon who is paying off $428 as his share of the building of the Klamath project.

Federal investment in reclamation projects in 17 Western States has reached $5.1 billion. Nearly 90 percent of the total eventually will be returned to the Federal Treasury from revenues received for electric power and water. The facilities for municipal and industrial water will be repaid in full with interest.

Electric power, mostly distributed by public power systems, has been a paying partner of irrigation during the 60-year history of the Federal reclamation program. Alex Radin of the American Public Power Association in a recent speech in Kansas City, Mo., reminded listeners that Federal reclamation investment represents a two-way street with benefits traveling both ways.

Another observer, Reclamation Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy, commenting on the fact that 90 cents out of every dollar invested is returned, had this to say: "No other resource development agency can show such a cash-on-the-barrelhead return."

These facts must be kept in mind as debate continues over proposals to build more Federal water projects. The economic well-being which westerners enjoy can be attributed directly to the existence of the great water and power developments pioneered by the Federal Reclamation Bureau.

As the West continues to expand, future projects will play an equally important part in maintaining a vigorous and stable economic growth.

Tax Scheme To Milk the Large Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, the Honorable Richard O. Creedon, member of the Indiana House of Representatives, has taken exception to a recent tax distribution plan for education.

Mr. Creedon, in a letter to me, notes quite properly that the plan is a scheme to milk the large cities.

Because of the light which Mr. Creedon's letter sheds on the real effect of this tax distribution plan, I insert it in the Congressional Record:

Hon. Andrew Jacobs, Jr.,
Representative, 11th District, Indiana,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: On the 29th of January I asked you for a copy of the Congressional Record of January 24, 1966, containing the tax distribution plan for education as proposed by Representative Hall, Republican, of Missouri.

My comment at that time is on the bottom of the photocopy of the article that I sent to you where I said I was sure that this was a scheme to milk the large cities. It is.

His whole plan is set out on page 853 of the January 24, 1966, issue of the Congressional Record and I decided to do some arithmetic.

In the first year table, page 853, column 1, the State figures are divided by 12.07 to arrive at the number of students.

On page 856 chart No. 2 shows gross personal income and estimated expenditures for public elementary and secondary education as well as per capita personal income for the particular States.

Using the table for the first year on page 853, I compared Indiana and Mississippi and arrived at the number of students for the respective States. My arithmetic is that Indiana has 1.9 times as many students or 190 percent the number of students that Mississippi has.

Mississippi (chart 2) spends 5.34 percent of personal income for elementary and secondary education as prepared to Indiana figure of 4.87, which means that Indiana on a percentage of income basis spends 8.5 percent less.

However, our per capita income is 1.8 times as much as the per capita income of Mississippi.

On a dollar basis, Indiana spends $540.40 per student as compared to $383.70 or 40 percent more per student than does Mississippi.

If you go back to the 5-year charts and take the total received per State per student for each of the 5 years, Indiana under this plan would receive $365.65, per student whereas Mississippi would receive $383.65.

On a dollar basis Mississippi receives $18 per student more or Indiana receives $18 less when we spend $156.70 more or 40 percent more than Mississippi and we receive percentagewise 4 percent less on a dollar basis.

This sounds like a scheme to milk the large cities. I think I'm right.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD O. CREEDON,
State Representative, Marion County.

Aggression Is Hanoi's Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is almost incredible that after 25 years of watching Communist strategy, that anyone can say that the North Vietnamese are only seeking independence from Vietnam and that we are frustrating that goal. Is there anyone who seriously doubts what would happen if we allowed the Vietcong and their Hanoi masters to take over South Vietnam? There is no question in my mind that the people in South Vietnam would immediately find themselves in the same nationwide prison camp presently holding the people of North Vietnam and China.

The following article by Seymour Freidin from the February 19, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune tells the story of Hanoi's aggression against the south:

AGGRESSION, NOT INDEPENDENCE, IS HANOI'S GOAL

(By Seymour Freidin)

SAIGON.—Only a frayed street sign welcoming Vice President HUMPHREY hangs limply as a reminder of the boisterous jet-borne caravan that whizzed around southeast Asia to proclaim the American intention to hang on in Vietnam. But a new sense of urgency has been gathered from the vapor trails.

A test of American stamina and North Vietnamese intentions opens a fresh phase in this ferocious war. It involves a presidential behest to get results fast and the Communist expansionist appetite.

It seems more tangibly apparent now that the regime of Ho Chi Minh is embarked on a vastly ambitious project. The Northern regime sees all southeast Asia as its own real estate in the foreseeable future.

This can be implemented only by armed force and by withdrawal of a confused and uneasy United States. The initiative comes from the north without any meaningful pushes by Red China.

It may come as a shock to many to learn that wispybearded, benevolent-looking Ho is by no means senile. He is the take-charge commander of a policy long ago examined for loopholes, plugged and now being executed.

His political and military entourage may differ occasionally on tactics. But there is unanimity on the strategic goal: shotgun amalgamation of all Vietnam and then, southeast Asia. That explains the contemptuous treatment of all peace initiatives and anguished pleas of sympathizers with the north.

Thus, the speculation that the Red Chinese will intervene if we augment both our armed strength and economic contribution appears unfounded.

Red China never had to compel North Vietnamese to build and expand their guerrilla infrastructure in the south. The Chinese had little whatever to do with the buildup of the Vietcong and it political arm. The north, its cadres blooded in battle and victory against the French, worked out its own plans and timetable for chopping up the south.

This blatant aggressiveness has been totally overlooked by those, many in so-called uncommitted countries, who hail Ho as an Asian Tito. Their proclamation of Communist-supported independence runs into a dead end on the Ho Chi Minh trail.

Tito, remember, made a working peace with the West when he was pitted against Stalin. He has, with ups and downs, made of it enduring coexistence. There was never a serious Titoist adventure in expansionism once he decided to impose his image on Yugoslavia.

It's a far different story with North Vietnam. Hanoi, flushed with the mystique of Dien Bien Phu, is actively engaged in imposing its will on its neighbors. Laos and Thailand are prima facie cases along with the carefully contrived mass subversion in South Vietnam.

Only the southerners and the United States stand in the way of this vast and arrogant ambition, which has been checked but still far from shackled. In a present regrouping period, Ho has unleashed mass terrorism against civilians to prove to the south at large that fearful penalties can be exacted if acquiescence cannot be extorted.

Last week pressure mines, powerful enough to blast our tanks, blew up a couple of buses. The death toll was 49 civilians and children. It happened on a dusty route never used by the military.

This cold-blooded act of terrorism has been duplicated in work gangs, blown to pieces because they tried to earn a living repairing some port facilities. A pattern of widespread, calculated terror, directed by North Vietnam, is beginning to stretch fearsome fingers across this torn-up country.

To counteract a cynical indifference to human dignity and even survival—which critics of our role here display no less than Ho himself—the process of pacification requires time, trial, and patience. Unfortunately, political ballyhoo may prevent us from achieving our objective: security on which Vietnamese can build hope.

If the administration anticipates shining results by mid-year elections, then the massive effort that will be applied to this program may ring as hollowly as any other politilacal stunt. Too much is at stake for impatience and electioneering. The other side desperately wants to husband time and so should we.

Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, with profound sorrow I join my colleagues in expressing our grief over the loss of our Chaplain, Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

He was a great force for good in our midst and all of us are better for having known him. He was full of sympathetic and generous impulses toward us, and all mankind, and he will not be forgotten by any of us who served here with him.

We mourn his passing as a cherished member of our family circle, and I wish to join my friends and colleagues in expressing my great esteem for our friend and spiritual leader.

Mission Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the mission of Vice President HUMPHREY is hailed by the Houston Post, which asserted that the purpose of his trip was "to reassure the leaders and people of the nations that remain free in that part of the world that the United States is not going to run out on them or renege on its promises to help them keep their freedom and independence."

According to the Post, the Vice President's trip was designed "to counter the harm done by noisy critics of this country's Vietnam policies and actions, Communist propaganda which pictures the American people on the point of revolt and demanding the withdrawal of this country's military forces from Vietnam, and possible misunderstandings over the fact that the United States is waging a peace offensive simultaneously with its military operations to aid the Government of South Vietnam."

The newspaper believes the Vice President is communicating, and while it is important and desirable that everybody understand our views, policies, plans, and intentions, "it is vital that they be understood by the people who are directly involved and who stand within the shadow of Communist aggression."

I offer this forthright comment in its entirety for the RECORD, convinced that others will want to study its contents.

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 15, 1966]

HUMPHREY MISSION VITAL

If there ever was any question about the purpose of Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY's Asian mission, it is clear now that it is to reassure the leaders and people of the nations that remain free in that part of the world that the United States is not going to run out on them or renege on its promises to help them keep their freedom and independence.

He is seeking to counter the harm done by noisy critics of this country's Vietnam policies and actions, Communist propaganda which pictures the American people on the point of revolt and demanding the withdrawal of this country's military forces from Vietnam, and possible misunderstandings over the fact that the United States is waging a peace offensive simultaneously with its military operations to aid the Government of South Vietnam.

Because of his ebullient personality and infectious enthusiasm, the Vice President is unusually well qualified for this assignment. It remains to be seen how effective he will be as reassurer and morale reinforcer, but it is doubtful if President Johnson could have dispatched a better man for this particular job. Because the Vice President speaks with the authority of the President, it is hoped that his words will be convincing.

His assignment is most interesting, however, in that it shows the extent to which the office of Vice President has undergone a radical change within a very few years. Within the memory of most people, the Vice President of the United States was simply the man who presided over the Senate and succeeded to the presidency when and if a vacancy should occur.

The trend toward making him an active member of the administration in office by expanding his duties and responsibilities was started by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. President John F. Kennedy continued the policy. In neither case were the special assignments given the Vice President limited to the area of domestic affairs. Vice President Richard M. Nixon was sent on missions abroad, acting as special emissary and representative of the President, and so was President Johnson when he was Vice President.

In fact, President Johnson made a trip to southeast Asia comparable to that of Vice President HUMPHREY, in 1961, and when the spirits of West Berliners showed signs of sagging following construction of the wall by the Communists through the heart of their city, he was sent there to reassure the free German people.

Even if these foreign missions served no other purpose, they would be desirable as part of the educational process for Vice Presidents, to prepare them better for the duties of the Presidency if they should ever be called upon to assume them and to assure continuity of policies.

The Humphrey mission therefore would be desirable and worthwhile, even if there was no problem of morale and confidence. From all acounts the Vice President is doing an able job. At least he is communicating, and in view of all the clouds of confusion swirling over the world at this time, this is of great importance. It is important and desirable that everybody understand the views, policies, plans and intentions of the Government in Washington, with respect to Asia and to southeast Asia in particular, but it is vital that they be understood by the people who are directly involved and who stand within the shadow of Communist aggression.

The One-Man, One-Vote Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the dynamic and forward-looking 13th District Democratic Organization of Michigan urging full implementation of the one-man, one-vote principle:

RESOLUTION MADE AT THE 16TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION

Whereas there are unwise attempts being made to alter the principle of one man, one vote, as stated by the U.S. Supreme Court; and

Whereas the one-man, one-vote principle is basic to the American concept of democracy; and

Whereas the vote of one person should be equal to the vote of any citizen; and

Whereas any constitutional amendment diluting the equality of the vote of some citizens is an attack upon the principle that "all men are created equal," as stated in the Declaration of Independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Michigan 16th Congressional District Democratic Organization go on record in favor of the full implementation of the one-man, one-vote concept, and opposed to any action which might alter this fundamental democratic principle.

MICHAEL BERRY,
Chairman, 16th Congressional District Democratic Organization.

Your Opinion, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for several years it has been my custom to take samplings of public opinion in my congressional district.

For each Member of this body, the job of keeping aware of the thoughts and beliefs of his constituents is one of his foremost duties. Yet it is not easy to keep in touch with the opinions of 400,000 people in the average congressional district.

In addition to the thousands of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls I receive, I appreciate the opportunity for personal contact with the voters. Obviously, we cannot contact them all as frequently as we would like, and the opinion poll is a useful supplement.

I have found such questionnaires to be helpful to me in measuring public interest and attitudes on important matters before the Congress. This practice has also stimulated discussion and thought among my constituents on the major problems we face as a nation.

This year I am again asking for "Your Opinion, Please." The list of questions is necessarily brief, but I believe they touch upon the most important issues before us.

The war in Vietnam is obviously of paramount interest to us all. Of growing significance are the various domestic programs of the Great Society, and the level at which they should be pursued. An imminent threat is also posed by increasing inflationary pressures which may be felt in every segment of the economy in the coming months.

It is always difficult to select just the right questions and to phrase them in a way which is easily understandable and yet will elicit a meaningful answer. I have reviewed the questions asked by a score of my colleagues in an attempt to get the best possible.

Each of the replies to these questions will be tabulated and the results will be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Here are the questions I am putting to my constituents:

What course should the United States follow in Vietnam?	*Yes*	*No*
Maintain present level of involvement	( )	( )
Suspend bombing of North Vietnam	( )	( )
Withdraw our Armed Forces	( )	( )
Intensify military action	( )	( )
Do you favor changing the term of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years?	( )	( )
Should the Federal Government pay a portion of the home rentals for some families, as proposed by the administration?	( )	( )
Should additional tax credits or deductions be allowed parents of college students?	( )	( )
The administration has asked $1.6 billion for the war on poverty—an increase of $400 million over the first year. Do you approve?	( )	( )
Do you believe there currently is a threat of serious inflation?	( )	( )

Kurt Debus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my position on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has brought me in close touch with many learned scientists and experts in the field of rocketry. I know of no man whom I enjoy as much, nor for whom I have gained as much respect for than Kurt Debus, director of the Kennedy Space Center in Florida.

I was pleased to see that the Sunday Star honored Dr. Debus this past weekend as their headline personality, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article:

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Sunday Star, Feb. 27, 1966]

HEADLINE PERSONALTY—DEBUS CUT HIS TEETH AT GERMAN V-2 BASE

CAPE KENNEDY, FLA.—The man who saved the day for Project Apollo yesterday is a saber-scarred engineer who has fired more big rockets than most people have seen.

As a result of his long experience with these temperamental "birds," Kurt H. Debus has long since learned never to flap, even when things appear most unpromising.

Yesterday while others here and at Houston, Tex., were making a decision to "scrub" the launching of a big Apollo-Saturn superrocket because of a cranky gas-pressure system, Debus was communing with himself at his desk in launch control here. Even after the decision was made—and announced—the mild-mannered rocket engineer did not give up.

WORKED WITH VON BRAUN

As a result of his thoughtful persistence, the unthinkable happened: A scrub was "descrubbed," and Apollo-Saturn 201 went on to a resoundingly successful flight that already has secured a place in the space record books.

Debus cut his teeth, astronautically speaking, on V-2 rockets at the Nazi missile testing base of Peenemuende, where he worked closely with another German engineer, Dr. Vernher von Braun.

Debus and Von Braun came to the United States under the same postwar sponsored-immigration program and have since won high places in the U.S. space effort.

Debus is Director of the Kennedy Space Center here, a job parallel to Von Braun's position at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala. When men go to the moon about 1970, the last bit of earth their feet will touch before liftoff currently "belongs" to Debus.

SPARTAN IN EFFICIENCY

Graying and scholarly, Debus runs a center here, worth roughly a billion dollars, which is Spartan in its efficiency. He is one of the few space officials who has taken on a major project and carried out on time and within cost elements.

Debus and his principal associates are quick to disclaim the role of wonderworkers. They explain that their job has been construction of ground facilities, not rockets, modestly leaving unmentioned the fact that their works border on the fantastic.

On an average sunny Florida day, Debus can sit in his top-floor office in the KSC headquarters building on nearby Merritt Island and look a few miles north to the world's largest structure—a 525-foot vertical assembly building in which the first copy of the world's largest rocket, Saturn V, is beginning to take shape.

PAD WITHIN GAZE

Shifting his gaze a few miles to the east, he can make out the low-lying pad where the first flight-model of Saturn V will blast off sometime early next year. And like as not as he watches, a structure tall as a 40-story building will lumber slowly across the scene—a mobile launcher on a test run from the vertical assembly building to the pad.

Debus has been directly responsible for every manned launching that has taken place here, and for most of the big unmanned ones conducted by the space agency.

Rocket firings are his life—a far cry from the quiet academic days at Darmstadt University in Germany, or even from Peenemunde.

No one could have foreseen 55 years ago in Frankfurt, Germany, that the infant son of Heinrich and Melly Debus would be where and who he is today. The "where" transition sometimes surprises even Debus himself.

This drastic change of circumstances from pre-World War I Germany to space-age America has given Debus an accent that can only be described as "German cracker." He learned English as a second conversational language while working for the Army at Huntsville, in northern Alabama, and his way of speech reveals this.

"It's lucky anyone can understand me," he sometimes comments. Actually, Debus' English is fluent, idiomatic and not severely affected by mingling the tones of Darmstadt and Huntsville.

Every inch the suave, continental gentleman, Debus bears on the lower left side of his face "marks of honor" received in dueling encounters in his undergraduate days a la "The Student Prince." Many people assume the scars are sabrewounds but then unbelievingly shrug off the idea. No mistake, however: They are the real thing, right out of pre-Hitler Rhineland college capers.

A self-effacing man among extroverts, Debus is nowhere near so well known as Von Braun, the astronauts or such scintillating figures as Gemini Mission Director "Chris" Kraft. Friendly enough, he is not notably gregarious and finds his most enjoyable moments at home with the elaborate stereo hi-fi that he built. Classical music transports him, as a friend said, "to another world."

KURT H. DEBUS

Claim to fame: Director, Kennedy Space Center, Fla.

Home: Cocoa Beach, Fla.

Date of birth: November 29, 1908.

Education: Master's degree in electrical and high-voltage engineering from Darmstadt University, Germany; doctor of engineering.

Jobs: Assistant professor at Darmstadt; rocket engineer, Peenemuende missile base, Germany, member of "Von Braun group" at Fort Bliss, Tex., and Huntsville, Ala.; at Cape Canaveral (now Kennedy) since 1962; director of Kennedy Space Center since December 1963.

Family: Wife, Gay; daughters, Ute (Mrs. Adam Metheny) and Sigrid.

Hobbies: Classical hi-fi stereo music.

Gerald Yee Writes Winning Hawaii Entry in National VFW Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the many worthwhile projects of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is their annual Voice of Democracy Essay Contest for high school students. The contest not only stimulates discussions in classrooms on the meaning of democracy, but it also provides an opportunity for the students to compete for educational scholarships ranging from $1,000 to $5,000. More than 300,000 students participated in the contest this year, and the winner from each State has been invited to our Nation's Capital for the final judging on March 8, 1966.

Representing the State of Hawaii is Gerald Yee of Honolulu, Hawaii. Gerald's winning essay, entitled "Democracy—What It Means to Me," reflects mature understanding and appreciation of his role in the democratic processes by which our country is governed. His essay is a tribute to the democratic environment that Hawaii has always provided to nurture its young citizens.

It is with great pride, therefore, that I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Gerald Yee's outstanding essay:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Gerald Yee)

Time: 1835.

Place: The United States, with the great French philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville making his historic visit to study the workings of democracy.

On a restful night, De Tocqueville sat down and began writing. He captured the essence of democracy when he scribbled: "Whenever the political laws of the United States are to be discussed, it is with the supreme authority of the people that we must begin."

Forty-six years before, in 1789, the fathers of our country hopefully made plans for the American ship of state, a new vessel to sail on treacherous uncharted seas amidst the darkest storms of autocracy and tradition. These men, hoping for a land where they could be free, carefully laid out the blueprints for this masterful undertaking. George Washington was elected captain, and the ship was run by a rare element—democracy. Kings and parliaments laughed, sneered, and literally spit upon this ship of state. Never before had they heard of a government where a man without property could elect his leaders, or where the most ragged pauper was being guaranteed the same rights as the gold-studded noble. However, in time these kings vanished from the face of the earth while the U.S. ship of state sailed on.

We are all part of the crew of this ship of state, which sails by the exercise of democracy on board. We students are delegated as many responsibilities as the rich man, poor man, and the worker, who each has his share in maintaining operation of democracy.

Now let us have a closer examination of democracy. We define democracy as (1) faith of the people to govern themselves, and (2) the belief that common men alone have the ability to unite the ship of state, bound by common interest and common goals to protect the freedoms and welfare of all. As a democratic nation, we believe that God himself gave us the natural right and encouragement to decide for ourselves what is proper. This is proven when the founders of this great country wrote the laws of the land with the highest regard for the rights which God so earnestly gave us.

Accordingly, the common man alone has the ability to band together with his fellow beings to form a democratic state, whereby each man is entitled to his share of freedom. This state, formed by wealth, workmen, and teenagers, must possess sufficient energy and kinship to weather the onslaught of external forces and the changing of times.

As high school students in America, we must not be led to believe that our role in preserving our democratic way of life is limited to just voting and watching television forums. On the contrary, preserving our democratic way of life consumes all the energy we can supply. Our role is to keep our ears, our eyes, and our minds open for several sides of an issue, including those of extremist groups, and to constantly safeguard our sacred rights.

For instance, the other day my friends were discussing the pros and cons of the Vietnam war. Several fellows decided, with great spirit, that they must show their feelings toward the war on a larger scale. They brushed several slogans on cardboard signs and demonstrated in full view of the public. Certainly, their privilege to protest or to promote a cause is an inherent and vital organ of democratic society.

As high school students, attending school is obviously one of the major methods in which our democratic way of life is already being preserved. A close examination of today's high schools show that students are being prepared to become active citizens. High school students are doing their part to keep democracy alive and working by taking advantage of citizenship courses, while classes in U.S. Government and American history open doors to the rich meaning of democracy. Other school activities allow the student to exercise his leadership skills, which are vital to the preservation of democracy.

By exercising the fundamentals in school, we students practice democracy by listening, watching, and doing. For example, we can follow the course of an election campaign and wind up with a student mock election concerning identical issues.

As students, we must always be on the guard for infringements on democracy and strive for a more democratic society. We can start first at home and in the community by informing other citizens of their rights and obligations in a democracy. Apathy in democracy must never be tolerated, because enemies of democracy are always on the prowl. Consequently, we must carry out our duties conscientiously and with pride. Our Nation can be kept strong and free only if all of us live and breathe the free spirit of democracy and strive with determination and heart to sail our ship of state onward to a more perfect democratic society.

Questionable Acts With Moral Result

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent action taken by New York longshoremen in picketing the luxury liner, *Queen Mary*, to protest the involvement of British flag vessels in trade with North Vietnam demonstrates again the imperative need for the administration to take stronger measures to bring about an end to the aid and comfort being given by free world ships to our enemy. The intentions of the longshoremen are certainly understandable and commendable. Under no condition can such assistance to a nation operating on a war economy and dedicated to a policy of terror and aggression be tolerated. Many Americans, I know, are in sympathy with the purposes of the boycott called for a few days ago by the Maritime Trade Department of the AFL–CIO, after they received no response from the White House to a request for more effective action to end the traffic of free world ships in the harbor of Haiphong. Clearly no one should remain indifferent to this trade while we have so many servicemen risking their lives in daily combat. Yet, just as obviously the good intentions of the maritime unions are not enough to insure that their independent action can properly bring about the desired result.

This is a matter that can only be properly handled by governmental action. Governmental inaction only results in the abdication of responsibility to those who are not legally equipped to do the job. There are bills in Congress which would do what the maritime unions seek to do on their own but in which the administration has only shown a negative interest to date. I would hope that the outcome of the maritime unions' concern in this matter would be an appropriate change in our governmental policy rather than the relegating of the conduct of our foreign policy to private initiative, however well intentioned.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a thoughtful commentary on this situation in an editorial appearing in the Jackson Citizen Patriot, Jackson, Mich., Wednesday, February 23 entitled "Questionable Acts With Moral Result" which discusses an article by Columnist Victor Riesel.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, Feb. 23, 1966]

QUESTIONABLE ACTS WITH MORAL RESULT

In his column on this page today Victor Riesel gives details of the aims of the waterfront unions in their threat to boycott ships of "friendly" nations which are carrying goods to the enemy in North Vietnam.

As one of the Nation's top labor writers (and he may have no equals in his field) Mr. Riesel's statements that the unions mean business carries considerable weight.

The reaction from the White House to the threatened boycott has been guarded. Mr. Riesel hints that there will be no strenuous objections from the administration if the waterfront unions actually do hamper loading and sailing of ships which are picking up profitable cargo here between trips to North Vietnam.

The AFL–CIO resolution for the boycott gives the Johnson administration time to bring pressure to bear on its friends to stop this trade with the Communists. The threat from the unions, may strengthen America's hand in these negotiations.

At the same time, the cartoon by Oliphant makes an important point: That the conduct of foreign policy is the business of the Government, rather than any group of union leaders—or businessmen, or college professors, or students, or newspapers.

Yet the right to protest the administration's actions has to be respected. If a labor union, a business group, or any other organization or individual wants to criticize the Government for permitting ships which carry goods to the enemy to also work the lucrative American market, they have the right to do so.

The maritime unions are in a unique position because they can, if they wish, translate their vocal protest into direct action. Moreover, there is little the Federal Government can do about it if the dock workers refuse to handle the cargo of any given ship. Mr. Riesel indicates that the refusals to work may be of the hit-and-run variety. Thus the ponderous machinery of the law cannot be brought to bear on the unions if they decide to boycott ships.

And lurking in the background is the thought that if the unions can refuse to load ships because of an ideological dispute, another union could well decide to do the same thing if its leadership were not sympathetic to the American cause.

That is why any Communist infiltration of key unions is a matter of such great concern.

Thus there is something inherently wrong with this picture. The first impression may well be that a labor union should not impose its will on national policy.

But also wrong is the idea of not using all the Nation's power and prestige to prevent so-called friends from trading with the enemy.

The United States has moved with supercaution in dealing with this matter. The soft approach is rationalized in many ways.

It is difficult to believe, however, that if President Johnson and his administration really cracked down on its allies they could not appreciably decrease the amount of free world goods flowing to North Vietnam to help carry on the war against South Vietnam and its American allies.

Thus it can be said that the waterfront unions merely are seeking to force the administration to do what it should do on its own. The method is questionable, even dangerous, although the result may be moral.

ANGRY MEN SUPPORT SHIPPING BOYCOTT

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK.—None are tougher than waterfront labor leaders when they go for the jugular of the enemy.

And apparently now they are America's only angry men—sickened by the blood on the hands of allied nations' shipowners, infuriated by the blood money being pocketed by foreign shippers now running supplies to the Vietcong and steaming back across the world with Hanoi's exports to pile up hard currency for Ho.

These waterfront union leaders in a telegram and in a series of telephone conversations have informed the President and his advisers that moneymaking out of the bloodletting in Vietnam will be stopped by direct labor action.

Neither Mr. Johnson nor his advisors have asked the labor men to desist. They won't.

They'll plug up the holes through which the U.S. Department of Commerce is permitting foreign shippers to sail a freighter right into the Vietcong's port of Haiphong, dump its supplies, carry out Ho Chi Minh's coal and other produce, deliver it to another country, and then steam into New York or San Francisco to pick up profitable American cargoes.

This still is permissible under the Commerce Department's Maritime Administration's so-called blacklisting of foreign ships supplying the enemy.

As Congressmen and other Government people and the waterfront leaders themselves understand the recent Maritime Administration's edict, the only cargoes such foreign ships cannot pick up in U.S. ports are those generated or financed by the U.S. Government itself. But these shippers can send in their vessels to take on commercial cargo—and at rates undercutting U.S. shipping companies along all shores, including those of the Great Lakes.

The direct labor action is being braintrusted by the joint maritime labor committee, headed by the peppery and peripatetic Teddy Gleason, America's No. 1 longshoreman; by the stonewall Paul Hall, leader of the Seafarers; and by Big Joe Curran, the Paul Bunyanesque chief of the National Maritime Union.

Soon they will meet with Labor Secretary Wirtz in Bal Harbour, Fla. There they will tell him of plans to close all waterfronts to all ships trading with the enemy, regardless of treaties, diplomacy, State Department pressure, injunctions, admonitions, imprecations, or incarcerations.

They will be conferring with the Secretary of Labor while the rest of America's labor leadership is in the area for midwinter strategy sessions. There is no doubt that the AFL–CIO high command is solidly behind the waterfront chiefs.

But this will be just the beginning.

These men are aware that of the 119 free world vessels which steamed regularly into North Vietnam last year, 107 flew the flags of NATO countries, which the United States is pledged to support should they be attacked by the very same nations now backing the enemy.

So, at first, the three dockside musketeers will put their hooks into the ships which are on the direct, though circuitous run from enemy territory to American ports.

Then will come swift, though short, demonstrations against the entire fleet of a company which sends even one of its ships into North Vietnamese ports. If such a ship's actual owner is hidden by complex holding corporations, the real papers will be dug out. Then, for example, if a commercial fleet doing business with the enemy has 20 ships in U.S. harbors, all of them will be boycotted. The key man here will be the bantam Ted Gleason.

Not one of the vessels will be loaded or unloaded in any American port for 2 or 3 days. The longshoremen will lose pay, but they know it's not even a grain of sand in a desert compared with the awesome sacrifice the kids are making in Vietnam.

This boycott technique is called hitting the company.

If this doesn't end the blood money, runs the trio is ready to "hit the flag" of nations permitting their ships to run into Haiphong. Thus, not only a single steamship company would be tied up, but it is possible, and probable, that all the British ships in all American harbors, luxury and cargo, will be boycotted for a few days or longer.

When such a decision is made, all waterfront workers, be they tugboatmen or truckers, will obey the Maritime Labor Committee's picket lines. No British ship will be able to dock. If already alongshore, no dockwallopers will unload or load it. If loaded, when the signal comes it will not be able to sail, for no lines will be untied.

The cost to the provisioners of the enemy will be enormous.

"What of it," asked the husky blondish Paul Hall. "What they are doing is unspeakable and ghoulish. We have 200,000 kids in Vietnam. For us to be silent would be betrayal.

"We will not be silent. We will not be idle. There will be no blood money—especially American money—in their pockets or on our hands or consciences. There is no braggadocio in this. But you asked me and I—we—are saying we'll take on all comers on this one.

"Realism has got to start somewhere."

And they are starting it.

Pfc. Winston Belton Justifies the Faith of Lt. Gen. Robert Colglazier, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 22, 1965, I inserted in the Congressional Record, with appropriate remarks of my own, the factsheet prepared by the Department of the Army relative to action taken by Lt. Gen. Robert Colglazier, Jr., in the case of Pvt. Winston R. Belton.

I am sure that everyone in this body has read of the recent promotion of Pvt. Winston Belton to private, first class which appeared in the February 18, 1966, edition of the Evening Star and which I would like to insert at this point in the Record. If ever there was vindication of trust and faith of one man in another, Mr. Speaker, this is it. I am sure that Private, First Class Belton is proud of himself, and knowing General Colglazier as I do, I am sure he is proud of Private, First Class Belton.

Proves Self in Combat—Ex-striker Is Fine Soldier

(By Peter Arnett)

Ben Cat, South Vietnam.—Six months ago a university graduate named Winstel R. Belton staged a seven-day hunger strike at Ft. Benning, Ga., to dramatize his distaste for being drafted and his refusal to fight in Vietnam. Yesterday a big, proud smile flashed across Belton's face as he was promoted to private first class on a battlefield in South Vietnam.

Looking just as proud was his company commander, Capt. R. K. Spriggs of Mexico, N.Y., a professional soldier who had hated everything Belton's hunger strike had stood for.

Spriggs was furious last November when he returned to his unit after recovering from a bullet wound to find Belton assigned there.

GIVEN A CHANCE

Spriggs said yesterday he would take the 26-year-old Winslow, Ariz., soldier into combat with him any time, anywhere.

Belton arrived in Vietnam with a 12-month suspended jail sentence hanging over his head because of his hunger strike in mid-August. A court-martial had given him a bad conduct discharge, total forfeiture of pay and the jail sentence.

But he was also given a chance.

Belton, a Negro, was told that if he went to Vietnam and proved himself, he would not have to serve his jail sentence. If he failed, he would serve it.

His old unit, the U.S. Army's 1st Air Cavalry Division, wouldn't take him back.

The 1st Infantry Division accepted him.

KNOWN ONLY BY ONE

Spriggs was the only man in A Company of the 2d Battalion, 28th Regiment, who knew that the new radio telephone operator was the hunger striker Belton.

Lt. Gus Berzines, a weapons platoon commander from Kalamazoo, Mich., recalled talking with Belton one day about various things and finally saying, "You mean you're that Belton?"

More and more men in the unit began realizing that Belton had publicly protested what they themselves had accepted as a patriotic duty. None of them brought up the subject with him except the company commander, and few ever discussed it among themselves.

"That was his business," said Sgt. Frederick Range of Dallas, Tex. "We treated him like any other soldier."

BATTLES FORGED TIES

Belton, holder of a bachelor of science degree in education, was initially cold and reserved with his buddies. But the heat of battles in December and January melted his attitude and forged ever-tightening bonds with Spriggs and the other men in the company.

Initially given the job of laying wires between the company headquarters and the platoons, he began carrying Spriggs' radio.

Early in January, he proved he had what it takes.

Sp5c. Larry Kabriel, of Summerfield, Kans., recalls that the company was under heavy fire near Trung Lap and an urgent call came over the radio for Captain Spriggs.

The radioman shouted back: "The captain's not here. He's up front. There's heavy fire, I can't reach him."

Kabriel said Belton shouted out, "It's your duty to get up to the captain," crawled over to the reluctant radioman, grabbed the apparatus and moved up under fire to his captain.

Spriggs has used him as his radioman ever since.

"Belton in his conduct and bearing has been above average as a soldier and a valuable asset," Spriggs said. "He has worked in very well socially and he has got along with the men.

"I am personally satisfied that he now honestly believes his actions in the past have not been consistent with being a soldier or man.

"I personally wrote to the commanding general recommending that he be promoted and his sentence remitted. Belton has seen men fight and die for his country, and he has felt the honor that comes when you do fight."

PROMOTION DELAYED

Spriggs tried to promote Belton 2 months ago, but the Army wanted to wait longer. Spriggs was told he must be absolutely sure Belton had changed his ways.

"I told Belton he deserved to be promoted," Spriggs said. I knew he was happy. I knew he felt he had made it."

Belton is still a man of few words.

Asked why he launched his hunger strike, he replied: "I figured the Army had interrupted my education, and I needed the schooling. And when they said I had to go to Vietnam, well, I thought why should I go there, I don't think we should be there.

"I wasn't a part of a protest movement. I wasn't then and I'm not now."

What about those now protesting American involvement in Vietnam?

"We have good reasons to be doing what we are doing here," said Belton, "and we belong here, I know that now. I don't know if we'll ever win. But we're here and we have to stay."

Belton added that he hasn't changed his ideas "a full 360 degrees."

"I still don't like killing," he said. "I get faint when I see a dead man. I hate to kill, but I do my job."

The husky Belton credited Captain Spriggs with getting him his promotion and the remittance of his sentence.

"I'm glad I came to this company," he said.

Belton intends to go back to school in Milwaukee, Wis., when he gets out of the service, on the new GI bill, he hopes.

And he wants to forget his experience as a hunger striker. The forgetting has already begun for the 1st Division. The commanding general, Maj. Gen. Jonathan O. Seaman, said: "I had deep satisfaction in remitting Belton's sentence."

"Belton made a mistake," the general added, "but he had a chance to correct it on the field of battle and he did so. He proved he had the courage and the spirit to overcome the difficulties brought about by an unthinking action."

Belton will be in Vietnam with his company until late April at least. His personal motto, printed across his steel helmet, probably reflects his change of thinking as much as anything else.

It reads: "Cast your fate to the winds."

Resolutions on 48th Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1966, at a meeting of the Lithuanian American Community of the USA, Inc., in Hartford, Conn., the following two resolutions were passed on the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. I call these to the attention of the Members of the Congress:

Whereas the US. Government has always championed and aided the course of freedom and sovereign independence for all peoples: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we proudly reaffirm our loyalty to the United States of America, and wholeheartedly support Lyndon B. Johnson and the Government of the United States of their honorable and noble policy of determination to arrest Communist aggression and expansion in South Vietnam, the Dominican Republic and elsewhere.

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania by legal and democratic processes but by force of arms; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America consistently has refused to recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to uphold the rights of peoples everywhere to determine their destinies through free participation in elected governments: Therefore be it

Resolved, To request the President of the United States to bring up Lithuania's question before the United Nations and ask, That the Soviets withdraw all Soviet troops from the Baltic States to permit free elections under the supervision of the United Nations.

These resolutions are signed by: Algimantas Dragunevicius, chairman, and Justinas Guntulis, secretary.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181, Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b, Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or w
out individual headings, shall be consid
as a single extension and the two-page
shall apply. The Public Printer or the Of
Reporters of the House or Senate shall re
to the Member of the respective House
matter submitted for the Congressi
Record which is in contravention of
paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Rep
ers of each House shall indicate on the ma
script and prepare headings for all matt
be printed in the Appendix, and shall m
suitable reference thereto at the proper p
in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*.	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
nouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
ckson, Henry M., *Wash*	
vits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	2500 Virginia Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine*.	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Tydings, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Michael Rodak, 6311 Joslyn Pl., Cheverly, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—H. C. Hallam, Jr., 113 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

testing base of Peenemuende, where he worked closely with another German engineer, Dr. Wernher von Braun.

Debus and Von Braun came to the United States under the same postwar sponsored-immigration program and have since won high places in the U.S. space effort.

Debus is Director of the Kennedy Space Center here, a job parallel to Von Braun's position at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala. When men go to the moon about 1970, the last bit of earth their feet will touch before liftoff currently "belongs" to Debus.

SPARTAN IN EFFICIENCY

Graying and scholarly, Debus runs a center here, worth roughly a billion dollars, which is Spartan in its efficiency. He is one of the few space officials who has taken on a major project and carried out on time and within cost elements.

Debus and his principal associates are quick to disclaim the role of wonderworkers. They explain that their job has been construction of ground facilities, not rockets, modestly leaving unmentioned the fact that their works border on the fantastic.

On an average sunny Florida day, Debus can sit in his top-floor office in the NASA headquarters building on nearby Merritt Island and look a few miles north to the world's largest structure—a 526-foot vertical assembly building in which the first copy of the world's largest rocket, Saturn V, is beginning to take shape.

PAD WITHIN GAZE

Shifting his gaze a few miles to the east, he can make out the low-lying pad where the first flight-model of Saturn V will blast off sometime early next year. And like as not as he watches, a structure tall as a 40-story building will lumber slowly across the scene—a mobile launcher on a test run from the vertical assembly building to the pad.

Debus has been directly responsible for every manned launching that has taken place here, and for most of the big unmanned ones conducted by the space agency.

Rocket firings are his life—a far cry from the quiet academic days at Darmstadt University in Germany, or even from Peenemunde.

No one could have foreseen 58 years ago in Frankfurt, Germany, that the infant son of Heinrich and Molly Debus would be where and who he is today. The "where" transition sometimes surprises even Debus himself.

This drastic change of circumstances from pre-World War I Germany to space-age America has given Debus an accent that can only be described as "German cracker." He learned English as a second conversational language while working for the Army at Huntsville, in northern Alabama, and his way of speech reveals this.

"It's lucky anyone can understand me," he sometimes comments. Actually, Debus' English is fluent, idiomatic and not severely affected by mingling the tones of Darmstadt and Huntsville.

Every inch the suave, continental gentleman, Debus bears on the lower left side of his face "marks of honor" received in dueling encounters in his undergraduate days a la "The Student Prince." Many people assume the scars are sabrewounds but then unbelievingly shrug off the idea. No mistake, however: They are the real thing, right out of pre-Hitler Rhineland college capers.

A self-effacing man among extroverts, Debus is nowhere near so well known as Von Braun, the astronauts or such scintillating figures as Gemini Mission Director "Chris" Kraft. Friendly enough, he is not notably gregarious and finds his most enjoyable moments at home with the elaborate stereo hi-fi that he built. Classical music transports him, as a friend said, "to another world."

KURT H. DEBUS

Claim to fame: Director, Kennedy Space Center, Fla.

Home: Cocoa Beach, Fla.

Date of birth: November 29, 1908.

Education: Master's degree in electrical and high-voltage engineering from Darmstadt University, Germany; doctor of engineering.

Jobs: Assistant professor at Darmstadt; rocket engineer, Peenemuende missile base, Germany; member of "Von Braun group" at Fort Bliss, Tex., and Huntsville, Ala.; at Cape Canaveral (now Kennedy) since 1950; director of Kennedy Space Center since December 1963.

Family: Wife, Gay; daughters, Ute (Mrs. Adam Matheny) and Sigrid.

Hobbies: Classical hi-fi stereo music.

Gerald Yee Writes Winning Hawaii Entry in National VFW Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the many worthwhile projects of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is their annual Voice of Democracy Essay Contest for high school students. The contest not only stimulates discussions in classrooms on the meaning of democracy, but it also provides an opportunity for the students to compete for educational scholarships ranging from $1,000 to $5,000. More than 300,000 students participated in the contest this year, and the winner from each State has been invited to our Nation's Capital for the final judging on March 8, 1966.

Representing the State of Hawaii is Gerald Yee of Honolulu, Hawaii. Gerald's winning essay, entitled "Democracy—What It Means to Me," reflects mature understanding and appreciation of his role in the democratic processes by which our country is governed. His essay is a tribute to the democratic environment that Hawaii has always provided to nurture its young citizens.

It is with great pride, therefore, that I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Gerald Yee's outstanding essay:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Gerald Yee)

Time: 1835.

Place: The United States, with the great French philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville making his historic visit to study the workings of democracy.

On a restful night, De Tocqueville sat down and began writing. He captured the essence of democracy when he scribbled: "Whenever the political laws of the United States are to be discussed, it is with the supreme authority of the people that we must begin."

Forty-six years before, in 1789, the fathers of our country hopefully made plans for the American ship of state, a new vessel to sail on treacherous uncharted seas amidst the darkest storms of autocracy and tradition. These men, hoping for a land where they could be free, carefully laid out the blueprints for this masterful undertaking. George Washington was elected captain, and the ship was run by a rare element—democracy. Kings and parliaments laughed, sneered, and literally spit upon this ship of state. Never before had they heard of a government where a man without property could elect his leaders, or where the most ragged pauper was being guaranteed the same rights as the gold-studded noble. However, in time these kings vanished from the face of the earth while the U.S. ship of state sailed on.

We are all part of the crew of this ship of state, which sails by the exercise of democracy on board. We students are delegated as many responsibilities as the rich man, poor man, and the worker, who each has his share in maintaining operation of democracy.

Now let us have a closer examination of democracy. We define democracy as (1) faith of the people to govern themselves, and (2) the belief that common man alone have the ability to unite the ship of state, bound by common interest and common goals to protect the freedoms and welfare of all. As a democratic nation, we believe that God himself gave us the natural right and encouragement to decide for ourselves what is proper. This is proven when the founders of this great country wrote the laws of the land with the highest regard for the rights which God so earnestly gave us.

Accordingly, the common man alone has the ability to band together with his fellow beings to form a democratic state, whereby each man is entitled to his share of freedom. This state, formed by wealth, workmen, and teenagers, must possess sufficient energy and kinship to weather the onslaught of external forces and the changing of times.

As high school students in America, we must not be led to believe that our role in preserving our democratic way of life is limited to just voting and watching television forums. On the contrary, preserving our democratic way of life consumes all the energy we can supply. Our role is to keep our ears, our eyes, and our minds open for several sides of an issue, including those of extremist groups, and to constantly safeguard our sacred rights.

For instance, the other day my friends were discussing the pros and cons of the Vietnam war. Several fellows decided, with great spirit, that they must show their feelings toward the war on a larger scale. They brushed several slogans on cardboard signs and demonstrated in full view of the public. Certainly, their privilege to protest or to promote a cause is an inherent and vital organ of democratic society.

As high school students, attending school is obviously one of the major methods in which our democratic way of life is already being preserved. A close examination of today's high schools show that students are being prepared to become active citizens. High school students are doing their part to keep democracy alive and working by taking advantage of citizenship courses, while classes in U.S. Government and American history open doors to the rich meaning of democracy. Other school activities allow the student to exercise his leadership skills, which are vital to the preservation of democracy.

By exercising the fundamentals in school, we students practice democracy by listening, watching, and doing. For example, we can follow the course of an election campaign and wind up with a student mock election concerning identical issues.

As students, we must always be on the guard for infringements on democracy and strive for a more democratic society. We can start first at home and in the community by informing other citizens of their rights and obligations in a democracy. Apathy in democracy must never be tolerated, because enemies of democracy are always on the prowl. Consequently, we must carry out our duties conscientiously and with pride. Our Nation can be kept strong and free only if all of us live and breathe the free spirit of democracy and strive with determination and heart to sail our ship of state onward to a more perfect democratic society.

Questionable Acts With Moral Result

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent action taken by New York longshoremen in picketing the luxury liner, Queen *Mary*, to protest the involvement of British flag vessels in trade with North Vietnam demonstrates again the imperative need for the administration to take stronger measures to bring about an end to the aid and comfort being given by free world ships to our enemy. The intentions of the longshoremen are certainly understandable and commendable. Under no condition can such assistance to a nation operating on a war economy and dedicated to a policy of terror and aggression be tolerated. Many Americans, I know, are in sympathy with the purposes of the boycott called for a few days ago by the Maritime Trade Department of the AFL-CIO, after they received no response from the White House to a request for more effective action to end the traffic of free world ships in the harbor of Haiphong. Clearly no one should remain indifferent to this trade while we have so many servicemen risking their lives in daily combat. Yet, just as obviously the good intentions of the maritime unions are not enough to insure that their independent action can properly bring about the desired result.

This is a matter that can only be properly handled by governmental action. Governmental inaction only results in the abdication of responsibility to those who are not legally equipped to do the job. There are bills in Congress which would do what the maritime unions seek to do on their own but in which the administration has only shown a negative interest to date. I would hope that the outcome of the maritime unions' concern in this matter would be an appropriate change in our governmental policy rather than the relegating of the conduct of our foreign policy to private initiative, however well intentioned.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a thoughtful commentary on this situation in an editorial appearing in the Jackson Citizen Patriot, Jackson, Mich., Wednesday, February 23 entitled "Questionable Acts With Moral Result" which discusses an article by Columnist Victor Riesel.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, Feb. 23, 1966]

QUESTIONABLE ACTS WITH MORAL RESULT

In his column on this page today Victor Riesel gives details of the aims of the waterfront unions in their threat to boycott ships of "friendly" nations which are carrying goods to the enemy in North Vietnam.

As one of the Nation's top labor writers (and he may have no equals in his field) Mr. Riesel's statements that the unions mean business carries considerable weight.

The reaction from the White House to the threatened boycott has been guarded. Mr. Riesel hints that there will be no strenuous objections from the administration if the waterfront unions actually do hamper loading and sailing of ships which are picking up profitable cargo here between trips to North Vietnam.

The AFL-CIO resolution for the boycott gives the Johnson administration time to bring pressure to bear on its friends to stop this trade with the Communists. The threat from the unions, may strengthen America's hand in these negotiations.

At the same time, the cartoon by Oliphant makes an important point: That the conduct of foreign policy is the business of the Government, rather than any group of union leaders—or businessmen, or college professors, or students, or newspapers.

Yet the right to protest the administration's actions has to be respected. If a labor union, a business group, or any other organization or individual wants to criticize the Government for permitting ships which carry goods to the enemy to also work the lucrative American market, they have the right to do so.

The maritime unions are in a unique position because they can, if they wish, translate their vocal protest into direct action. Moreover, there is little the Federal Government can do about it if the dock workers refuse to handle the cargo of any given ship. Mr. Riesel indicates that the refusals to work may be of the hit-and-run variety. Thus the ponderous machinery of the law cannot be brought to bear on the unions if they decide to boycott ships.

And lurking in the background is the thought that if the unions can refuse to load ships because of an ideological dispute, another union could well decide to do the same thing if its leadership were not sympathetic to the American cause.

That is why any Communist infiltration of key unions is a matter of such great concern.

Thus there is something inherently wrong with this picture. The first impression may well be that a labor union should not impose its will on national policy.

But also wrong is the idea of not using all the Nation's power and prestige to prevent so-called friends from trading with the enemy.

The United States has moved with supercaution in dealing with this matter. The soft approach is rationalized in many ways.

It is difficult to believe, however, that if President Johnson and his administration really cracked down on its allies they could not appreciably decrease the amount of free world goods flowing to North Vietnam to help carry on the war against South Vietnam and its American allies.

Thus it can be said that the waterfront unions merely are seeking to force the administration to do what it should do on its own. The method is questionable, even dangerous, although the result may be moral.

ANGRY MEN SUPPORT SHIPPING BOYCOTT

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK.—None are tougher than waterfront labor leaders when they go for the jugular of the enemy.

And apparently now they are America's only angry men—sickened by the blood on the hands of allied nations' shipowners, infuriated by the blood money being pocketed by foreign shippers now running supplies to the Vietcong and steaming back across the world with Hanoi's exports to pile up hard currency for Ho.

These waterfront union leaders in a telegram and in a series of telephone conversations have informed the President and his advisers that moneymaking out of the bloodletting in Vietnam will be stopped by direct labor action.

Neither Mr. Johnson nor his advisers have asked the labor men to desist. They won't.

They'll plug up the holes through which the U.S. Department of Commerce is permitting foreign shippers to sail a freighter right into the Vietcong's port of Haiphong, dump its supplies, carry out Ho Chi Minh's coal and other produce, deliver it to another country, and then steam into New York or San Francisco to pick up profitable American cargoes.

This still is permissible under the Commerce Department's Maritime Administration's so-called blacklisting of foreign ships supplying the enemy.

As Congressmen and other Government people and the waterfront leaders themselves understand the recent Maritime Administration's edict, the only cargoes such foreign ships cannot pick up in U.S. ports are those generated or financed by the U.S. Government itself. But these shippers can send in their vessels to take on commercial cargo—and at rates undercutting U.S. shipping companies along all shores, including those of the Great Lakes.

The direct labor action is being braintrusted by the joint maritime labor committee, headed by the peppery and peripatetic Teddy Gleason, America's No. 1 longshoreman; by the stonewall Paul Hall, leader of the Seafarers; and by Big Joe Curran, the Paul Bunyanesque chief of the National Maritime Union.

Soon they will meet with Labor Secretary Wirtz in Bal Harbour, Fla. There they will tell him of plans to close all waterfronts to all ships trading with the enemy, regardless of treaties, diplomacy, State Department pressure, injunctions, admonitions, imprecations, or incarcerations.

They will be conferring with the Secretary of Labor while the rest of America's labor leadership is in the area for midwinter strategy sessions. There is no doubt that the AFL-CIO high command is solidly behind the waterfront chiefs.

But this will be just the beginning.

These men are aware that of the 119 free world vessels which steamed regularly into North Vietnam last year, 107 flew the flags of NATO countries, which the United States is pledged to support should they be attacked by the very same nations now backing the enemy.

So, at first, the three dockside musketeers will put their hooks into the ships which are on the direct, though circuitous run from enemy territory to American ports.

Then will come swift, though short, demonstrations against the entire fleet of a company which sends even one of its ships into North Vietnamese ports. If such a ship's actual owner is hidden by complex holding corporations, the real papers will be dug out. Then, for example, if a commercial fleet doing business with the enemy has 20 ships in U.S. harbors, all of them will be boycotted. The key man here will be the bantam Ted Gleason.

Not one of the vessels will be loaded or unloaded in any American port for 2 or 3 days. The longshoremen will lose pay, but they know it's not even a grain of sand in a desert compared with the awesome sacrifice the kids are making in Vietnam.

This boycott technique is called hitting the company.

If this doesn't end the blood money, runs the trio is ready to "hit the flag" of nations permitting their ships to run into Haiphong. Thus, not only a single steamship company would be tied up, but it is possible, and probable, that all the British ships in all American harbors, luxury and cargo, will be boycotted for a few days or longer.

When such a decision is made, all waterfront workers, be they tugboatmen or truckers, will obey the Maritime Labor Committee's picket lines. No British ship will be able to dock. If already alongshore, no dockwallopers will unload or load it. If loaded, when the signal comes it will not be able to sail, for no lines will be untied.

The cost to the provisioners of the enemy will be enormous.

"What of it," asked the husky blondish Paul Hall. "What they are doing is unspeakable and ghoulish. We have 200,000 kids in Vietnam. For us to be silent would be betrayal.

"We will not be silent. We will not be idle. There will be no blood money—especially American money—in their pockets or on our hands or consciences. There is no braggadocio in this. But you asked me and I—we—are saying we'll take on all comers on this one.

"Realism has got to start somewhere."

And they are starting it.

Pfc. Winston Belton Justifies the Faith of Lt. Gen. Robert Colglazier, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 22, 1965, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with appropriate remarks of my own, the factsheet prepared by the Department of the Army relative to action taken by Lt. Gen. Robert Colglazier, Jr., in the case of Pvt. Winston R. Belton.

I am sure that everyone in this body has read of the recent promotion of Pvt. Winston Belton to private, first class which appeared in the February 18, 1966, edition of the Evening Star and which I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD. If ever there was vindication of trust and faith of one man in another, Mr. Speaker, this is it. I am sure that Private, First Class Belton is proud of himself, and knowing General Colglazier as I do, I am sure he is proud of Private, First Class Belton.

PROVES SELF IN COMBAT—EX-STRIKER IS FINE SOLDIER

(By Peter Arnett)

BEN CAT, South Vietnam.—Six months ago a university graduate named Winstel R. Belton staged a seven-day hunger strike at Ft. Benning, Ga., to dramatize his distaste for being drafted and his refusal to fight in Vietnam. Yesterday a big, proud smile flashed across Belton's face as he was promoted to private first class on a battlefield in South Vietnam.

Looking just as proud was his company commander, Capt. R. E. Spriggs of Mexico, N.Y., a professional soldier who had hated everything Belton's hunger strike had stood for.

Spriggs was furious last November when he returned to his unit after recovering from a bullet wound to find Belton assigned there.

GIVEN A CHANCE

Spriggs said yesterday he would take the 26-year-old Winslow, Ariz., soldier into combat with him any time, anywhere.

Belton arrived in Vietnam with a 12-month suspended jail sentence hanging over his head because of his hunger strike in mid-August. A court-martial had given him a bad conduct discharge, total forfeiture of pay and the jail sentence.

But he was also given a chance.

Belton, a Negro, was told that if he went to Vietnam and proved himself, he would not have to serve his jail sentence. If he failed, he would serve it.

His old unit, the U.S. Army's 1st Air Cavalry Division, wouldn't take him back.

The 1st Infantry Division accepted him.

KNOWN ONLY BY ONE

Spriggs was the only man in A Company of the 2d Battalion, 28th Regiment, who knew that the new radio telephone operator was the hunger striker Belton.

Lt. Gus B[illegible]xines, a weapons platoon commander from Kalamazoo, Mich., recalled talking with Belton one day about various things and finally saying, "You mean you're that Belton?"

More and more men in the unit began realizing that Belton had publicly protested what they themselves had accepted as a patriotic duty. None of them brought up the subject with him except the company commander, and few ever discussed it among themselves.

"That was his business," said Sgt. Frederick Range of Dallas, Tex. "We treated him like any other soldier."

BATTLES FORGED TIES

Belton, holder of a bachelor of science degree in education, was initially cold and reserved with his buddies. But the heat of battles in December and January melted his attitude and forged ever-tightening bonds with Spriggs and the other men in the company.

Initially given the job of laying wires between the company headquarters and the platoons, he began carrying Spriggs' radio.

Early in January, he proved he had what it takes.

Sp5c. Larry Kabriel, of Summerfield, Kans., recalls that the company was under heavy fire near Trung Lap and an urgent call came over the radio for Captain Spriggs.

The radioman shouted back: "The captain's not here. He's up front. There's heavy fire, I can't reach him."

Kabriel said Belton shouted out, "It's your duty to get up to the captain," crawled over to the reluctant radioman, grabbed the apparatus and moved up under fire to his captain.

Spriggs has used him as his radioman ever since.

"Belton in his conduct and bearing has been above average as a soldier and a valuable asset," Spriggs said. "He has worked in very well socially and he has got along with the men.

"I am personally satisfied that he now honestly believes his actions in the past have not been consistent with being a soldier or man.

"I personally wrote to the commanding general recommending that he be promoted and his sentence remitted. Belton has seen men fight and die for his country, and he has felt the honor that comes when you do fight."

PROMOTION DELAYED

Spriggs tried to promote Belton 2 months ago, but the Army wanted to wait longer. Spriggs was told he must be absolutely sure Belton had changed his ways.

"I told Belton he deserved to be promoted," Spriggs said. I knew he was happy. I knew he felt he had made it."

Belton is still a man of few words.

Asked why he launched his hunger strike, he replied: "I figured the Army had interrupted my education, and I needed the schooling. And when they said I had to go to Vietnam, well, I thought why should I go there, I don't think we should be there.

"I wasn't a part of a protest movement. I wasn't then and I'm not now."

What about those now protesting American involvement in Vietnam?

"We have good reasons to be doing what we are doing here," said Belton, "and we belong here, I know that now. I don't know if we'll ever win. But we're here and we have to stay."

Belton added that he hasn't changed his ideas "a full 360 degrees."

"I still don't like killing," he said. "I get faint when I see a dead man. I hate to kill, but I do my job."

The husky Belton credited Captain Spriggs with getting him his promotion and the remittance of his sentence.

"I'm glad I came to this company," he said.

Belton intends to go back to school in Milwaukee, Wis., when he gets out of the service, on the new GI bill, he hopes.

And he wants to forget his experience as a hunger striker. The forgetting has already begun for the 1st Division. The commanding general, Maj. Gen. Jonathan O. Seaman, said: "I had deep satisfaction in remitting Belton's sentence."

"Belton made a mistake," the general added, "but he had a chance to correct it on the field of battle and he did so. He proved he had the courage and the spirit to overcome the difficulties brought about by an unthinking action."

Belton will be in Vietnam with his company until late April at least. His personal motto, printed across his steel helmet, probably reflects his change of thinking as much as anything else.

It reads: "Cast your fate to the winds."

Resolutions on 48th Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1966, at a meeting of the Lithuanian American Community of the USA, Inc., in Hartford, Conn., the following two resolutions were passed on the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. I call these to the attention of the Members of the Congress:

Whereas the US. Government has always championed and aided the course of freedom and sovereign independence for all peoples: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we proudly reaffirm our loyalty to the United States of America, and wholeheartedly support Lyndon B. Johnson and the Government of the United States of their honorable and noble policy of determination to arrest Communist aggression and expansion in South Vietnam, the Dominican Republic and elsewhere.

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania by legal and democratic processes but by force of arms; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America consistently has refused to recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to uphold the rights of peoples everywhere to determine their destinies through free participation in elected governments: Therefore be it

Resolved, To request the President of the United States to bring up Lithuania's question before the United Nations and ask, That the Soviets withdraw all Soviet troops from the Baltic States to permit free elections under the supervision of the United Nations.

These resolutions are signed by: Algimantas Dragunevicius, chairman, and Justinas Guntulis, secretary.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181, Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b, Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.